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Abstract

The Western world has long boasted different, regional culinary traditions as witnessed by the Yorkshire pudding of Northeast England, the gateaux of France and the griddle of Western Scotland. An extraordinary aspect of these culinary traditions is that they have stood the test of time. Many may argue that for an Indigenous culinary tradition to exist it would be in isolation from the Western world and there could be no influence from alternative resources, tools and methods. The colonization of New Zealand brought inevitable changes in Māori society and one of the most fundamental of these changes affected Māori cuisine. First impressions of a contemporary Māori household would have one believe that traditional Māori food, tools and methods are extinct; therefore a Māori culinary tradition is also long dead, surviving only at formal occasions on marae (meeting house). However the appearance of Māori recipes in modern day cookbooks, and Māori cookbooks themselves would seem to contradict this statement. Nevertheless one has to ask if these cookbooks are a long line of ‘heritage’ books harking back to days of old: are they designed for tourists in order to get the ‘authentic’ Māori experience; are these recipes due to a renaissance of Māoritanga in order to assert cultural identity? Or are they in fact evidence that a Māori culinary tradition has been running parallel to that of Pākehā? Through analyses of these cookbooks and through interviews conducted with members of the Māori community, it is evident that an Indigenous people such as Māori can in fact absorb outside influences whilst still retaining an inherently Māori culinary tradition.
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## Glossary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>aroha</td>
<td>love</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>atua</td>
<td>usually translated as god</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hākari</td>
<td>feast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hapū</td>
<td>sub-tribe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hualhua</td>
<td>food preserved in fat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hui</td>
<td>meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iwi</td>
<td>major tribe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kai</td>
<td>food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kaihaukai</td>
<td>type of feast, with obligation to reciprocate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kainga</td>
<td>village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kaitiakitaka</td>
<td>stewardship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>karakia</td>
<td>invocation/prayer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kaumatua</td>
<td>elder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kaupapa</td>
<td>framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kauta</td>
<td>cooking shed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kete</td>
<td>a woven basket, often of flax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kinaki</td>
<td>relish, secondary food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>koha</td>
<td>a gift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kumete</td>
<td>bowl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mana</td>
<td>prestige, power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manaakitaka</td>
<td>hospitality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manuhiri</td>
<td>visitors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mātauranga Māori</td>
<td>knowledge and values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>noa</td>
<td>free from sanctions (relative to tapu)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>piro</td>
<td>stinking or putrid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pōhā</td>
<td>storage bag of kelp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poua</td>
<td>grandfather</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>puku</td>
<td>stomach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rāhui</td>
<td>to restrict access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rohe</td>
<td>tribal or hapū territory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tahu</td>
<td>to preserve in fat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tangata whenua</td>
<td>people of the land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tangi</td>
<td>funeral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tapu</td>
<td>involving sanctions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tāua</td>
<td>grandmother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te Ao Māori</td>
<td>Māori Worldview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tipuna</td>
<td>ancestor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tikanga</td>
<td>correct way, rule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>te reo Māori</td>
<td>the Māori language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>umu</td>
<td>earth oven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>waru</td>
<td>to scrape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>whakapapa</td>
<td>genealogy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>whānau</td>
<td>family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>whanāungatanga</td>
<td>sense of family</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Introduction

My perceptions about what being Māori means are epitomised by my association with food. This is because to an outsider, my family would look like the pin-up models for 20th century assimilation practices. We cannot speak te reo (the Māori language) and we do not actively participate at our marae (meeting house); therefore, to an outsider we may just look like very tanned Pākehā. That would be until they entered our kitchen.

Growing up in Bluff, I was constantly surrounded by food; the men in my family were fisherman-cum-farmers so there was always an abundance of seafood, a few buckets of muttonbirds waiting to be opened and eaten, and the constant consumption of what we call Ruapuke roast - home killed mutton from Ruapuke Island. There were numerous pot-luck dinners at my taua (grandmother) and poua’s (grandfather) house, where all the aunties, uncles and cousins would partake in a feast. There was also the annual hāngi at Ruapuke on New Year’s Day, and this was a chance for the entire extended family to come together and relax while we kids ran rampant. We were brought up knowing that we were lucky to be able to eat the foods that we did, and we knew that the reason we did eat them, was due to our being Māori.

At a recent funeral I attended in my hometown, I was able to re-establish this connection, after an eleven year absence from Bluff. The connection that the mourning family had with food was evident, especially at the wake. This Māori family did not have a traditional tangi (funeral) but they did put on a traditional hākari (feast). The food was symbolic of the deceased, and of many others present. Not only was there an abundance of muttonbirds present, but an array of other Māori delicacies, including kōura (crayfish, Jasus lalandii), fish, cockles (tuaki,

1 Taua and poua, have not been italicised here, as this is not only their title, but the name that we call them, just as a ‘nana’ would be called ‘Nana’.
Paphies australis) oysters, pāua (Haliotis spp), and tuna (eel Anguilla dieffenbachii). These foods were prepared in a variety of methods, from the traditional method of drying tuna in the sun, to a more modern method of battering the oysters or serving them fresh from the shell. While there were the standard egg sandwiches and sausage rolls, it was the traditional kai that was devoured first, and with the most relish.

I myself can identify with this food. It is the food that makes me feel as if I am home. Every different item served had a memory attached to it, that not only included me, but members of my whānau (family) and hapū (sub-tribe). For example, the enormous bowl of cockles in their shells reminded me of digging for them with my cousins, as taua, mum and aunties would look on. After the dig, they would be cooked up on the beach in a makeshift pot (which was more often than not an old spaghetti can that had been brought down to the beach with this purpose in mind), eager puku’s waiting.

The affinity with food shown here is more than just a nostalgic glimpse into my childhood, it encompasses my being. A Hawaiian scholar Manulani Meyer says that “self-reflection of one’s thoughts and actions helps you understand that who you are, how you were raised, what you eat, and what you hunt all act as agents for how you see and experience the world” (2006: 15). By reflecting on my past experiences with food, I have learnt that it has shaped who I am. I have learnt that some foods are fundamental in the life of my own whānau (family) and hapū (sub-tribe) and it is through these foods that we are able to retain our links with our ancestors and our culture.
This very brief synopsis of my personal experiences with food, including what is being cooked, how, and where and with whom I partake of a meal, is grounded in what is termed a culinary tradition. It includes all food related aspects of any given culture (Rozin and Rozin 1981) including the culturally transmitted rules that govern the what, how, who, when and where of food preparation and consumption (Leach pers.comm. 2006). My personal culinary tradition is therefore based on certain foodstuffs and preparation methods, the sharing of food with my family on a daily basis as well as on special occasions, and the over-arching notion that food shapes my identity.

Many questions can be raised from my experiences, such as – Are my associations with food and its encompassing notions shared with the rest of the New Zealand public? If not, are these views shared with other Māori, and if they are, are they views that were held by our ōpuna (ancestors)? Or has colonisation, followed by globalisation meant a destruction of these ancestral culinary traditions?

Therefore, the aim of this thesis is to determine whether there is a distinct Māori culinary tradition in contemporary New Zealand. Based on my own personal experiences, I hypothesise that a Māori culinary tradition absorbed European foods, preparation methods and material culture and integrated them into an evolving Māori tradition.

It is necessary to emphasise here that this thesis is not intended to give a detailed description of all foods and dishes cooked by Māori either traditionally or in contemporary times. Rather, this thesis aims to show the key themes and components of a Māori culinary tradition, whether that be one which is distinct, or one that has been enveloped by the dominant culture ceasing to exist as a separate entity.

Contrasted with my own experiences of food, there were vast discrepancies to be found within the literature on New Zealand cuisine. Māori culinary traditions are often omitted from the literature completely, or depicted as historical relics, relegated to a tourism gimmick. However the most concerning are those descriptions that regard a Māori culinary tradition as extinct.
Changing Tastes, by David Burton (1992), gives an entertaining overview of the food revolution in New Zealand from the 1950's onwards. Burton describes the influence of key immigrant groups on New Zealand cuisine, such as the Chinese, Jews, Greeks, Dutch and many other Europeans who introduced their own unique cuisines to the New Zealand public. However Burton fails to mention what influence these foods had on a Māori culinary tradition, or what influence Māori may have had on New Zealand cuisine. In fact Burton fails to mention Māori people in the entire article. The closest reference is when he describes how Pākehā increased their “openness” towards shellfish, reflecting a “wider cultural outlook away from Europe, and an increasing appreciation of New Zealand’s culinary place in the Pacific” (ibid: 35). By failing to mention a Māori culinary tradition Burton is nullifying its existence to the reader.

Tony Simpson (1999) in his book A Distant Feast explores the origins of New Zealand’s food culture, and the changing culinary tradition of New Zealanders. It begins with an in-depth look at British cuisine prior to the colonisation of New Zealand. In light of this, it would seem necessary to also explore the longstanding Māori cuisine prior to colonisation. However Māori cuisine features little within his book, taking up a miserly half chapter. This half chapter describes the introduction of foods from the very first Māori settlers and the subsequent introduction of food and techniques from Europeans. It would seem that Simpson has only included a section on Māori cuisine as a form of ‘tokenism’, as he does not give it the same status as the European cuisine in New Zealand, which takes up approximately seven and a half chapters and about one tenth of the time in New Zealand’s history.

While Simpson acknowledges a Māori culinary tradition of times gone by, he fails to recognise that this culinary tradition might be still alive and thriving. The language used to describe Māori cuisine and its modern survival is somewhat vague in nature, giving the impression that a Māori culinary tradition has only survived as a historical relic. An example of the rather dismissive language follows - “Maori ate all manner of shellfish.” (ibid: 82). Despite the fact that Māori still to this day eat “all manner of shellfish” among
other foods from the sea, Simpson fails to address this. Simpson has also grossly underestimated the use and consumption of tuna by contemporary Māori as well when he states: “It’s always seemed to me astonishing that when our waterways teem with eels we don’t do more with them” (ibid: 50). Although, despite its popularity in Europe, eel is often looked at unfavourably by many Pākehā it is deemed a great delicacy by Māori, who will at times go to great lengths to acquire it (Williams 2003: 215-217). By treating the Māori culinary tradition as a historical relic, Simpson is therefore implying that it no longer has credibility or usage among Māori today.

Hillman (1979: 188) states that Māori culture is disappearing, and “virtually all Maoris [sic] have forsaken their ancestral cooking methods for gas or electric stoves”. This contradicts my own personal experience of Māori cuisine, where hangi and cooking in an open fire have been common practice throughout my life. It also conflicts with Hillman’s opening statement: “[Cuisines] are the result of evolution, an intermingling of forces over centuries or millennia. A national cuisine grows, develops, and changes as part of a living culture” (ibid: 11). Hillman overlooks the ability of a cuisine to change with reference to Māori. His inability to examine the foods or techniques that are employed when using the ‘gas or electric stove’ by modern Māori means that the ‘evolution’ of Māori cuisine cannot be explored. In doing so Hillman would have found much evidence that the Māori culture and culinary traditions are still in existence.

A common thread among these authors is their failure to understand culinary traditions as a component of a world view. For example Hillman mentions that although Māori culture is dying out, Māori hospitality has been slow in changing – “a guest still feels welcome” (ibid). What he fails to recognise is that manaakitaka (hospitality) is an integral component of a Māori world view. By acknowledging manaakitaka as a component of the Māori world view, one can recognise the significance of it with regards to a Māori culinary tradition. Whilst Hillman can be forgiven for his faux pas because he is not a New Zealander, Simpson and Burton cannot. They are New Zealanders writing about New Zealand cuisine, and should have therefore examined Māori cuisine and traditions more thoroughly as they are an integral part to the wider New Zealand context.
In order to address the failings within the contemporary literature this thesis must incorporate a Māori world view. To accomplish this effectively, the food habits of Māori must be examined from pre-European, through to contemporary times. The description of pre-European and contact culinary traditions uses conventional academic sources such as the use of 18th century observations, archaeological evidence, ethnographies and oral traditions. The more contemporary (post 1869) food habits of Māori are described through the analysis of cookbooks and through interviews with members of the community.

In order to test the hypothesis that a Māori culinary tradition absorbed European foods, preparation methods and material culture and integrated them into an evolving tradition, a collection of Māori cookbooks and recipes were analysed. Cookbooks can be used as a tool for explaining sociological, environmental, economic and political phenomena (Robinson and Arcodia 2006: 2). The majority of these cookbooks analysed have come from the private collection of Professor Helen Leach. Professor Leach has been collecting cookbooks since the late 1950’s and most of her collection was obtained in the South Island, especially Dunedin (Leach and Inglis 2006: 69-70).

The 1189 cookbooks in Professor Leach’s collection have been entered into a database to keep track of the holdings. Within this database a field was created for the topics covered by the recipes, including those identified as ‘Māori’ (ibid: 71-72). From this collection, 72 cookbooks were tagged as Māori. Only 53 of these have been included in this study as there were further criteria established by this author to determine what was deemed a Māori recipe.

Māori recipes were recognised in this study if they contained traditional foods, that is, foods which are Indigenous to New Zealand and were known to be consumed by Māori. However, some recipes that contain Indigenous foods, such as whitebait, most fish and some crayfish were omitted from the study. That is because of the ambiguous nature of the recipes, it is often difficult to distinguish between a Māori recipe and a Pākehā recipe. The exception is if these foods employ Māori preparation and processing methods. The
Māori processing methods and preparations are also based upon ‘traditional’ forms. These are discussed in detail in chapter three.

As this thesis uses interviews it is essential to point out the methods employed. A total of six people were interviewed and their backgrounds were varied, ranging from teachers to kaumātua (elders of great standing within the community). Similarly, the interviewees were from four different iwi (tribes) thus giving a satisfactory sample of New Zealand Māori. Although Category A ethics approval was obtained to enable the participants to be named, four of the six interviewees wished to remain anonymous. This is not uncommon, as many Māori, especially of the older generation do not seek acknowledgment of their contributions, rather letting the knowledge speak for itself. The interviews themselves were informal, generally a discussion over a cup of tea, and only three of the interviews were tape-recorded. Two interviewees did not wish to be tape-recorded, so notes were taken during the discussion and one was conducted over the telephone.

It is appropriate to note that as I am a Kai Tahu woman, there may be some bias towards an emphasis on Kai Tahu traditions and or recipes and sometimes a complete omission of other iwi traditions and recipes, such as those from the geothermal areas. This is not a reflection of a lack of tradition or value among other iwi; rather it reflects the penchant for South Island cookery books of the collector and the affinity with South Island food of this author. In light of this it may seem appropriate to thus align the pre-European baseline and subsequent analysis with a South Island tradition. However, the recipes within the cookbooks were not necessarily from the South Island, despite the location of publication. Therefore a generic overview of culinary traditions is provided throughout.

Furthermore, in order to accord my own ancestors their appropriate mana, the southern Kai Tahu dialect will be the preferred spelling of Māori terms and the ‘k’ substitute for ‘ng’ will be employed only when the common usage dictates (e.g. ‘tuaki’ and ‘tuangi’). Also the southern spelling will be used where there are alternative spellings and vocabulary, for example the southern ‘kūmera’ and the northern ‘kūmara’ and where the
word is quite different (e.g. Southern ‘poua’ and Northern ‘koroua’). Direct quotes and statements made from interviewees (i.e. depending on their iwi, Northern spelling will be employed in the instance of a Northern informant) are exempt from the above conventions.

Chapter Outline
The second chapter consists of comparative studies, by reviewing literature that describes other societies that have undergone colonisation and or globalisation, and what effect this has had on their culinary traditions. This will then be used to form a framework for the thesis. The third chapter is an outline of pre-European culinary traditions and acts as a baseline for the comparison with the contemporary culinary tradition. Chapter four looks at the Māori response to the arrival of European foods, technologies and material culture. It discusses the immediate implications of these introductions and what effect they had on their culinary traditions up until 1869. This chapter also outlines the European response to the way in which European foods, methods and material culture were adopted by Māori. Chapter five analyses a range of Māori cookbooks, including the first cookbook published in New Zealand, written by Lady Martin in 1869. The focus of this chapter is on the recipes and the types of dishes created, and their culinary origins. Chapter six analyses Māori recipes in mainstream cookbooks paying particular attention to the types of cookbooks published and determining their role in the transmission of a Māori culinary tradition. Chapter seven discusses the culturally transmitted rules associated with a culinary tradition through an analysis of the interviews, and other oral sources. The final chapter will summarise the findings.

2 Adapted from Williams (2003: xvi).
2.0 Literature Review

The literature pertaining to a pre-European Māori culinary tradition is extensive. However, writings on Māori cuisine after contact through to today are lacking. Therefore it is necessary to turn to studies from other Indigenous groups that have dealt with changing culinary traditions. This chapter will first give an in-depth definition of the term ‘culinary tradition’ outlining the characteristic features, namely that of the dish and the meal. Secondly this chapter will discuss the circumstances which may contribute to a modification of culinary traditions. It will then examine how Indigenous people mediate these changes to prevent an overall transformation of their culinary traditions. Lastly, this chapter will utilise these concepts to create a framework for the argument that a Māori culinary tradition has been running parallel to that of Pākehā.

Culinary Tradition

Elizabeth and Paul Rozin (1981) define culinary traditions as the food related practices of any given culture. These practices include: the selection of a set of basic foods, that can be either staple or secondary; the frequent use of a distinct set of flavourings; the process and preparation of foodstuffs; and the usage of rules that deal with the acceptability of foods, the social context in which they are served and the symbolic nature pertaining to those uses. They state:

> It is especially in these last aspects, the symbolic and social aspects of food, and the many interactions between language and food use, where the biological continuity with our nonhuman ancestors is least apparent. (ibid: 243)

Helen Leach (pers. comm. 2006) develops and improves on this definition. She describes the importance of material culture within the processing and preparation context; this is important as one can often distinguish a given cuisine based on their unique utensils, such as the wok and cleaver in Cantonese cooking, the umu (earth oven) in Oceania and the griddle in north-western (Celtic) Europe (ibid). She also includes characteristic dishes, such as couscous of North Africa and pizza of Italy.
Subsequently, Leach uses a conflation of Rozin and Rozin’s (1981) definition along with her own improvements to construct a more precise definition that distinguishes between the individual dish (and its recipe, written or unwritten) and the meal, that has its own set of cultural rules underlying its structure. Leach therefore defines a culinary tradition as being made up of two components, the first being orientated to the ‘food item’ or ‘dish’, and the second being orientated to the ‘meal’.

Dish Orientation: Food selection and preparation for a dish is determined via culturally transmitted rules. These include the mixing of ingredients which can be basic, secondary or flavouring substances; the processing of these ingredients with a characteristic set of material culture. Finally the resultant combination of ingredients and processes creates ‘dishes’ which are more often than not named.

Meal Orientation: Meal composition and eating behaviour is determined by culturally transmitted patterns of rules. This involves the selection of types of foods to be served at a meal, the combination of dishes, their order of consumption, the time, material culture and the location of the meal.

This definition can then be broken down into its components and examined further.

**Dish Orientation**

A culinary base is first and foremost dependent on the environment that a society inhabits. Rozin (2000) says that in the formative stages of creating a culinary tradition, geography and climate are the decisive factors in accumulating foodstuffs. Due to the antiquity of this selection stage, she goes on to say that these foods tend to be conservatively retained by the society even when new ingredients are introduced.

Pollock (2000) uses this approach to gain an understanding of the place of food in the world view of Pacific Island Societies and the continuity of some Pacific foods. Her observations of food events to establish a group’s belief system are used to categorise
food. This categorisation according to Pollock can aid in the discovery of what is eaten in any given time and space. For example two categories of staple foods and supplementary foods were identified and isolated. The staple foods or ‘real foods’ included “taros, yams, bananas, breadfruit, cassava and sweet potatoes” (ibid: 27). The supplementary foods or ‘relish’ consists of animal foodstuffs such as “shellfish, pig, bird, egg, crab... and even tinned meat like corned beef” (Akimichi 1980:598, 600, cited in Pollock 2000: 27). By knowing how these two food categories interact with each other it is possible to understand why a ‘real food’ is more likely to be retained by a Pacific Island society compared to that of the ‘relish’. For example in Japan, the ‘real food’, rice, has been used to aid in the adoption of western foods such as hamburgers. These hamburgers are made up of a hamburger patty, and bun-shaped wedges of pressed rice in lieu of the Western style bread buns (Cwiertka 1997).

Flavour also plays an important role in the food choices of a given society. The role of flavour is believed to begin in-utero and is enhanced by breastfeeding; it provides sensory labels that allow an individual to identify themselves as a member of a group (Rozin 2000). As Pollock explains, people choose food based on the flavour, texture, smell and visual appeal, not the nutritional value of a food (2000). In Cook Island migrants to New Zealand, it was those foods that were so unfamiliar to them such as “mushrooms, tripe, sweetbreads, rhubarb and alcohol” that were deemed as ‘disliked’ foods among the population (Fitzgerald 1986: 78). Conversely the foods deemed as ‘liked’ were those foods that were familiar to them, especially island food (fish and taro) (ibid). Su’a (1987) analysed the role of flavour in the persistence of the Polynesian Pudding throughout the Pacific, and finds a distinct correlation between flavour, texture, appearance and the preservation of the puddings.

Recently the Western notion of food selection has become predominantly concerned with the nutritional content and biological functions of food, and their necessity to maintain human existence (Pollock 2000: 2). However as most Indigenous people do not see food in this context, (see Fitzgerald 1986) it is important to understand the “culturally transmitted rules” that are employed in the selection of food.
The manipulative techniques involved in the preparation of a dish can be divided into three classes. The first involves the physical change in size, shape or mass such as particulation (cutting, slicing, dicing, mincing, pounding, pureeing-applied to seeds, grinding, milling, grating, rasping, sifting, pulverising), incorporation (where another substance is added using techniques such as mixing, stirring, beating and whipping), and separation or extraction (this could be as simple as peeling, or as complex as in pressing oil or rendering fat) (Rozin 2000: 135).

The second class are those processes that require manipulation of the water content, this includes marinating (this may be brief, such as adding citrus juice to fish, or extended, such as curing (brining in a salt solution) or pickling in acid), dry curing (in salt, air, or smoke) and freezing (ibid). Finally, the last manipulative technique involves direct chemical changes to the food, such as fermentation or the application of heat in dry, wet, or lipid cooking (ibid).

When cultures are introduced to new foodstuffs foreign cookery techniques are often omitted in favour of methods already known to that group (Cwiertka 1998: 120). The methods employed are usually based upon foods already in that cultures' repertoire. For example, beef when first introduced to Japan was prepared and consumed in the form of an already popular dish, sukiyaki (ibid). Similarly Leach states:

> If the new item can be prepared and cooked using traditional methods and technology, its adoption will be relatively free of resistance, provided of course that it tastes good to the recipients (Leach 1983: 144).

The production of food is made possible due to a distinct set of material culture items that are synonymous with the culture that utilises them. An analysis of material culture ensures the ability “to understand culture, to discover the beliefs – the values, ideas, attitudes and assumptions of a particular community or society at a given time” (Prown 1993: 1). Su’a (1987: 13) argues that the study of different preparation methods along with the different material culture of a Pacific nation allows for the differentiation and identification of Polynesian puddings, that are made throughout the Pacific. Similarly
Cwiertka (1997: 64) explains the necessity of incorporating material culture into a definition of culinary tradition as it aids in identification: “sushi eaten with chopsticks in a Japanese setting gives a stronger image than one consumed at the table with a knife and fork”.

Dishes are the result of foods being selected and processed with a distinct set of material culture. Cwiertka (1997: 64) defines dishes as “the cultural process of transformation.” She goes on to argue that the “same foodstuffs may be combined and prepared differently [and with different material culture] in different societies” (ibid). While foodstuffs are seen as being flexible and easily incorporated, dishes are more difficult to incorporate into an Indigenous diet because as they are imbued with stronger cultural connotations (ibid).

Dishes contain cultural messages...They may retain or lose their ethnic character. The process of adapting foreign dishes to local taste preferences is based on repetitive trial and error, and eventually only a few culinary experiments gain wide acceptance. (Cwiertka 1998: 120)

Symbolism also pervades the naming of dishes. For example an Anzac biscuit under its original name 'Rolled Oat Crispies' does not hold the same connotations (Leach, pers. comm. 2006)

**Meal Orientation**

A meal, according to Mary Douglas (1975), is made up of a range of dishes which have an internal structure, as well as a specific named order. Many other authors have also commented upon the structures associated with meals (Mitchell 1995, Chang 1977, Pollock 2000). Mitchell (1995: 31) explains that food habits in society are structured. This involves the timing of a meal, constituents of a meal, combination of foods, and the occasions at which certain meals are eaten. Cwiertka (1997:64) explains that a cuisine consists of all those elements that make up a meal – the set and sequence of dishes to be eaten, the use of particular eating utensils, and the social rules surrounding the eating of a meal.
These structures persist through time; they are in fact a snapshot of the past in the present and are therefore a viable means to discover what aspects of a people’s food habits have transformed through time (Goody 1989, cited in Mitchell 1995: 35). Furthermore, because meals are such complex structures, filled with symbolism, Cwiertka asserts that they are often never wholly incorporated by a different culture. Sahlins (1985) describes the idea of a changing structure in Hawaii, one that is pliable yet has its roots firmly in an Indigenous epistemology:

Hawaiian history is surely not unique in the demonstration that culture functions as a synthesis of stability and change, past and present, diachrony and synchrony...Every practical change is also a cultural reproduction.(Sahlins 1985: 144)

Therefore one can assume that an inner process within the culture creates an outward change. In other words, culture mediates changes in culture.

Helen Leach (pers. comm. 2006) argues that the underlying factor that allows for the initial and subsequent selection of dish and meal selection are the culturally transmitted rules. These rules are the framework that ties everything together, that allow an understanding of society, the world, and one’s place in it. They also aid in making the critical decisions that shape one’s future. They synthesise the wisdom gathered in the different aspects of a culinary tradition. They allow the observer to see the picture as a whole, rather than focusing on small sections of reality. In particular, they assist in understanding, and therefore coping with, complexity and change. Such a conceptual framework is the basis of a "world view".

James Sire (1988) asserts that "a world view is a set of presuppositions (or assumptions) which we hold (consciously or subconsciously) about the basic makeup of our world" (ibid: 17). In simpler terms, a worldview is a view of the world, and a view for the world.

Pollock (2000: 4) defines a world view as a set of images, assumptions, and beliefs that influence social behaviour. These constructs together make up the integral principles and
meanings that are accepted by the group as a means to social unity and harmony via regulation. World views however are not static; they have been transforming, and are being transformed over time. The apparently disconnected components of a world view can in fact be understood as part of an encompassing scheme describing the interaction between a system or self and the world or environment.

Understanding a world view and especially its ability to transform through time is crucial to this thesis. For it is a culture's world view which dictates what impact external cuisines will have on that culture's culinary traditions. A Descartian and therefore a Western method would have a researcher studying the food habits alone. However, in order to understand a culinary tradition in its entirety it is essential to look at the culturally transmitted rules, thus incorporating a Māori world view. This is because a world view is inseparably linked to food habits and vice versa. One affects the other.

**Changes within Culinary Traditions**

There are numerous reasons why a culinary tradition undergoes change, the most dominant being political pressure, including colonisation. However factors such as food availability, migration, and globalisation also result in changes.

The changing food habits in Kordofan, Sudan, have been attributed largely to increased technology, which allows the people to more effectively utilize their environment (Theis 1999: 93). With the expansion of mechanized farming, there has been a growing tendency among the population to grow and consume more Sorghum (a grain used to create a form of porridge), which in traditional times was used as secondary food source (ibid: 95). The ability to use parts of the environment that would have traditionally been unexploited is just one example of how environment can change the food habits of a group. Similarly when Polynesian explorers came to New Zealand, many changes had to be made, as the climate of New Zealand would not allow cultivation of some of the crops that they had brought with them. Consequently, many of their most highly prized foods were dropped from their cuisine (Leach 2003: 442).
Cwiertka (1997) discusses the impact that globalization has had on Japan’s cuisine in *Domesticating Western Food in Japan, a Comparative View*. She states that “Japanese adoptions from the West were conditioned by the inferiority complex towards Western civilisation” (*ibid.*: 72-73). The explanation for this ‘complex’ is due to the Japanese being heavily influenced by the West and their cuisines from the 1860’s onwards, “initiating several processes that led to the transformation of Japanese food culture” (*ibid.*: 73). One hundred years on, this initial adoption by the Japanese has led to the almost complete incorporation of some Western foods, to the point that some have deviated so much from their original form that their roots can no longer be traced (*ibid.*: 73).

Political institutions inevitably have a huge bearing on the culinary traditions of a society, especially on an Indigenous community that is colonised by a dominant force. Anderson (2005: 163) says that most change has occurred as a necessity due to economic and political pressure. It has also been argued that food changes are so reliant on the political structures of the time that a historian would be well placed to use the diffusion of culinary customs in order to ascertain the “distribution of political power within certain social strata in a given territory” (Fragner 1994: 50-51). This changing balance of power is most evident in times of war, when people are unable to eat their preferred cultural foods; however as Anderson (2005: 164) claims, this is not a change born of cultural will, but due to the environmental pressures from the outside. Unlike changes that occur in wartime that can revert back once the war is over, sustained political pressures do give rise to permanent changes in cuisines. Colonisation for example has a huge impact on an Indigenous people; political policies that directly influence the access to traditional resources for example mean that a particular resource is often impossible to obtain.

This is evident among the Seminole Indians of Florida. Joos (1984) examines what impact political, economical and social changes in the United States have had on this Indigenous group. From first contact with Europeans, politics has shaped the way in which the Seminole live, from introduction of new technologies and foods, through to Government policies that effectively removed them from their sacred home lands. These
political intrusions have had a major effect on the culinary tradition of the Seminole, noticeably with regards to their preparation methods. Frying food was non-existent among these people before the advent of colonisation, and its increased adoption consequently meant that traditional methods of cooking are all but extinct, with the exception of making *Sojki* (a drink that resembles a thin gruel of cornmeal, grits or roasted and cracked corn) which has persisted despite the introduction of new drinks (ibid: 230).

With political changes comes a change in what food items are thought of as valuable, or as having status. Traditional foods are often dropped because they are a sign of low status. Kalčik (1984: 40) cites the blood sausage of Illinois Germans as an example of a low status food that was dropped as it was “offensive to their American neighbours”. In other circumstances, the food of the dominant culture is appropriated because of its association with being of high-status. For example chicken and steak were seen as having the greatest status among Cook Island immigrants to New Zealand, and were thus incorporated into their diet (Fitzgerald 1986).

The status of foods often differs from generation to generation. This is noted most widely in the literature pertaining to migrant groups, but does translate into an Indigenous culture being colonised by a dominant group. The first generation of migrants to any culture are more likely to hold on to their foodways longer, whilst the second generation are likely to adapt to their new environment (Fitzgerald 1986, Kalčik 1984). When a cultural group undergoes colonization, urbanisation follows, so in essence these Indigenous people become urban immigrants. Urban Indigenous groups are often faced with the same pressures to drop ‘low-status’ foods, and the second generation is likely to follow the same pattern of adapting to their new environment. In a study conducted by House, Stiffman and Brown (2006), it was shown that the second generation had less connection to food as an identity marker than the first generation. However, the third generation has been shown to pick up lost foodways and reintroduce them into their culinary practices (Kalčik 1984). This is most likely associated with a revitalisation of identity (ibid).
Mediation of Changes

Many changes may occur within a culture's culinary traditions, especially when faced with outside influences. But what is widely noted throughout the literature is that these traditions are not lost. Although new foods, technologies and political infrastructure may be introduced to a culture, what is not so easily displaced are the “culturally transmitted rules” (Leach pers.comm. 2006). These rules appear as the ‘glue’ which enables a culture to hold fast to their traditions.

Manulani Meyer a Hawaiian scholar exposes the Western notion of empiricism with regards to an Indigenous knowing by incorporating a third element into the fold. This third element is spirit, and when used in conjunction with body and mind it is seen as the “innate intelligence that sees the clarity of things just as they are” (Meyer 2006: 23). When the term spirit is used here, it is not in the religious sense, nor am I speaking of it in the outer body experience. Rather it is the process of enculturation described by Singer (1984) as a

process of becoming, a process through which the implicit background of a culture, its set of underlying and motivating assumptions and premises about the way things are and must be, comes to be accepted. Regarded as “too true to warrant discussion,” rarely stated explicitly or subjected either to catechizing or to debate, these assumptions and premises seem to the cultural participants to be self evident (Singer 1984: 195).

In other words, culturally transmitted rules are the mould which shapes our realities. It holds the structures of body and mind together, enabling one to adopt new foods and technologies while still retaining the true essence of their culinary traditions.

Culturally transmitted rules are therefore the driving force that allows us to do the ‘normal’ aspects of our everyday lives, communicating with family, showing hospitality to guests, and preparing a meal. It is the instinctive knowledge that tells us the proper
way that things must be done. Furthermore, these rules are so innate, that their existence is not acknowledged until faced with a different set of conventions:

We are under most circumstances unaware of these rules, just as we are unconscious of the rules of syntax that govern our utterances. It is only when we attempt to teach or describe an act of cooking (or of speaking, etc.) to another human that we become intensely aware of the necessity for learning the rules that underlie any culturally transmitted system or tradition of behavior (Rozin 1982: 202).

Arjun Appadurai (1988) explores the reasons behind the importance of regional cuisines in Hindu Indian cooking, and why a ‘national’ cuisine did not emerge in India as it has done in other nations. Appadurai discusses the moral and social ties associated with traditional Hindu Indian cooking and how food cements “the relationship between men and gods, as well as between men themselves” (ibid: 10). He goes on to explain how Hindu thought is encompassed in an ontological and epistemological pursuit of a superior gnosis (ibid). Thus, Appadurai hypothesises that a pan-Indian Hindu cuisine did not emerge in India because of a resistance to a wholly empirical thought. Instead it was grounded in cultural factors which incorporated their beliefs in social and cosmic laws (ibid: 12). In essence, Appadurai explains the resistance of the Hindu-Indian culinary traditions because of a notion larger than the individual and the group – the spirit.

Alternatively this approach can be described as the affiliation between food and identity. The food one eats is often associated with the identity of that person; it is summed up accurately in the age-old adage ‘you are what you eat’. Anderson (2005: 125) looks at the notion of identity with regards to food, and describes how food is both a marker for solidarity and for separation. Food enhances sociability among the people, and that the “very act of eating creates relationships and bonds that could not otherwise be made” (ibid). On the contrary food encourages separation among differing social classes, religious groups and families (ibid). The combination of these two markers assists in the formation of the identity of an individual and their identity as a member of a group. Mitchell (1995: 32) says that food has this ability because it is a carrier of symbolic messages, and transmitter of values through the commonality among a cultural group.
Furthermore food has the ability to reassert a group’s identity. Colonised cultures often adhere to their own food practices as one important way of resisting colonial incursion (Heldke 2003:10). This is evident in Aboriginal Australians who have undergone an extreme process of assimilation. Reid (1986) looks at the reassertion of self-determination among the Yolngu people through the use of food. She states that food is used as

both a means of achieving rapprochement with Europeans and expressing conflict... [Food] is visible and well understood by both groups (unlike the “law”), and because it is unambiguously different from European food, it enables Yolngu to highlight the ethnic boundary that separates Europeans and Aborigines in a positive and sometimes advantageous way. (ibid: 64, 65).

Food is thus seen as a symbol of identity and can be used to emphasise one’s identity. The regional nuances seen in the food and cooking of the Hindu-Indian communities and the use of food as a tool for self-determination by the Yolngu people are means to assert the identity of those groups. Therefore for culinary traditions to become extinct, it would be first necessary for the identity of that group to be extinct.
Framework

Several key features with regards to a changing culinary tradition have been isolated from the preceding text to act as a framework for this thesis. This will enable a concise and thorough argument to be produced.

- The greater the antiquity of a food, the more likely it will be retained.

- Foodstuffs are selected and incorporated based on their flavour, texture, taste, smell and most importantly familiarity. Therefore similar foods are more likely to be adopted to create dishes.

- Introduced foodstuffs are normally prepared using traditional methods, and are often modified to imitate established dishes. The probability of this occurring increases if the introduced food is comparable to a traditional food.

- Material culture can be used as an identifying tool for a continued culinary tradition.

- ‘Meals’ are less likely to be dropped from a culinary tradition, as they contain strong cultural messages, and symbolise the origin of the culture. Conversely, they are also less likely to be adopted by another culture.

- Food availability, political influences, migration and globalisation can bring about changes in culinary traditions.

- Any modifications to a given culinary tradition are a product of that culture’s culturally transmitted rules.

- Culturally transmitted rules are likely to persist due to them being based in a worldview.
3.0 Pre-European Culinary Tradition

This chapter will examine the Māori culinary tradition in the pre-European context, which was fervently etched into a Māori mindset due to several hundred years of occupation in Aotearoa prior to European arrival. As the major food types have been discussed by Young (1992) I will not be engaging in a discussion of them. Rather, I will discuss key preparation methods in reference to the culinary tradition defined by Leach (2006) (see chapter 2.1). The aim of this chapter is to provide a pre-European baseline, to assess any subsequent changes that may have occurred in a modern culinary tradition.

3.1 Tikaka Māori

For this discussion it is necessary to consider the rules associated with a pre-European culinary tradition. Whakapapa (genealogy) is an underlying notion that persists through all aspects of Māori life. Binney (1987:21) emphasises the importance of whakapapa when writing any historiography when she says “genealogy is the backbone of all Māori history”. Rakinui and Papatūānuku were known as the progenitors of all things, and from their union a “web of kinship” was born (Stevens 2003: 30). This web connects the denizens of the sea, flora, fauna and other natural elements and allows individuals to trace their lineage “back in time and space via an earthly, human lineage to pre-human ancestors and thence to gods” (Haami and Roberts 2002: 405).

Furthermore, whakapapa allowed Māori to understand their place within the ‘web of kinship’. This allowed for the unification of the spiritual and material world, between the living and the non-living, and between the animate and the inanimate (Haami and Roberts 2002: 405). The Descartian dichotomy that is apparent in Western culture where the mind is split from the body is not apparent in Māori ideology. In fact Māori did not distinguish between the mental and physical realms of the world; humankind was seen as an “integral part of the whole, and hence there is no “nature / culture” divide” (Haami and Roberts 2002: 405). This is exemplified in the creation of the world itself where the cosmogony begins with Io-matua-kore (Io the parentless), a monotheistic creator of all things (Haami and Roberts 2002: 403) (See figure 1). This is where both physical and
metaphysical are ‘born’ thus reinforcing the web of kinship; not just between objects but between thoughts and spirituality as well:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Io: matua-kore</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Io-mata-ngaro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te Korekore (the void)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te Kōwhao (the abyss)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te Pō (the night)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te Hihiri (elemental and pure energy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te Mahara (the subconscious level)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te Whakaaro (consciousness)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te Wānanga (knowledge and wisdom)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te Whe (the seed word)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te Hauroa (life)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atamai (shape)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Āhua (form)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te Wā (time)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te Ātea (space)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Te Ao Wairua (the spiritual world): Rangi = Papatūānuku
Tane mā

Figure 1. Creation Geneology
Adapted from Reilly (2004: 3)

This *whakapapa* allows for the notion of inter-relatedness among all things, in particular the spiritual and the physical. With this in mind, it is no wonder that the relationship Māori have with the environment and its resources is one that is based on reciprocity and balance. The relationship is also a reflection of the belief that all things are imbued with a physical aspect as well as a spiritual aspect which has been passed down via the *atua*.

This spiritual aspect is known as *tapu* (sacredness/being with potentiality of power). All things possess *tapu* on their creation, and the source of the *tapu* comes from the *mana* (power/authority) of the *atua* (Shirres 1997: 33). For example, fish have *tapu*, and the source of their *tapu* is the *mana* of Takaroa. All things too have *mana* on their creation,
however unlike tapu it is a power that is realised over time therefore, “the child who is of chiefly line has not yet the mana, the power, of a chief, but has already the tapu of a chief” (Shirres 1997: 37). At the end of a being’s (be it human or otherwise) existence both its mana and tapu are extinguished. Therefore, a fish that is eaten is devoid of both tapu and mana. This possibility came about because Tūmatauenga (a son of Rakinui and Papatūanuku) ate the children of his brothers, i.e.; the birds of Tane, the fish of Takaroa, the kūmara of Ronogomātane, and the fern root of Haumiatiketike (Reilly 2004: 4). In doing so, he desecrated the tapu and mana of the food, thus making it noa (to be devoid of tapu). Consequently, we, as human beings, who possess our tapu from the mana of Tūmatauenga, are able to eat what is essentially our tuakana (elder siblings).

Not only did tapu facilitate the connection between the spiritual and the physical world, it also aided in the facilitation of restrictions, which was eminent in pre-European society. Restrictions were important because when tapu met tapu, it was dynamic; being either constructive or destructive (Shirres 1997: 38). The institution of tapu became the principal mechanism of social order throughout the country. “The system particularly emphasises the person and the person’s relationships with other people and with the surrounding universe” (ibid). This is what Shirres (1997) describes as extrinsic tapu – those things that are fundamentally tapu because they are an extension of intrinsic tapu.

Extrinsic tapu could also be associated with certain occasions. For example a pregnant woman towards the end of her pregnancy was very tapu. A special hut (whare kohanga or whare puhi in the South Island) was constructed for her occupation along with a “rude cooking hut” some distance from the whare puhi (Best 1914: 34). This was to ensure that the woman’s tapu and mana would not be violated by the cooked food which is noa.

Because food was considered noa it had the ability to make things, people or events noa; this act was known as whakanoa. However, it did not necessarily impinge on one’s intrinsic tapu, merely rendering the restrictions or extrinsic tapu, noa. For example, once the birth of a child took place a special rite was undertaken to make the area where the whare puhi was constructed noa.
In the execution of this function, which had its own special ritual, the parents, or fathers of the parents' child, would partake of food on the site of the [whare puhi]...to render the spot noa...It would be highly improper for any unauthorized person to be the first to take food at such a place, or he might remark, in after days, "I was the first person to eat at the [whare puhi] of so-and-so." This would be a belittling expression, and would assuredly cause trouble (Best 1914: 134).

There are many occasions and circumstances that required the whakanoa rite; and the consumption of, or cooking of, food was the most common method undertaken. 3

Food was also an important component of everyday life particularly when exhibiting manaakitanga (hospitality). Numerous pepeha (sayings) allude to the dissatisfaction among visitors when hospitality is not forthcoming or sufficient, such as; "Kai ana mai koe he atua, noho ana au he tangata" – "You are eating like a god, while I am sitting here as a man" (Mead 2001: 953). It was therefore imperative that hospitality was shown to guests, and the universal way that this was achieved was with kai (food). It was a great blow to one’s mana if hospitality was not received nor given. Cook on his first voyage to New Zealand noted that once their intentions had been established by Māori they were treated with “great hospitality” and were supplied “with as much excellent fish, resembling mackerel, as was sufficient for all their dinners” (Cook 1784: 67-68).

Manaakitanga was displayed in all its glory at hākari (feasts). Hākari were ritual feasts that occurred on account of special events, such as births, marriages, harvesting, victory in war and tangihanga (funerals). While hākari were used as a means for celebration they generally played a more important role in removing tapu. For example, the hākari at the end of a tangihanga released the participants from the mourning process and the tapu surrounding the dead. Nonetheless, one could not participate in the hākari if the restrictions were still required for protection, as shown by this pepeha: “Kia heke te kawakawa i te rae o te tangata ka kai ai ia i te taro” – “When the greenery is shed from one’s forehead, taro may be eaten” (Mead 2001: 1283).

---

3 See Shirres (1997).
4 Kawakawa *Macropiper excelsum* leaves were worn by people in mourning.
The reciprocal giving of kai was known as kai-hau-kai and was a special form of hākari. The collection of food for the feast could take a tribe up to a year (Colenso 1880: 13). Williams (2003: 147) describes it as a “means of distributing, from district to district, the significant and disparate surpluses”. Huge pyramid structures were built as food platforms, and the sheer size and amount of food on these great platforms would have been an amazing spectacle. Colenso mentions a relatively small feast at Matamata in 1837 where there was

Upwards of 20,000 dried eels, several tons of sea-fish, principally young sharks (a great Maori delicacy), a large quantity of hogs, 19 big calabashes of shark oil, 6 albatrosses, and baskets of potatoes (sweet and common) without number (Colenso 1880: 13).

Both Williams (2003) and Stevens (2003) emphasise the importance of this practice, especially to the Southern iwi (tribe), Kai Tahu, yet it was an important component to all Māori. It was a means of acquiring foods that were generally unavailable in that specific rohe (area). Stevens (2003: 41) says that kūmara (sweet potato, *Ipomea batatas*), taro (*Colocasia esculenta*) and hue (gourd, *Lagenaria siceraria*) could be exchanged from the North Island for tītī. Moreover, it was a systematic approach to ensure intra and inter-tribal relationships were maintained as this system was reciprocated in kind (Williams 2003: 147).

### 3.2 Food Selection

The environment in New Zealand was dramatically different to that of the tropical islands in the Pacific. For this reason many traditional food items that came aboard ngā waka (canoes) with the first settlers were unable to be grown in Aotearoa. Important foods such as the banana, breadfruit and coconut would have been especially missed, as they were ‘staple foods’ within Island Polynesia (Pollock 2000: 17). But due to climate and geographical conditions, many of these staples were excluded from a Māori diet altogether. Foods that were able to be cultivated were the kūmara, uwhi (yam, *Dioscorea* sp.), taro, hue and the tropical tī (*Cordyline terminalis*) although the latter four were
restricted to the very far north\(^5\) (Basset, Gordon, Nobes and Jacob 2004:185). Māori successfully adapted their cultivation techniques to grow kūmera in New Zealand’s cooler climate as far south as Banks Peninsula but it could not be cultivated south of the Opihi River (Williams 2003: 28).\(^6\)

Therefore the foods available to the very first Māori settlers consisted of the above cultivable foods, as well as a number of less familiar foods available from the ocean, rivers and forests. The unfamiliar foods of New Zealand were subsequently adopted by Māori, and both old and new preparations and rules were adapted to these to create a pre-European culinary tradition.

Māori foodstuffs were sorted into categories, similar to those in the Pacific of staples and relishes (Pollock 2000: 27). In New Zealand these were known as kāi and kina respectively. These terms can be traced back to the ancestral Proto Polynesian (PPN) language (Kirch and O’Day 2003: 485) (See Figure 2.).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proto Polynesian</th>
<th>Māori</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>kai</em></td>
<td>kai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>kai</em> <em>kina</em></td>
<td>kai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>kina</em></td>
<td>kinaki</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2. Etymology of kai and kinaki
(Adapted from Kirch and O’Day 2003: 485)

The PPN term *kai* and the Māori term kai refer to the general term food, as well as the specific sense of “staple starch food” (ibid), while *kina* and kinaki refer to the supplementary foods or relish which normally accompanied the staple (ibid). In Aotearoa the relish usually consisted of a flesh food – birds, fish, rats or kūrī (dog). Kirch and O’Day (2003: 486) when regarding the Hawaiian cognate of kinaki - i’a state that “while

---

\(^5\) Nor could kūmera, hue or taro be cultivated in Tuhoe land (Best 1902: 45)

\(^6\) Judge F.R. Chapman notes that in some years, and with optimum conditions, kūmera could be grown even further south: “Wetere Te Kahu told me that Arowhenua was the southern limit of the cultivation of kumara” (Williams 2003: 28)
a meal can consist solely of ‘ai [kai and *kai] (in which case it is a poor meal), i’a alone cannot make a meal, it can only accompany and embellish ‘ai. The same is true of Māori meals and dishes.

3.3 Food Preparation

This next section will outline the principal processes associated with pre-European food preparation. They are broken into five parts, cooking in an earth oven (hangi or umu), roasting/grilling, boiling, preservation and fermentation. It is unfortunate that in an essay of this size it is impossible to describe every food that was cooked via these methods, therefore only key foods or ‘dishes’ will be described in this chapter.

Savage (1807: 61) states that “the operations of a New Zealand kitchen are few, and exceedingly simple”; he then goes on to say that Māori “accomplish the principal object of all cookery”. Not only does this verify that pre-European Māori were capable cooks, but the following statement also shows that they were content with their methods: “the natives here are perfectly well satisfied with them, and rise from their meal with as much cheerfulness [sic] as an alderman, and with much more activity (ibid)”.

3.31 Earth Oven Cookery

Earth oven cookery was a method of steaming food (tao kai) in an umu or hangi (earth oven). It involved an extensive amount of labour, including the collection of specific firewood for specific foods7 and rocks8, digging a hole (large enough for the amount of food required), as well as any prior preparation of the food. Tāo kai was the most widely used form of cookery among pre-European Māori and was therefore applied to most food stuffs (Leach 2007: 55).

---

7 Manuka was thought to be the best wood, as it burns the longest and hottest. Koromiko was employed when cooking the moa “He koromiko te rakau i tunua ai te moa” – “The koromiko is the wood that roasts the moa (Beattie 2004: 8). Place names also refer to koromiko being used to cook the moa, for example, a renowned moa cooking area near Oamaru is called Te Awa Kokomuka (southern dialect) (ibid).

8 Rocks were generally kept on hand for re-use (Williams 2007 pers. comm)
Although there were many variations, the basic system was for a pit to be dug into the ground proportionate to the amount of food to be treated. Wood was then placed in the hole, “set up on end, with cross-pieces above” (Walsh 1902: 23). This was to allow the stones\(^9\) which were placed on top to fall through once the fuel has burned. The embers were then removed, and the stones spread out level. To remove any excess ash, a little water was poured over the stones to raise a “jet of steam” \((ibid)\). The stones were then covered with a layer of green leaves \(\textit{watawata}\) and water was sprinkled over them (Taylor 1855: 390). The prepared food was then placed on top of the leaves – \(\textit{kūmera}\) and any other durable foods first, followed by any \(\textit{kinaki}\) such as fish. The food was then covered with more vegetation followed usually by flax mats \(\textit{taporo}\) or old \(\textit{kete}\) (flax bags) and water liberally sprinkled over\(^{10}\) \((ibid)\). It was then covered over with earth to ensure that no steam escapes. Cooking time was dependent on the food within the \(\textit{hāngi}\).

An additional method is described by Best (1923) called \(\textit{umu komao}\). In this method, fire was not kindled in the pit; instead “the stones are heated in a fire apart from the \(\textit{umu}\) and when sufficiently hot, are transferred to the pit” \((ibid: 56)\). It was deemed a “far superior” method \((ibid)\), presumably because there was less chance of ash and charcoal contaminating the food.

Best \((ibid)\) also mentions a peculiar type of oven cooking used by people in the Whanganui district used for cooking birds. The birds were buried in wet earth, and a fire kindled over the top of them, in this way the birds were cooked well, and this was the single mode of cooking birds in this area.

The cooking of fish by \(\textit{umu}\) cookery was mentioned by the earliest explorers such as Furneaux who described this method:

\[
\text{they first dig a hole in the ground in which they make a fire and heat a number of stones, which then done are taken out together with the fire that the pot or oven is quite clear, on which they lay their fish or any other food}
\]

\(^9\) The stones were “as large or larger than a man's fist” (Taylor 1855: 390) and were generally volcanic to retain the heat and were known as \(\textit{kohatu}\).

\(^{10}\) The use of water distinguishes it from the \(\textit{umu}\) used in the rest of Polynesia where dry heat was employed (Leach 2007: 88).
wrapped up in green leaves, and put on hot stones, and then they rake the coals over them and make more fire if necessary; this method does them quite clean and very good (Beaglehole 1961: 739).

The process described by Furneaux was usually employed when small quantities of food were to be cooked, or the food was “easily cooked” (Best 1923: 54). Savage (1807) also describes this “rather uncommon” method of wrapping the fish in leaves,

The fish being cleaned, is enveloped in a quantity of leaves of the cabbage 11, and bound with tendrils; it is then laid upon a stone that has been previously heated, upon which it is occasionally turned... The leaves being taken off, the fish is found to be well cooked and unbroken (Savage 1807: 60).

Eel were wrapped in the leaves of the *puwha* (*Sonchus* spp.), or bound spirally in the leaves of *harakeke* (*Phormium* spp.). The parcel of eel was placed directly on the hot stones and the skin thus became *pakawera* (brown and crackly) (Papakura 1938: 250).

Green leafy vegetables such as *puwha*, were a favorite vegetable food in pre-European times. *Puwha*, after thorough washing – which included rubbing it between the thumb and first finger to extract the bitter milky juice, was used as a leaf wrapper as well as being placed wet on top of the kūmera or other vegetables or *kinaki* in the hangi (ibid: 215).

The very young fronds of the fern mouku (*Asplenium bulbiferum*) were cooked and eaten as a vegetable in the same manner as *puwha*, and also the very young fronds of the *paretao* (*Asplenium obtusatum*). The very young fronds called *pikopiko* were gathered when they were four to six inches high, and cooked in a *hangi* on top of the kūmara and eaten as a vegetable (ibid: 213).

Kūmera were one of the most prized food among pre-European Māori; this is shown through the rituals surrounding the cultivation 12. It was often cooked in flax baskets with a relish of fish, dried shark or any other flesh (Bhalla 2001). Kūmera was also cooked in the *hāngi* to create a dish known as *kao*. Kūmera to be grown for making *kao* were

---

11 The manner in which the fish is ‘enveloped’ in cabbage leaves, has been passed down from the Polynesian practice; where food is wrapped in large leaves (such as taro) for protection and to impart the flavours of the leaf, as well as retaining the flavours of the enveloped item (Savage and Dubois 2006: 377)

12 See Best 1925: 47-119 for further details on the cultivation and the rituals associated.
planted at a specific phase of the moon to ensure that they would grow “small, but long, so that their skins could easily be rubbed off” (Puwharariki and Te Ranga-a-te-anewa 1967: 6). The preparation of kao is as follows:

1. The finest and longest tubers were selected when two thirds grown and were kept in a rua (pit) until dry.

2. The dry kümera were then scraped, generally by women, with a shell or a pieces of split supplejack (Ripogonum scandens) until the skins were removed. This process was called waruwaru (Papakura 1938: 161)

3. The kümera were then sun-dried on a platform called a paparahi/taka/tuwhara, and were turned each day and put under cover at night. This drying process could take as long as two weeks (Phillips 1969: 45).

4. The dried kümera, wrapped in the leaves of the karamu (Coprosma grandifolia) or puriri (Vitex lucens), were then packed into kete and placed into a hängi14 for twelve to sixteen hours (Walsh 1902: 23).

5. The cooked kümera was then stored with fern leaves (Asplenium bulbifereum) to impart their distinct flavour (Bhalla 2001).

The kao was dry and black in appearance and had a “sweet aromatic flavour” (Walsh 1902: 23). It could be kept for a lengthy time if stored appropriately in whata (storehouses) and was generally reserved for journeys, feasts and kai-hau-kai (ritual exchange of food) (Tikao 1990: 130). When ready for consumption, the kao was eaten “either raw [no further processing], or soaked and mashed with a little warm water” (Colenso 1880: 12; Phillips 1969: 45; Anon 1868: 10). It was also pounded to form a cake, and prepared this way, tī kouka was generously spread on top of it “like bread and butter” (Bhalla 2001). Also the Arawa people of Rotorua made a drink from kao; it was pounded to a powder and mixed with water (ibid).

---

13 Colenso (1880: 12) mentions that the kümera were edible at this point in the process.
14 No additional water was added to the hängi; the only moisture coming from moistened layer of fern leaves covering the stones. This was to prevent the kümera from becoming too soft, which would mean additional drying (Bhalla 2001).
The ūi tree or cabbage tree (*Cordyline* spp) was another important food in pre-European society, especially south of the kūmara growing limits, where Simpson (2000: 153) says that a whole *kāuru* (preserved ‘flesh’ of the ūi tree) culture emerged.

*Ki te kore he mara ū o te tangata, he tangata mate tēnā.*

If a person has no ūi cultivation, there is an impoverished person. (Mead 2001:1364)

All parts of the ūi tree were used for one purpose or another, the leaves for making kete, rope and other fibrous materials and the stem, roots and pith for food (Fankhauser 1982: 132). The heart or pith of the ūi (*kōata*), found in the centre of the head, was used as an accompaniment to fatty foods as it contains a product, known as saponin, which is capable of breaking down fat (Simpson 2000: 153). *Kōata* can be eaten raw; however it was usually roasted, or steamed in the *hāngi* and less frequently, boiled. Cooked *kōata* is called *kōuka* (*ibid:* 150). The roots of the young trees were also eaten and were cooked directly in the fire, steamed roasted or eaten raw (Bhalla 2001). The roots were also pounded with a wooden club on a flat stone and then soaked in water, where a sweet juice could be squeezed out. The juice, known as *waiti* or *waitau kāuru* and was often used to sweeten other food (Tikao 1990: 141).

The roots and stem (*kāuru*) were the most prized aspect of the ūi, as they contained large amounts of sugar. Because humans do not have the capabilities of breaking down the raw carbohydrates found in the stems and roots (Fankhauser 1986: 68), they underwent a ‘strenuous’ process to extract the sugar content (Tikao 1990: 140). Consequently umu ūi (specialised ovens for cooking ūi) were developed all over Polynesia (Carson 2002: 352). *Umu ūi* in New Zealand do not differ significantly from their Polynesian counterparts, they were both very large to ensure that the heat generated in the oven could break down the polysaccharides into the edible form of carbohydrates – monosaccharides (Carson 2002: 353; Fankhauser 1986: 68).

---

15 Fankhauser (1986: 184) mentions that it was equivalent to *taro* and *yam* in terms of carbohydrate and contained more sugar than sugar cane or beet.

16 *Umu ūi* in the South Island had a diameter of 3.66m whereas *umu ūi* in Hawaii were 3.20 metres (Carson 2002:352).
During the summer months the stems\(^{17}\) were cut and trimmed to remove the outer fibrous bark then dried standing up right on a *whata* (storage platform) for a few weeks (Simpson 2000: 155). A large hole was dug (about two metres deep) and the firewood\(^{18}\) stacked in the hole and lit in the morning. The stones were then placed on top (*ibid*). Once the fuel was exhausted the stones were raked out evenly and a layer of earth and leaves placed on top. The stems which had been packed into *kete-ti* (laced-up baskets) were then piled up to the top of the pit and covered with *tapora* and sprinkled with water. They were then buried to prevent the escape of steam (*ibid*). *Kāuru* was cooked for approximately 24 hours (Carson 2002: 354).

The cooked *kāuru* could last for many years if stored away from moisture and was used for *hakari* and *kai-hau-kai*, as well as at the arrival of an important guest (Tikao 1990: 130). The *kāuru* could be eaten on its own, but was often used as a sweetener with other foods, especially fernroot (Best 1925: 139). To obtain the crystallised sugar granules or *para* the *kāuru* was beaten, and the fragments tapped into a vessel to collect. These were then dissolved in water (*ibid*). More commonly the *kāuru* was pounded, then soaked and the sugar wrung out of the fibrous material and mixed with water (*waitau kāuru*) (Simpson 2000: 158).

### 3.32 Polynesian Puddings

Several dishes have been labeled as 'bread', 'cakes' or 'loaves' due to their resemblance to European bread loaves. However, they are more similar to the 'puddings' of Polynesia which use a starchy component (often taro) along with a lubricant (usually coconut oil) to create a homogenous consistency (Su’a 1987). Su’a says that the New Zealand case is unique as:

> It neither had the tropical starchy fruit range nor the coconut so common in its Polynesian tropic neighbouring island groups. As a temperate island group, it possessed the fern-root, a very hard, fibrous root and the native berries such as the *hinau*. Both the fernroot and *hinau* required exacting treatments to free the palatable meal. Here-in is demonstrated the direct relationship between the physical nature of the base and the type of

---

\(^{17}\) Tikao (Best 1925: 141) says that only the stems were cooked in the *umu ti* and the roots were roasted or cooked in a standard *umu*. He also says that only the stems were used for preserving (*ibid*).

\(^{18}\) Manuka (Best 1925: 140)
processing technique that is warranted to reduce the meal to a workable state. As such, there was a predominant use of sun-drying either prior to cooking and/or following cooking. Another common practice was to soak the base for long periods of time before freeing the necessary meal. In most cases, water was mixed into the meal that formed cakes, loaves, bread, gruels or puddings. (ibid: 104)

Colenso (1880: 28-29) and Taylor (1855: 391-392) describe the process of making cakes from raupō (Typha angustifolia) pollen (pungapunga, renga or pua). The flower heads containing pollen were collected in vast quantities in the mornings and evenings, when the winds that blew the “seeds” 19 around were at their lowest (Taylor 1855: 391). Once collected the flower heads were dried in the sun everyday for several days, when they became very dry. The flowers were then gently beaten or sifted to remove the ‘hairs’ from the heads. The bark from the hīnau was obtained and stripped off the tree in large lengths (twelve to fourteen feet long) which were folded to create a bag with an opening at one end, the sides being sewn up with flax, leaving a hole at one of the lower corners. Mats (tupaki) made of flax were laid next to these large bags and the flower was stripped from the stem (this process was known as uhu). The flowers were then placed in these large bark bags and then gently beaten so the pollen was collected from the small hole in the bottom and collected in very finely woven kete 20.

The pollen could be collected in huge amounts as Colenso (1880) states:

On one occasion, more than thirty years ago, I had several buckets full brought me by the present chief, Tareha, in his canoe, some of which I sent both raw and cooked to the Kew Museum (ibid: 28).

To cook the pua, it was either mixed with water into cakes then placed in an umu (ibid), or the pollen was put into a kete with leaves and sewn up, then the kete was placed in an umu (Taylor 1855: 392). Presumably there was sufficient steam in the oven to produce coagulation as Taylor says that on completion “the substance still retained its resemblance to seeds; but the baking converted it into a solid mass” (ibid).

The flesh of the ripe fruit from hīnau (Elaeocarpus dentatus) was used to create a form of bread or cake 21. The flesh was removed via a long steeping process in water, sometimes,

---

19 Taylor presumably means the furry like pollen of the raupō not the seeds.
20 Colenso uses the term pu for the name of the kete, however Kahutoi Te Kanawa (2007 pers, comm.) describes a finely woven kete called pukoro used for straining the juice of the tutu berries. It is thus presumed that the same type of kete was employed here, Colenso just using the shortened name pu.
21 The ‘flour’ of hīnau was also made into a type of gruel (Colenso 1880: 30).
as long as one year (Taylor 1855: 393). However some tribes did not steep the fruit at all; they just pounded it “in a rude wooden mortar with a pestle-like club” (Colenso 1880: 26) to remove the pulp. The berries were then placed in a finely woven *kete* 22 and “beaten upon a stone with a small wooden club” (Taylor 1855: 393), the residue being left in the *kete* and discarded, leaving only the pulp. The “dark flour” (*ibid*) like pulp is then kneaded into cakes with a little water or honey (Bhalla 2001). The cakes were then wrapped in leaves and placed in an *umu* to cook (Taylor 1855: 393).

Both of these dishes were reserved for visitors and *hakari* (feasts). The hīnau dish was so popular that there is a famous *pepeha* explaining that one should only be roused from sleep in the instance of hīnau cakes being supplied. “*Kia wakaoho koe i taku moe, ko te Watutureiarua*” – “When you disturb my sleep, let it be on account of the arrival of te Watutureiarua.” 23 (Taylor 1855: 393).

### 3.33 Roasting

Thomson (1859 I: 159) alleges that “the New Zealanders despised this mode of cooking [roasting], and called it a make-shift, a dinner for slaves in a hurry”. Furneaux emphasises that early Māori roasted and spitted their food when in a rush (Beaglehole 1961: 739). Food however, was often cooked in a hurry, especially in times of warfare, when it was thought that an enemy could encroach on one’s meal as this *pepeha* (proverb) explains, “*mata kitea, maoa riro kē*” (When raw it is seen, but when cooked it is taken away) (Mead 2001: 1755). This means that it is better to eat your food raw, because cooking meant light and smoke, both of which might attract the attention of the enemy. It is therefore likely that this method may have been employed more frequently in times of warfare, or on journeys in place of the more time consuming processes of steaming in an *umu* and preserving. Consequently Māori would have likened a fast meal to wartimes, and long expeditions hence the apparent “dislike” of this practice. *Kia wakaoho koe i taku moe, ko te Watutureiarua*

---

22 Here Taylor calls the *kete* – *pu*. Te Kanawa’s (pers. comm. 2007) comment applies here also.

23 Watutureiarua was said to be the first person who made hīnau bread (Taylor 1855: 393).
Sir Joseph Banks (1963 II) noted that fish were generally toasted or broiled, stating that Māori were:

spitting them upon a large skewer, the bottom of which is fixed under a stone and another stone being put under the forepart of the skewer it is raised or lowered by moving that stone as the circumstances require (Banks 1963 II: 21).

Shellfish were also roasted. Tikao (1990: 139) says that paua were harvested in the early spring when the kowhai (Sophora tetraptera) flowered24 and that the tough inner flesh was removed and beaten to soften it before it was cooked on hot coals or in a hāngi (Papakura 1938: 238). Paua along with most other shellfish were vigorously soaked in fresh water to remove mataitai (the salty sea taste) before they were cooked (Tikao 1990: 139). Many of the early explorers noted the Māori abhorrence for salty tasting foods, “salted meats, or fish, do not please them; and mustard, pepper, and similar condiments, grateful to the taste of a European, are repudiated with much aversion” (Polack I 1838: 402).

Many small birds such as the pihipihi (wax eye, Zosterops lateralis) or tūi (Prosthemadera noveseelandiae) were plucked then passed through a long piece of wood and stuck in the ground by the fire for roasting. The stick was then turned round and round until they were cooked (Papakura 1938: 266). Pukeko were also cooked in this method, along with the kiore (ibid: 267).

Aruhe or fernroot (Pteridium esculentum) was the staple food of pre-European Māori, holding this status above other foods such as the kūmara. This was because it could be procured throughout most of the year and grew prolifically all over New Zealand25. The rhizomes of this plant were harvested and roasted; a description of the preparation follows:

1. The roots were dug up, those that were deeper were said to contain more of the mealy matter and less fibrous material (Taylor 1855: 379). They were then stacked in short

24 “Ko te aro o te kōwhai” - “The budding of the kōwhai” (Mead 2001: 1533).
25 When the fern was in active growth there would be little starch in storage in the rhizome. Also, rhizomes of good quality were obtained only from deep, moderately fertile land (Mc Glone, Wilmhurst and Leach 2005: 165).
lengths on end (to allow ventilation (Rusden 1883 I: 12)) to dry in a sheltered area (Buck 1929: 85) on a stage known as tītara aruhe (Best 1902: 51). Because fresh fernroot was deemed unpleasant, those that had been above ground for longer than a year were the “most esteemed” (Thompson 1859: 154).

1a. Some authors assert that aruhe was soaked\footnote{26 Perhaps the reason aruhe was sometimes steeped was to extract a jelly like substance. Nicholas (I 1817: 191) says the fern root “on being steeped in water, deposes a glutinous substance resembling jelly”.} at this point and then re-dried in the sun (Bhalla 2001; Thomson 1859: 154).

2. Aruhe was always roasted on the fire and was never cooked in the umu. The dried roots were placed on the embers for a short time to roast where the outside became blackened (Beaglehole 1961: 739; Best 1902: 52; Thomson 1859: 154; Polack I 1838: 293).\footnote{27 “He aruhe kia wē te pōpa” “Fernroot is soon cooked”. A distinctive popping sound is heard when the aruhe is cooked (Mead 2001: 347)}

3. The roots were taken off the fire, and the blackened outside was scraped off with a shell (Taylor 1855: 379) or peeled by hand (Papakura 1938: 204).

4. The rhizomes were afterwards beaten with a wooden mallet known as a patu-aruhe or paoi in some areas (Buck 1929: 85). Each family had their own patu-aruhe, which Cook noted and stated that they were kept “without the house” (Beaglehole 1961: 86). Buck (1929) describes the beaters as being made from hard wood “round in section with a rounded end, and with the handle rounded to a lesser diameter to fit the grip” (ibid 85-86).\footnote{28 See Leach and Purdue (2001) for further information on patu aruhe.} The roots were placed upon a wooden or stone block until they became capable of mastication.

5. Once the black stringy fibres were removed, the fernroot could be eaten. It was then chewed laboriously and any remaining woody fibre was spat out (Taylor 1855: 379)

6. For the purposes of feasts or journeys (especially for war parties) the beaten aruhe was made into cakes. The pounded fern root was “worked with the hands in water in a wooden bowl to extract the starchy material and the water decanted” (Buck 1929: 86) leaving only the starch at the bottom of the bowl. This mealy material, which was completely free of fibre, was then pressed into cakes known as komeke about “8 in.” in length (Best 1902: 52).
Thomson (1859: 154) described the taste as being similar to ships biscuit and Polack (1838: 293) also notes its flavour as being rather bland and “possessing little taste”. Early Māori obviously agreed with this, as it was often flavoured, for example with the juice korari\(^{29}\) nectar or with the fruit of the tutu. The tutu juice having been previously collected and treated\(^{30}\) was placed into calabashes and mixed with the prepared cakes. In this state it was a much favoured food. Bhalla (2000-2001) gives this elaborate concoction of komeke “dipped into whale oil, bird fat, or muttonbird fat, mashed with whitebait and dried in the sun or by the fire”. Tikao (1990: 139) also says that mashed aruhe was mixed with mata (whitebait) and was called kohere-aruhe. As a result of these treatments the aruhe gained much status as a food – not only for the practicalities of it, but for its flavour:

**He aha, he aha,**
**he kai ma taua?**
**he pipi, he aruhe,**
**ko te aka o Tuwhenua:**
**ko te kai e ora ai te tangata.**
**matoetoe ana te arero,**
**i te mitikanga,**
**me he arero kuri au. Pao**
(Shortland 1851: 202).

What, what
is the food for us?
pipi, aruhe
the vines of Tuwhenua
the food that sustains the people
that causes the tongue to salivate
and lap
like that of a dog!

### 3.34 Boiling

Because Māori had no earthenware pots for boiling it may appear that boiling did not exist. However, Māori in pre-European times were familiar with a form of boiling for the purpose of dyeing fibre which was first witnessed by William Wade in the 1830’s:

the bark [of the tanekaha *Phyllocladus trichomanoides]*... when softened by beating, it is put into cold water, in a kumete, (a kind of trough, resembling a short ill-shaped canoe,) along with the muka, or prepared flax. Stones made red hot are then thrown into the water till it boils, the stones being changed for others from the fire, till the muka is dyed red, and hung on a pole to dry” (Wade 1842: 42).

---

\(^{29}\) The nectar from the *harakeke* (*Phormium spp.*) flowers.

\(^{30}\) The same treatment was applied to the tutu when making rehia. See page 31-32 of this thesis for further details.
Leach (2007) maintains that while this method does not relate to food, it is obvious that this method was known to pre-European Māori. This stone boiling technique was later recorded in relation to food by Rev Richard Taylor in the process of making a type of 'gruel' from hīnau (*Elaeocarpus dentatus*):

The natives sometimes cooked it by pouring a quantity of the flour into water which had been heated by putting hot stones into it, the only way the natives previously had of heating water. In that state it was called *rerepi*. (Taylor 1855: 393)

Some species of seaweed underwent an elaborate process that involved boiling before consuming. *Gigartina rehia* or *rimūrehia* contained a complex carbohydrate (carrageen) obtained from red edible seaweeds, which was used in the preparation of jellies (Turner 2003: 285). It could also be cooked in a *hāngi*, eaten raw (either fresh or in the dry state, where it was dried in the sun) (Papakura 1938: 238; Bhalla 2001).

To create the jelly, it was sweetened, for example with the juice from the fruits of tutu, which were collected in great quantities. First, the juice was strained from the 'berries' [fleshy sepals] ensuring that the poisonous seeds and foot-stalks were extracted. A *kete* known as a *pūkoro* with a very fine weave made from *tī* leaves was used to wring the juice from the seeds. Secondly, the juice and the *rimu* were then boiled together (von Hochstetter 1867: 140; Taylor 1855: 451) and eaten cold (Bhalla 2001). The sweetness of this confection is compared to jam and had the consistency of jellyfish (Williams 2003: 162). The name of this dish was *rehia*, notably because of the seaweed used (*rimurehia*), and because the word *rehia* is used to denote anything pleasurable or enjoyable (Williams 2002: 334).

Stone-pot boilers were also utilised to render down the fat of birds for preservation and for any other purpose where hot liquid was required.

---

31 Rimu is the generic name for seaweed.
32 It is not stated whether the traditional stone boiling method was employed or if the cast iron pots which were widespread during Taylor and Hochstetter times were used. However we can deduce that in pre-European days, the stone boiling method would have been used to create the jelly substance.
33 See pp 19-20.
3.35 Preserving

Preservation was very important in traditional times due to the unreliable weather conditions in New Zealand, especially in the winter months. It was also critical that food was available for the eventuality of visitors, where hospitality took precedence above all else. This pepeha conveys this message: “Ka ngaro te kai, e mimiti tā tiwae” - “The food is gone, consumed by the visitors” the general idea being, that enough food must be kept in reserves for such an occasion (Mead 2001: 1049). It was therefore paramount that there must not only be enough food for the inhabitants, but for any visitors that may arrive – preserving in the summer months accommodated this.

Haere ki te moana kia whaka pūharutia koe ki te kete maoa — Go to the sea to get tasty morsels for the baskets of cooked food (Mead 2001: 286)

The people who inhabited the Pacific Islands34 obtained the bulk of their protein from the sea. Johannes (1978: 349) says that this is often due to their being no other alternative; as the land was usually unfavourable to sustaining a vegetable harvest due to “calcareous soil with little humus”. He goes on to say that the precarious environment of the Pacific meant that typhoons, droughts, and tsunamis periodically destroyed any vegetation that was in existence; and that the humid climate meant that storage of staple foods for emergencies was almost impossible (ibid: 349-350). However, the abundance of seafood on these islands was relatively sustainable and dependable (ibid: 350).

Due to the environmental factors mentioned above, surplus catch was unable to be stored for long periods of time, yet, there were still methods in place to accommodate short duration storage. Sun-drying, smoking, or salting was often employed in these instances and in some cases, fish or fish stews were often re-heated for weeks at a time, and the resultant dish was “surprisingly palatable” (ibid: 353).

---

34 Johannes is referring to the coral atolls, not the high islands where most people lived. Nevertheless, it demonstrates that even in the most extreme environments fish was plentiful.
The knowledge procured from the Pacific pertaining to fishing and the numerous ways of preparing dishes, either for immediate consumption or for preservation was therefore held by their descendants in New Zealand.

There were many kinds of *kaimoana* (seafood) consumed in pre-European times. Leach and Boocock (1993: 15) say that at least 27 families of marine fish were caught and eaten, but that eight of these were less than one percent of an average catch. So while there was a great number of different species caught, there were only a small number that were economically significant, and the majority of those significant species were found in an inshore environment. However they do concede that while offshore species may have been inconsequential in a staple diet, they nonetheless had cultural significance as evidenced by linguistics, which shows 14 names for kahawai and 10 for yellow eyed mullet (*ibid*: 34).

There were three main methods in fish preparation: drying, steaming in an *umu*, and roasting or grilling in direct contact with a heat source. These methods could be employed individually or in conjunction with each other for the purposes of preservation. Shellfish could also be prepared via these methods, but in many instances they were often eaten raw (Papakura 1938).

The general process of drying fish consisted of cleaning the fish with sea water then splitting it from head to tail and to the backbone (Buck 1929: 106; Nicholas I 1817: 235), then exposing it to the sun to dry on a vertical scaffold (*whata*) of poles (Buck 1929: 106; Papakura 1938: 233). *Tuna* (freshwater eels) were also prepared in this way (Buck 1929: 106) and the resulting food was known as *pāwhara* (Williams pers. comm. 2007).

Below is Yate’s (1835) account of the preparation of mackerel (*Allothunnus fallai*), which describes an alternate method for preserving fish and incorporates two modes of preparation, firstly cooking in the *umu*, then drying the fish in smoke:
When taken, [the fish] is gutted, thoroughly washed with sea-water, and hung up to drain; it is afterwards put into the oven, and half cooked\textsuperscript{35}; then placed upon a wattled stage, about ten feet from the ground, under which burns a good strong fire during the night, but which is quenched by day, that the fish may be dried in the sun. The mackerel, thus prepared, eat very short, and are a favourite winter-food amongst the great folks of the land. (Yate 1835: 109-110)

Shellfish were often preserved in the procedures described above, but were threaded onto strings called \textit{takiaho} (Papakura 1938: 238; Buck 1929: 106; Anon: 1952: 54) and left to dry in the sun. The most esteemed shellfish were the *pipi* (\textit{Paphies australis}) and *tuaki\textsuperscript{36}* (cockle, \textit{Austrovenus stutchburyi}), which are the most recognised, most abundant and most widespread — "\textit{E ngā pipi o Hokianga, he waii tangata tonu}" — "Oh pipi of Hokianga, still man's essential nourishment" (Mead 2001: 201). They live in harbours, estuaries and sheltered beaches in the intertidal zone, buried just under the sediment. Densities can be very high in places (4,500 per metre squared have been recorded) forcing the shellfish to the surface (Annala \textit{et al.}, 2004), making collection easier.

The *pipi\textsuperscript{37}* and *tuaki*, because of their prolificacy, did not require preservation, as they could be procured fresh all year round. They were placed in a heap, and a fire built around them, until the shells opened. However they were still preserved in vast quantities for inland food gathering expeditions (Williams pers. comm. 2007). *Toheroa* (*Paphies ventricosa*) were also steamed and dried by pre-European Māori and taken as portable food for journeys (Polack I 1838: 71). The less favoured *tuatua* (*Paphies subtriangulata*) also underwent the same treatment, but only in times of extreme need (Williams pers. comm2007)

According to legend, reptiles (\textit{Ngārara}) are the *tuakana* (elder brother) of *mango* (the Shark) and they therefore fall under the realm of Takaroa, even though they reside in the realm of Tane (\textit{atua} of the Forest). The lizard at parting from his brother said "\textit{E noho ki

\textsuperscript{35} Banks (1963: 53, 58) states that *mango* (shark) was the only fish that was steamed cooked before it was dried. It is more than likely that Banks only ever witnessed shark being preserved in this manner and thus assumed this was the case.

\textsuperscript{36} *Tuaki* is the southern dialect, *tuangi* is the Northern.

\textsuperscript{37} The term *'pipi'* refers to shellfish in general as well as the species *Paphies australis*, to which the word today usually applies (Williams 2003: 156).
"waho ki te moana, kia wakapuharutia koe ki te tokanga-kai-maoa!" ("Remain in the open sea, to be served up on a dish of cooked food for man to eat!") (Shortland 1856: 57). That is why the shark became a great delicacy among pre-contact Māori. It was either cooked in the hāngi, but more commonly preserved (Banks 1963: 53, 58).

Shark was preserved by being cut open and hung up in the sun on high horizontal poles to dry. In this state they would become quite “putrid” and the taste is likened to cottage cheese by Taylor (1855: 384). Once dry, they were stacked in store houses “like firewood” (Matthews 1910: 602). When it was required for eating narrow strips were cut and cooked on hot stones, and beaten with a paoi (pestle for pounding fern-root) to soften the flesh. Sometimes the cooking was done in a hangi or steam-oven. In this case the flesh was cut in chunks, and not pounded...

Seaweed was used extensively in pre-historic New Zealand, both as a food source and as part of their material culture. Karengo (Porphyria columbina) grows on flat clayey tidal rocks (Papakura 1938: 237) and was picked during the winter or spring months (Young 1992: 23). It was sun-dried and stored for use in kai-hau-kai, and for traveling parties (Papakura 1938: 27). It was such a prized food in pre-contact times, that the rocks that karengo grows on were transported to an area south of the Mataura by hand (Williams 2003: 134).

Rimurapa or bullkelp (Durvillaea antarctica) was a very important part of pre-European material culture, especially in the far south where hue were unable to be grown. The kelp was collected from specific areas known to be good for rimurapa. A small incision was made at the top and the hand was then placed in this incision to pry the two membranes of the kelp apart, being careful not to break open. Once a hollow had been made nearly all the way to the end a pūpūi rimu (a special blowing device made from bunui Stilbocarpa robusta) was used to blow the kelp open. The kelp bags known as poha were

---

38 Harold Ashwell says that Kaka Point was the most renowned place in Southland for collecting rimurapa, and it was especially strong if it was collected every year (Kai Tahu video 1992).

39 Literally translates to ‘blow kelp’ (ibid). One of Beattie’s (1994: 177) informants called it a pūpu hirimu.

40 A ‘p’ was often pronounced as a ‘b’ in the Kai Tahu dialect.
left to dry in the sun, where they kept their shape and became pliable, and they were described as being “a bit like oiled silk” (Ashwell in Kai Tī video 1992).

Pōhā were employed when preserving large birds such as kererū or tītī (Stevens 2003: 41). Once the birds were plucked, gutted and de-boned (this was to ensure that the poha was not damaged by the sharp bones) they were then cooked in hinu (fat, oil) in an ipu (a vessel normally made out of totara (Podocarpus totara), and heated by placing hot stones into the fat). Once cooked, the birds are placed into a pōhā, and the cooled hinu is poured in to preserve the birds (Beaton 2006: pers. comm.). Aside from storing food, poha could hold water and could be cooked in the hot embers; eggs and shellfish were often cooked this way (Beattie 1994: 116).

Hue or gourds were used in the North Island for the same purposes as poha. The fleshy inner part was eaten when the plant was still young about ten to twenty centimetres long and Māori cooked it in a hangi with potatoes or kumara or any other food. It was also eaten cold. It was cooked whole or cut in two, without peeling, and the young seeds were left in, so that the whole was eaten (Papakura 1938: 216).

The larger mature hue were dried to be used as water containers or as containers for holding food preserved and potted in their own fat (huahua). The hue was chosen for its size, and flat bottom which had been purposely grown in that fashion. Once selected, the hue was filled with seawater to rot the inner flesh (Buck 1929: 91) and then dried in the sun. The contents were scooped out through a small hole in the stem end (Riley 1994:153). Sand or small stones were then poured inside and shaken to clear any remaining pulp (ibid). The hollow gourd was then “left to dry in the sun or baked in a fire to harden the shell” (ibid). The gourd was then elaborately carved and decorated for

---

41 Savage (1847: 237) says that “each pod held upwards of a quart”, while Shortland describes some that were as tall as a man (Shortland 1851: 224)
42 The fat used from tītī was called katu and is the fat surrounding the kidneys (Whaitiri and Beaton pers. comm. 2006)
43 The progenitor of the hue, Putēhue said, “the seeds within me shall provide water vessels for my descendants” (Riley 1994: 153).
ceremonial occasions (Best 1977: 240). All manner of food was preserved in the *hue* including most bird species, rats, sea mammals and humans (Leach 2003: 451).

Smaller *hue* cut in two, were used for serving small fish like dried whitebait and liquid food, such as the aforementioned puddings or jellies (Papakura 1938: 216-217).

The importance of *hue* as a container is illustrated by the fact that they were given names and some were passed down as family heirlooms and could remain in a family for many generations (*ibid*: 216). This is further exemplified by the various sayings referring to the gourd as an item that needs to be handled with care (Mead 2001).

### 3.36 Fermenting

Kina were generally eaten raw due to their highly perishable nature (Papakura 1938: 238), but could be preserved via fermentation processes. Whyte, Hudson, Hassell and Monson (2001: 816-818) describe two methods, where the kina were harvested and either stored in freshwater for several weeks, or buried underground for several months.

**Method 1:**
The first method involves placing the kina in containers of fresh water followed by storage for several weeks. The kina are then removed from water and eaten immediately. Six to twelve kina are eaten at a sitting.

```
Collect Kina
↓
Place in kete of fresh water
↓
Leave up to 3 weeks
↓
Remove from water and eat immediately
```
Method 2:
The kina are buried and stored underground for several months. Kina prepared in this manner are consumed by removing the “teeth” part, adding freshwater, stirring and then drinking. Normally, five kina are eaten at a sitting.

Collect Kina

↓

Stack on top of each other to drain

↓

Place in hangi-type hole

↓

Cover with flax mat?

↓

Uncover

↓

Pack into poha

↓

Bury under soil (3-4 months)

Kohere (1953: 51) in Te Ao Hou refers to the first method of preparing kina; “White kinas in season, after being steeped in fresh water for two days, is the nicest thing there is”.

Seafood was not the only food that was fermented, some fruit were too. Polack (1838 I: 287) mistakenly claimed that “the fruits indigenous to the country are few”. While there are few large fruits\(^4^4\), as there were in other parts of Polynesia, there was an array of smaller fruits that were eaten and used extensively in pre-contact New Zealand. The most noticeable and those that received the most attention from early explorers were the karaka (Corynocarpus laevigatus), hīnau, tawa and tutu, yet there were many more utilised\(^4^5\).

\(^4^4\) The tāwhara, the fruit of the kiekie (Freycinetia banksii) being an exception.

\(^4^5\) See Papakura (1938) for an extensive list of fruits eaten.
Karaka is an evergreen tree, with dark green, thick, glossy leaves, that grows to twenty metres tall and is found in coastal and lowland forest in the North Island and northern South Island (Sawyer, McFadgen and Hughes 2003: 5). It was a very important food in traditional Māori society as it was a source of carbohydrate for those where kūmēra cultivation was limited (ibid). Its importance is evident due to the systematic planting of karaka trees among settlement areas and the many whakataukī that refer to it (Mead 2001). It was also regarded as one of the staples on the Chatham Islands (Sutton et al. 1982: 79).

Its antiquity of use can also be shown by pepeha; as it was believed to have been brought to New Zealand from Polynesia - “Te karaka i ruia mai i runga o Rangiatea” – “The karaka which was sown on Rangiatea”46 (ibid). Even though it is now known to be endemic, one can presume that the processes associated with karaka are long-standing.

While the outer flesh of the ripe berry is pleasant tasting, it is the kernel or nut which contains the bulk of the value (Cambie and Ferguson 2003: 114). However the kernel contains poisonous substances47, which can cause spasmodic pains, giddiness, partial paralysis and death if eaten in their raw state (ibid). They therefore underwent an arduous process of hydrolyzing the poisonous glucosides to render them edible. There are different accounts on the length of time that the fruit is placed in the hāngi or steeped and when and how the flesh is removed48. Nonetheless the following gives an accurate overview of the process.

(1) Fallen ripe berries gathered
(2) Fruit placed in a hāngi

---

46 French Polynesia, more specifically Ra’iata, which has been mis-spelt in the above pepeha. However as there are similar species of karaka in New Caledonia and New Hebrides (Sawyer et al 2003), it is more than likely that this is the place of origin. See Stevenson 1978 for further information.
47 Karakin and four other related nitropropanoyl glucosides have been isolated (Bhalla 2001).
48 Bhalla (2001) says that the pulpy fruit was removed after being cooked in the hāngi in a running stream then dried and stored. The kernels were then softened by steaming when needed for eating (ibid). Buck (1929: 88) says that the fruit was trodden on with barefeet before being placed in the hāngi, and that they were kept in their water enclosures until needed for eating (ibid). Times of cooking in the hāngi vary from 24 hours (Papakura 1983: 211; Buck 1929: 88) to 10 days (Thomson 1859: 157).
(3) Kernels steeped in running water

(4) Kernels removed and sun dried – once in this state they are called kopī.

Once the kernels have undergone this process their food value nutritionally is said to resemble that of oatmeal\(^{49}\).

This chapter has highlighted the social and ritual significance of food consumption in traditional Māori society, showing that food was an integral component of everyday life, playing a far greater role than just providing nutrition to people. Food was seen as being a part of the wider kinship group and was thus imbued with mana and tapu derived from the atua. Furthermore, because food had the ability to whakanoa it played an important role in many rituals, such as removing the tapu from the whare puhi or from the living after tangihanga. Kai was also important in ensuring inter and intra tribal relations, and this was accomplished via feasts and the ritual exchange of food. The reciprocity associated with these food exchanges exemplifies manaakitanga in its greatest form. Preserved foods were the preferred foods to be served to manuhiri, and at hākari and they were also important for travel, as well as a provision on long journeys.

This chapter has also established that Māori had an appreciation of starch and sugar resources as kai, and of flesh as kinaki – an ancient food classification system. There was also a wide range of cooking methods employed to create the kai/kinaki dishes, including: umu cookery, Polynesian puddings, preservation, boiling and fermentation.

Lastly this chapter has shown how extra value was often added to foods by elaborate processing as was the case with kāuru and karaka which could take several weeks before the final product could be consumed. The Polynesian puddings were also highly valued as a food source because of the complex processing required to create a homogenous consistency.

\(^{49}\) Approximately 10% water, 10% protein and 60% carbohydrates (Bhalla 2001).
4.0 Māori response to the arrival of European Cuisine 1769-1869

This chapter will outline the Māori response to the arrival of European foods and material culture, from 1769 to 1869. These dates are used, opposed to those set out by Mead (1969) and Firth (1959) who use the dates 1800-1900 and 1800-1860 to distinguish this early contact period of “transition” and “adoption” respectively. While their dates are useful for establishing the changing shape of Māori culture in general, they are too broad for the purposes of this study. That is because in 1769 Māori were first exposed to and utilised European foods and material culture and 1869 was the date of the first published cookbook; the publication of this cookbook signaled the next phase in a Māori culinary tradition - the written recipe.

European foods were introduced at the earliest point of contact in the 18th century. The potato, for example, was first introduced to New Zealand by de Surville, a French explorer, in 1769 and later that same year Cook gave “two handfuls of potatoes to a chief [Taniwha] (Thomson 1859: 158) in Mercury Bay” (Leach 1984: 98). The introduction of this tuber along with the many other introduced foods brought about a significant change in the traditional economy of New Zealand (Fitzpatrick 2004: 16). While traditional modes of food distribution such as hakari and kai-hau-kai were still practised throughout the country, direct trade with Europeans became more common. Furthermore, the trading between Māori and Europeans meant a countrywide dispersal of European material culture, especially the iron cooking pot and consequently the method of boiling became dominant among other various cooking techniques.

As European foods became more readily available, and the knowledge associated with their processing was more widely known, some foods (especially foods that had made up

---

50 Lady Martin (1869) He pukapuka Whakaatu tikanga mo nga rongoa mo nga kai.
51 While boiling was a technique employed by pre-historic Māori, it was generally used for specific dishes; however, with the advent of the iron cooking pot, it was now being used for a number of foods and dishes.
the carbohydrate component of a Maori diet, such as *tī kōuka* and *aruhe*) were slowly phased out. Nevertheless, the traditional foods and methods mentioned in Chapter 3 were still utilised. Swainson (1859: 22) notes that although Waikato Māori were “abundantly supplied with pigs” they did not utilize them and favoured traditional foods:

> their diet being chiefly vegetables and fish. Beans and potatoes are largely cultivated by them. Fern-root was their great staple; Indian corn, especially after having been soaked till it has reached a state of pungent putrefaction, is enjoyed by them with the keenest relish. Eels, cockles, snapper, and the mango, or small shark, are the fish of which they consume the greatest quantity. (*ibid*)

There is also evidence that Māori material culture was still being used in conjunction with European utensils. Shore-based whaling stations in the Murihiku and Rakiura region tended to be a gathering place for local Māori as well, for the benefit of trade and to increase the *mana* of the *hapū* or *iwi*. Here, artefacts of both European and Māori material culture (including the *kohua* (tripod iron pots) and what appear to be vegetable food beaters) have been discovered (Coutts 1976: 298). This suggests that both European and Māori food preparation techniques were employed in 1829 when the first station was established in Preservation Inlet and for the following three decades (*ibid*).

Furthermore during this period of incorporation it appears that the culturally transmitted rules associated with the pre-European culinary tradition, such as *tapu*, were still evident.

### 4.1 The Potato

Māori acceptance of potato into their diet is illustrated by the speed with which it was made a staple. Fitzpatrick (2004) says that Māori hold the record for the most rapid adoption of the potato as a food staple outside the Americas...what took centuries in the introduction of the potato into Europe seems to have taken only decades in New Zealand. (*ibid*: 16-17)
This “rapid adoption” of the potato does not necessarily imply that it was incorporated into a Māori diet with the same vigour. He attributes this to Māori having a wealth of experience in cultivating similar tubers, coupled with nationwide availability, unlike the kāmera (ibid). Similarly, Helen Leach argues that

for cross cultural transfer and adoption of crop plants to take place the new cultigens would have to be readily classified as a form of existing crop, and the cultivation methods for that crop would need to be similar to traditional methods. (Leach 1983: 44-45)

Accordingly, the adoption of the potato was unhindered, due to its morphological and agronomic resemblance to the kāmera. A chief (Teiratu) in the South Island was shown the value of the potato by Cook in 1773, where it was made apparent that the potato was a readily classifiable crop, as Forster explains:

[Cook] conducted Teiratu thither, and showed him every plant in [the garden], especially the potatoes. He expressed a great liking to the last, and seemed to know them very well, evidently because of a similar root, the Virginian or sweet potato, is planted in some parts of the North Island, from whence he came. The captain parted from him after obtaining the promise that he would not destroy his plantations, but leave everything to grow up and propagate. (Best 1925: 150)

Additionally, in the South Island where cultivation of the kāmera was limited, the potato became the most readily adopted food. By 1810, the potato was flourishing along the shores of Foveaux Strait (Leach 1984: 99) and in 1813 in the major sealing zone in Bluff, there were “large Māori potato plantations” being reported for export (Biggs 1990: 16). Further evidence of the significance of the potato in the South Island is illustrated in the name given to it – te aruhe para (the boat fern root) (Dacker 1994: 8). Because fern root was seen as one of the most important foods of pre-European Māori, the potato, having been bestowed with this name, was seen as the “portion that can never be withdrawn”52.

The potato was eaten so abundantly throughout New Zealand that in the 1870’s New Zealand was importing a large number of potatoes from elsewhere. In September of 1874 one vessel alone imported “no less than 2,117 bags [of potatoes]” and there was concern

52 Literal translation of the whakatauki referring to aruhe, “Te tūtanga tē unuhia” (Mead 2001: 2473).
of a ‘potato famine’ occurring here as it did in Ireland (Te Waka Māori o Niu Tirani 1874: 261).

The introduction of the potato is said to have brought “the most essential benefit to the island” (Darwin1890: 308), not only for its reliability as a food source, but its significance as a trading commodity. Potatoes were traded, at first for smaller iron goods such as nails which were fashioned into fishing hooks and the like, and later they were included in the purchase by Māori of muskets and other larger items (Fitzpatrick 2004: 158). For example, in 1820, the ‘cost’ of one musket was 15 pigs and 200 baskets of potatoes (ibid: Table 2). Furthermore, the potato’s influence as a trading item for muskets coupled with its availability, meant that Māori were able to sustain “long-distance military campaigns” that had been previously unfeasible (ibid). Consequently, the potato was bestowed with much mana, and Belich (1996: 158-9) even comments that the “Potato Wars” would have been a more applicable title instead of the infamous “Musket Wars”.

Because of its similarity to kūméra the potato was prepared and cooked in the same manner; it was either steamed in the hangi with puwha, or roasted on the embers (Thomson 1859: 158; Angas: 1847 II: 131). It was eaten with a kinaki thus emphasising its status as kai among Māori. For example Taylor (1855: 166) comments that “I have frequently seen natives eating their potatoes with putrid train oil53, plentifully poured over them”. He also mentions it on a second occasion, where a chief was “eating potatoes, and squeezing a large lump of blubber over them as a relish” (ibid: 318). There is also an elaborate dish using potatoes described by Yate:

The stem of the...Tawara [sic]54, scraped and beat to a pulp; a few peaches and onions, chopped with a hatchet; a few cooked potatoes and kumera (the fruit of the Kohutuhutu, Fuchsia excorticata); the brains of a pig; a little lard or train-oil; the juice of the Tupakihi (Coriaria sarmentosa)55, a berry similar in taste to that of the elder, whose leaves, branches and seed, are highly poisonous; and a little sugar, if they possess it; --these, all mixed together, are pressed to a pulp with the hands, which are often introduced

53 Train oil is seal or whale oil (Su'a 1987: 108)
54 Tawhara
55 Tutu
into the mouth of the cook, who in this way manages to satisfy his own appetite, in tasting his dish before it is served up. (Yate 1835: 111)

This dish is classed as a pudding by Su'a (1987: 108) due to its homogenous consistency and the use of a base and lubricant; she states “this dish presents a case for continued taste, flavour and textural preference as revealed throughout the rest of Polynesia” (ibid: 109). Because puddings are perceived as being a luxury dish imbued with much mana (Leach 2003: 454), one can conclude that this dish would have acquired the same status as those original dishes of Polynesia. This dish would have therefore been reserved for special occasions such as tangi or for special visitors.

Potatoes also received the same treatment given to karaka, being steeped in water for a length of time and then either eaten as a gruel or made into cakes. This dish was known as māhi (Thomson 1859: 158), kōtero, pōruru or ngaio (Yen 1959: 326) and was served to both Māori and Pākehā alike. Angas’ description of both the gruel and cakes exhibits the similarities to kao, as kao was often steeped in water and then roasted on the embers if being fashioned into cakes.

They first offered me some gruel, which looked black and filthy; and doubtless was so, being made of putrid potatoes, rotted under water for some weeks. This they gave to my lads, together with some cakes of the same nauseous materials, which were baked in the ashes, and quite black. (Angas 1847 II: 131)

Likewise, the introduced turnips were also dried and preserved in the same manner as the young kūmera tubers to make a dish similar to kao (Leach 1983: 101).

4.2 Maize

The earliest recorded introduction of maize or kaanga (Zea mays) was in 1772 by Marion du Fresne (Yen 1959: 319). The largest concentration of cultivation was in those areas north of the 40° S latitude mark such as Northland, Hawkes Bay, Poverty Bay, and the Bay of Plenty (ibid).

56 Normally māhi meaning to ferment or putrefy (Williams 2002: 163). Kōtero was the term applied in the central part of the North Island while pōruru and ngaio was typically used in the far north (Yen 1959: 326).
Because Māori were unfamiliar with the European processes of grinding the corn into ‘flour’, Māori adapted their own traditional processes to create an ingenious dish known as *kanga wai*[^57] (Earle 1832: 134). Leach (1983) explains that when incorporating new foods, the knowledge regarding the processes was often “irrelevant” due to a lack of the required material culture – i.e. milling equipment (*ibid* : 144). Therefore Māori had “to classify the new plants as akin to an existing cultigen and apply the relevant…culinary techniques” (*ibid*):

> If the new item can be prepared and cooked using traditional methods and technology, its adoption will be relatively free of resistance, provided of course that it tastes good to the recipients. (Leach 1983: 144)

In the case of maize, it was treated in the same manner as karaka and other berries which required a lengthy steeping process. The following steps for treating maize are taken from Yen (1959: 325-326):

1. Mature whole cobs are placed un-husked in a jute sack, weighted down with rocks and fully submerged in water[^58].
2. The corn is left submerged for three months, or until the corn is soft[^59].
3. The kernels are scraped off the cob, and minced or pulverized.
4. The minced corn is then mixed with water and boiled[^60] to form a sort of gruel.
5. The resultant dish is mixed with milk, sugar or cream as with porridge, some add salt.

Alternatively maize could be prepared into cakes via the above method. The corn was stripped of the leaves and the kernels were scraped with a shell into a basket. The kernels were then reduced to a rough meal and shaped into cakes and placed in a *kete*. This dish which was either boiled or baked was known as *kānga warū*[^61]. In some treatments the maize was steeped for some weeks in water before they were made into cakes (Angas I

[^57]: Or *kānga pirau* (Williams 2007), *kaanga kopiro* (Leach 2006), *kaanga piro* (Williams 2002: 284)  
[^58]: Both running water and stagnant pools are used  
[^59]: The leaves of the *mange mange* (*Lygodium articulatum*) were often placed around the sack to prevent it from rotting.  
[^60]: Before the cooking pot became prevalent, the kernels were boiled in the traditional *kumete*, or were fashioned into cakes and baked in the earth oven (Earle 1832: 134).  
[^61]: *Warū* meaning ‘to scrape’ (Williams 2002: 480).
The *kete* was then put into the *hangi* and steamed (Elder 1932: 488; Angas 1847: 29). Marsden says that the elderly were required to steep it in water due to its hardness before they ate it (Elder 1932: 488). However because karaka could also be steeped at the final stages it was probably a remnant of this tradition. With the advent of the pot the putrefied maize was mixed with water and boiled over the fire in a *kohue* or large pan (Angas 1847: 29).

### 4.3 Wheat

The adoption of potatoes and corn was a relatively easy process; wheat, on the other hand, faced resistance by Māori and therefore took a greater amount of time to be universally consumed (Leach 1983: 145-146). As for maize, the technology for milling wheat into flour was not available at first, and was not common until the second half of the 19th Century (Hargreaves 1961:228).

It appears that several crops, especially wheat, were preferably grown for trade rather than consumption. By the 1850's Māori were producing a large amount of wheat and flour to sell to settlers, especially in the Auckland district, which was considered the 'chief seat of native trade' (Hursthouse 1857: 179). For example in 1853, 442 waka over a three month period brought 15 bags and ½ a tonne of wheat plus 10 ½ tonnes of flour among other items – a total value of £4000 worth of produce (*ibid*).

Unlike maize, Māori did not readily impose their own set of culinary techniques in the processing of wheat to an edible state. This is most likely because wheat did not bear any resemblance to a crop already cultivated in Aotearoa. Māori did not grow nor eat any kind of grass crop prior to the arrival of Europeans. Therefore when de Surville gave wheat to Māori in Doubtless Bay in 1769, and tried to explain, via crude hand signals, how to “harvest it, crush it to make flour of it, turn this flour into a paste, and cook it to get bread” (McNab 1914: 343), it is of no surprise that Māori did not eagerly adopt it. It wasn’t until Māori began travelling to Europe and Australia that the true value of wheat was understood. Ruatara, a chief, who had observed and learnt how to make bread and biscuit on his travels to Australia, endeavoured to impart this knowledge on to
neighbouring chiefs when he returned to New Zealand (Nicholas 1817 II: 389). It however was badly received, and its foreignness becomes apparent in the following abstract from Marsden:

[Ruatara] gave a portion of wheat to six chiefs and also to some of his own common men, and directed them all how to sow it, reserving some for himself and his uncle Shunghi... All the persons to whom Duatera62[sic] had given the seed-wheat put it into the ground and it grew well; but before it was well ripe many of them grew impatient for the produce, and as they expected to find the grain at the roots of the stems, similar to their potatoes, they examined the roots, and finding there was no wheat under the ground, they pulled it all up and burnt it. (Nicholas 1817 II: 389)

Eventually Māori did learn the art of cultivating and processing wheat, but it was not considered an economic crop until flour mills and cooking pots became widespread (Leach 1984: 102). However there were isolated incidences of Māori preparing wheat into bread. Marsden recorded the initial cooking of wheat flour into unleavened bread by Ruatara in 1815:

He quickly set to work and ground some wheat in the presence of his countrymen, who danced and shouted for joy at seeing the flour. He told me that he made a cake, baked it in a frying-pan, and gave it to the people to eat, which fully satisfied them of the truth of what he had repeatedly told them—namely, that “wheat would make bread. (Elder 1932: 67)

Shortly afterwards wheat was grown in Northland plantations, as the chiefs there had “begged some more wheat which they received and sowed (ibid: 69) and in 1815 Marsden saw some growing “exceedingly strong and fine” (ibid). In spite of this, wheat was still not cultivated widely until after 1832 (Leach 1983: 102).

Although traditional Māori culinary techniques were not imposed upon wheat per se; it does appear that the persistence of chiefly Polynesian puddings in Aotearoa may have influenced the early processing of wheat flour. This coupled with the influence of the

62 Correct spelling is Ruatara.
Pākehā stirabout dishes\(^{63}\) led to the creation of a pudding like mixture being processed by Māori known as *kororori* (Leach 2007: 62).

*Kororori* were reserved for Chiefs and or visitors on special occasions (Martin 1884: 38) as was in accordance to the ancient practice set out in the Pacific (Su’a 1987). Māori *kororori* composed of boiled flour and water and sometimes sugar was added (Polack II 1838: 64). Not only did Māori make these dishes themselves (*ibid*)\(^{64}\), but their requests were made to Europeans for this dish, often in exchange for fresh produce. Williams notes that “Some of our friends expressed a wish for some stirabout (boiled flour and water), and as the boys had caught a great quantity of fish, we did not hesitate to comply with their request” (Carleton 1874: 113).

European processed carbohydrates were very palatable to Māori due to the complete removal of fibre. The traditional method of pounding of the *aruhe* sought to remove all traces of fibre to create a consistency not unlike flour. Thus, when the technology was available to process wheat into flour it was adopted with vigour. This was illustrated by Leach (2007: 65) who says that Māori desire for flour based products was so fervent that they would consume these products even when they were deemed not fit for consumption by Europeans.

If there was no mill available to produce flour, Māori would often eat the wheat raw (Coleman 1865: 76) or boil the wheat grains in lye, which detaches the husk and bran. It was said to have the appearance of “superior rice, and makes a good and nutritious food” (*ibid*: 329).

Later, once European material culture became widespread, and Māori women were employed in the kitchens of missionaries, Māori learnt the art of processing the flour to create bread (Leach 2007:63).

---

\(^{63}\) Also known as hasty puddings.  
\(^{64}\) Flour was supplied to Māori by Pākehā — ‘seconds’ flour was supplied at ¼ pound per meal, this is the equivalent to three meals per day (Coleman 1865: 114).
4.4 Pigs

The introduction of pigs to Māori society was accepted enthusiastically, for it allowed for a greater selection of meat in their diet, especially after the extinction of the native kuri (dog). Pigs were prepared by being steamed whole in the hangi:

> After feasting, dancing, and conversing all day, in the evening, before they retired to rest, the cooks heated their ovens in the ground in which they put pork, potatoes, and greens, all in heaps, in large quantities sufficient for 200 or 300 persons, and covered them up, leaving them till morning to roast. (Elder 1932: 193)

Pork was widely eaten among both Māori and Pākehā, the latter relying on Māori for their sources of this meat (Martin 1884: 10). Due to its prolificacy as a food source it was treated in a number of ways to ensure that it did not “pall upon the appetite” (Campbell 1881: 152). The pigs were reared in a ‘free-range’ fashion, subsisting on fern root and maize scattered among the settlements which meant that the flesh was not “highly flavoured” (ibid).

The pig was often roasted whole over a fire, and the fat was procured from it to be used in preservation of other foods (Taylor 1855: 166). Taylor also mentions that the pool of melted fat, would be drunk “the same as water” (ibid). The use of fat as a kinaki has been mentioned elsewhere in this thesis, and the fat from the pig was probably used in the same fashion. Likewise, fat and brains were used as a lubricant in the creation of Polynesian puddings (Yate 1835: 111).

Campbell (1881) makes an interesting comment regarding “the proverbial ‘pork and potatoes’” prepared for him by a Māori woman in approximately 1840. While he does not make mention of the preparation of this dish, he remarks that it was served with a “quantum” of other vegetables, including; cobs of maize, kumera and taro (ibid: 152). It is quite likely that this dish was boiled as Campbell made this remark jokingly to his Māori cook:
Breakfast is ready, is it? And so am I, and won't I just walk into it, that's all; you see if I don't; hope the goashore\textsuperscript{65} is full to the top, for I think I'll play a good figure in seeing to the bottom of it. (ibid: 151)

It thus seems highly probable that the array of vegetables and pork was filled to the top and boiled together in the same pot. If so this is the first recorded mention of the modern ‘boil up’\textsuperscript{66} being cooked and eaten.

4.5 Material Culture

The use of pots was first observed by Māori onboard European ships, as the use of large boilers was commonplace there (Leach 2007: 57-60). Once these early explorers explored terra firma however, Māori would have been exposed to the three legged iron pots known as goashores or kohua as well as other utensil and equipment such as pans.

There is much debate regarding the naming of these vessels, and the argument centres on whether ‘goashore’ is a European transliteration of ‘kohua’, or whether ‘kohua’ is a Maori transliteration of the maritime term ‘goashore’. Leach (2007: 56-57) concludes that the former is correct. There was a change in focus from the Proto-Polynesian cognate of *kofu\textsuperscript{67}, where the focus was on the leaf-wrapped food items, to the Māori term kohua where the meaning was shifted to the oven in which the food was placed (ibid).

Helen Leach (2007) believes that the kohua aided in the adoption of European cooking methods, as Māori were still able to cook outside or in a kauta (cooking shed) which took into account tikaka Māori. While the kohua was slowly taking over the role of the small hangi or umu and fires, it was unable to cater for large groups – for this the hāngi was still the preferred method.

The trading and subsequent use of pots was not fashionable among Māori until the 1830’s (Leach 2007: 12). This coincides with the appearance of kanga wai as well as the

\textsuperscript{65} Goashore is the name of the tri-legged pot
\textsuperscript{66} Excluding the recipe for soup in Lady Martin’s He pukapuka whakaatu tikanga me nga rongoa me nga kai (1869). However, neither of these dishes are labeled as boil-up.
\textsuperscript{67} Meaning – “wrap up; covering; parcel (of cooked food or food ready to be cooked” (Leach 2006: 57)
conclusion of the musket wars. Māori during this period were engaging in systematic trading with Europeans as has been discussed elsewhere and the pot became a prominent item in trading agreements especially for land. For example the Church Missionary Society purchased land at both Waimate and Kaitaia, where a total of 91 pots were included in the payment to Māori (ibid).

The popularity of the kohua for cooking European foods is evident (Polack 1838, Nicholas 1817, Angus 1847 and Colenso 1880) but there was also noticeable mention of traditional foods being cooked in the kohua, for example Polack says:

> When a shark is taken to the southward, the liver is taken out, cut up into pieces, and boiled in a small iron pot. The fat is relished exceedingly. At present, iron trypots of small size are much in vogue; and the natives in the vicinity of European settlements make use of our culinary utensils, such as the frying-pan and similar useful articles. (Polack 1838: 399-400)

Colenso also mentions that tī roots, which normally required a tremendous amount of labour and time to prepare in the traditional hāngi, were cooked in the kohua (Colenso 1880: 28).

As Māori were already proficient in the art of boiling – albeit in rudimentary containers – it meant that the transition to cooking both Māori and European foods in European vessels was straightforward. Also, the kohua aided in the slow adoption, not only of European cooking methods, but also in the eventual transfer from the outdoor ‘kitchen’ to the Western kitchen (Leach 2007: 63).

Furthermore the kohua was seen by Māori as an extension of the umu, having been identified as a ‘native oven’. This is significant in terms of the origins of the boil-up. Like hāngi, the boil-up is a “one-pot meal” (Leach 2007: 66), where all foods are cooked within the same ‘oven’ as it were. The transfer of this method from hāngi to kohua shows how European material culture can be incorporated to emulate traditional cookery methods.
4.6 Tikaka Māori

Many features of European lifestyle were not so easily acquired. The rejection of European ‘table etiquette’ was common, due to the overarching spiritual values imbued within Māori conscious and subconscious. These values are rooted firmly in *whakapapa* and governed by *tapu* among other restriction based concepts such as *rahui*. The emphasis on common descent found in *whakapapa* ensured that the relationships between the spiritual and physical worlds were maintained as well as creating an infrastructure for the containment of knowledge.

This knowledge base was “reflected in the very fabric of society” (Williams 2003: 216) as Nicholas noted in 1817:

> It appears that the institution of *tapu* and *rahui* became principal mechanisms of social order throughout the country... *tapu* not only regulates their institutions, but likewise their daily labours, and there is scarcely a single act they perform, with which this momentous dissyllable does not interfere. (Nicholas 1817: 309)

He makes further mention of this during a shipboard meal (1817 I :286) where a chief used a spoon to take rice from his plate to his hand, and then convey it to his mouth with his fingers “scrupulously abstaining from touching with his lips the vessels out of which he ate and drank”(*ibidi*). This is consistent with *tikaka* Māori, where the head of a chief is very *tapu*; therefore “water was poured from a container, or from a stream, directly into the hands, and scooped or funneled into the mouth. The drinker’s lips did not touch the container” (Health Services Research Centre 1999: 10).

This is further exemplified by Maning some 50 years later where he describes that if a vessel was to come into contact with a chief’s mouth it could not be re-used — “even valuable glasses or teacups” were broken (Maning 1863:126). This would often cause confusion and hostility between the Pākehā host and his Māori guest as illustrated by Maning:

> A native whose personal *tapu* was perhaps of the strongest ... would drink the water [offered by a Pakeha] and then gravely and quietly break the cup to pieces... The new pakeha would immediately fly into a passion, to the
great astonishment of the native, who considered, as a matter of course, that the cup or glass was, in the estimation of the pakeha, a very worthless article, or he would not have given it into his hand and allowed him to put it to his head, the part most strongly infected by the tapu. (ibid: 114-115)

4.7 The European Response

It is essential to examine the European response to the adoption of European foods technologies and processes by Māori, because according to Kalcik (1984:) and Fitzgerald (1986) foods that are deemed as ‘valuable’ by the dominant culture will be adopted by the colonized group. This is evident throughout this chapter; Māori adopted the ‘valuable’ potatoes, wheat, maize, pigs and various utensils. Yet what is significant here is that, Māori then utilised these foods in a Māori way. Therefore the European response to these ‘new’ dishes as well as traditional foods would have influenced the preservation and loss of certain foods.

Māori were themselves pro-active in gaining knowledge and skills from Pākehā as witnessed by this letter written by a group of Waikato Māori to the Māori Messenger:

Our hearts have been set upon searching out some of the customs of the Europeans, and we have been engaged in this until the present time; and we intend to commence this year to follow the customs of the Europeans, as we think we have attained to some knowledge of these customs... We are now endeavouring to follow the advice given to us: we have purchased cattle and sheep, and are now turning our attention to farming. Our lands, which were formerly allowed to run to waste, we have now divided into portions... These have been marked off as runs for cattle and sheep, and for growing wheat, potatoes, oats, clover, grass, &c, for disposal to the Europeans, and also for food for our horses. (Swainson 1859: 22)

This letter would seem to be evidence that Māori had a choice in the lifestyle that they would lead; however the act of colonization itself, by its very nature makes the Indigenous ways of life ‘exotic’ and ‘different’. It perpetuates the notion that the Western way of being, is not only the right way of being, but the only way. Colonisation therefore
served a purpose in transforming Māori from their 'common' or 'normal' status to the status of the 'Other'. Said (1995) describes this process with regards to the Orient, where the coloniser defines and expresses themselves in relation to the 'Other'. In other words, if Māori are savage, Europeans are civilized and if Māori are eating bad food, then Europeans are eating good food. Furthermore the evangelical movement of the time; fronted by the missionaries, whose aim was to convert Māori to Christianity in the hope of reversing the effects of fatal impact – or at the very least 'soften the pillow for the dying race' compounded this notion. Therefore, the Maori way of being, and therefore eating was being shaped by the Western notion of what is correct.

The European response to the Māori adoption of their foods thus comes as no surprise; it was varied – ranging from satisfaction at their implementation through to dissent at Māori innovations.

With the large influx of Europeans, who had come to New Zealand for the lucrative whaling and sealing industries in the South, and the timber in the North there was a greater reliance upon Māori for their survival. Not only did Māori have the knowledge about the Indigenous food sources, but they were also becoming increasingly aware of European crops, and realized that material goods such as muskets, pots and even ships could be acquired by trading these crops with their European neighbours.

The attitudes of Māori during this period led to a greater cohesiveness between Māori and Pākehā, with the mutual exchange of goods, including food, utensils and knowledge. The occurrence of trade helped to unite the two races (Hursthouse 1857: 178), due to the symbiotic nature of the times. Thus Māori could see the implications of obtaining European cultivations and endeavoured to adopt a European style of living.

Up until the 1860's Māori were generally still resistant to the idea of producing bread for their own consumption. The production of leavened bread was generally reserved for trade, and European sought to shift this focus, to one of consumption. Therefore recipes

68 The original meaning of Māori was common or ‘normal’.
began appearing in the Māori newspapers. Three recipes for leaven were found in two different newspapers in 1861 (Anon in *Te Manuhiri Tuarangi* 1861: 15; Anon in *Te Manuhiri Tuarangi* 1861:16; Anon in *Te Haewata* 1861: 4). Two of these recipes were in the same newspaper just two months apart, and the third was in a different newspaper but in the same year. Hursthouse (1857) emphasises their appearance in newspapers as he stated that it would be better for Māori to “raise and eat these things, themselves, rather than to raise and sell them to the white man” (*ibid*: 186).

What is also apparent throughout the media is that there were some foods that were deemed acceptable by Europeans, and others that were not. Paterson (2004) discusses the role of the newspapers in mitigating the high mortality rate among Māori. Māori were told that they needed to change their ‘bad food’ to ‘good food’. Potatoes, bread (made from both wheat flour and maize flour) and milk were considered good foods, especially for mothers who were either pregnant or nursing (*Te Manuhiri Tuarangi Maori Intelligencer* 1861: 11). Māori were advised that there were “only two kinds of food necessary for children” which were “flour, baked or made into bread, and milk...Flour baked in a pot till dry is better for babies than bread” (*Te Karere Maori* 1859: 1-2).

Salt was also considered a good food and Māori were told that it should be eaten at every meal:

>The Pakeha mixes salt with all his food: but as for the Maori, he uses no salt at all, and this perhaps is the cause of some of those diseases which afflict both parents and children. Hence I advise the mother to take salt with her potatoes, as also with pork, and fish, and flour: let it all be eaten with salt. (Anon in *Te Manuhiri Tuarangi* 1861: 11)

While potatoes, bread and salt were considered ‘good food’, *kanga wai* and other traditional foods that were fermented were considered ‘bad food’. “Putrid corn also, and spirituous liquors, must be given up entirely, together with all kinds of putrid food, they must be avoided” (*ibid*). This newspaper also stated that because many of the traditional Māori foods had been removed from their diet Māori were converting to these bad foods (*ibid*). This removal of traditional foods is mainly attributed to the persistence of settlers
and missionaries like Rev. J. Morgan who according to Fenton (1859: 536) displaced indigenous foods with “energetic encouragement” in favour of European produce. Furthermore, there was great mana to be gained by obtaining the knowledge from a neighbouring Pākehā of how to grow wheat (Wakefield II 1845: 133).

However Europeans did not bargain on Māori creating their own dishes and the general consensus from early ethnographers and explorers regarding the preparation of kaanga wai was one of disdain and disgust, as most, when referring to it describe the pungent smell and the detrimental nutritive value in this dish. For example Angus states:

Fevers, too, are frequent, from the too abundant use of putrid corn; the natives steeping the ears of maize in water for several weeks, to render them soft, until they become perfectly rotten, and give forth a most offensive odour. (Angus 1847: 318)

Other descriptions liken the dish to “excrement” (Thomson 1859: 158), having an “exceedingly offensive” (Earle 1832: 134) smell, or having a “foetid odour as would disturb the complacency of any respectable quadraped, and cause intestinal embarrassment to any other biped than one of these islanders” (Polack I 1839: 401). Māori were themselves not oblivious to the smell, evidenced by the one of the names ascribed to it - kaanga piro. Nevertheless Māori ate it in great quantities and quite frequently (Thomson 1859: 158); they also believed maize to be “health-giving” and many Māori attributed their longevity in life to maize being cooked in this fashion (Yen 1959: 325). The advice set forth by Hursthouse was probably in response to this attitude of Māori, the idea being - if they must eat it, like the “silly drunkard” must drink, “they should take them only as occasional zests” (Hursthouse 1857: 186).

The early settlers absolutely abhorred this dish also, and have even attributed it to the the perceived demise of Māori. Baren Liebig in Fenton’s paper Observations on the State of the Aboriginal Maori Inhabitants of New Zealand asks the question:

Do facts exist, which prove that the state of the transformation or putrefaction of a substance is propagated likewise to any parts or constituents of the living body; that by contact with the putrefying body, a

---

69 Piro meaning putrid or stinking (Williams 2002: 284).
state is induced in those parts, like that in which the particles of the putrefying body themselves are? (Fenton 1859: 53)

According to Liebig "the question must be answered decidedly in the affirmative" (ibid). In other words those that come into contact with a putrefied substance somehow take up that state of putrefaction and are thus rendered putrid. Fenton's paper goes on to claim putrefied corn and the subsequent putrefied state of Māori was one of the main contributors to the failing health of Māori during this time period:

In order to discover what the natural causes of decrease have been and are, we should, on the supposition that the retrograde change in the progress of the population commenced about the year 1830, first inquire whether any marked change took place in the habits or food of the people at about that period. And it is remarkable that about that time the discovery of the art of manufacturing putrid corn by continued steeping in water was made. (ibid: 53)

We can surmise that Māori would have been well aware of the stigma associated with this dish, yet as Fenton's paper confirms, maize was still cooked and consumed throughout the nineteenth century. This however contradicts the theory put forward by Kalcik (1984) and Fitzgerald (1986), that so-called low status foods were dropped from the colonized group. The fact that maize challenges this theory is probably due to the antiquity surrounding its preparation. While maize itself was not ancient by any means, the processes which were employed in creating kanga wai were. Similarly the consumption of putrefied foods such as mango, koura wai also had a long history, thus creating a resistance to abandon kanga wai as a food source.

There was also opposition from Pākehā regarding the occasions of eating, and how they ate. Hursthouse (1857: 186) claims that three light meals a day were better than the two heavy meals that Māori traditionally consumed. Other commentators within the newspapers implied that the gathering of resources over a long period of time for hakari had permeated into the Māori business code with regards to trading. It was claimed that Māori would work for months to obtain enough produce to sell, but in the meantime were

---

70 Original emphasis.
71 And it is still cooked by some Māori to the present day: see chapter's five and six.
72 "Rotten" shark and crayfish.
said to be living on “wretched food that they may get two or three hundred pounds” (Anon in *Te Karere Maori* 1859: 4). This was seen as being detrimental to their health and contributing to the already depleting population.

Paterson (2004: 171) discusses how traditional feasting was looked upon as “a waste of God’s bounty” especially when *hui* were conducted to discuss the political ambivalence of the time. *Tangi* were especially frowned upon, it was thought that the resources put into the ceremony and feast could have been better spent on keeping the person alive and that “great is the waste of money over the dead” (Anon in *Te Manuhiri Tuarangi* 1861: 12). There were circumstance however where feasting and *manaakitanga* were appropriate; Paterson (2004: 171) explains that *hui* were looked upon more favourably if they were organised to discuss pro-government issues, such as the meeting set up by Hōiana Te Puni in Pītonge to support the government in the abolishment of the Königitanga. Similarly he remarks that Māori were still advised to feed travellers as Pākehā had become accustomed with Māori hospitality – and this aspect of Māoridom did not want to be discouraged (*ibid*).

Hursthouse (1857) decided that Māori needed a “Book of Life” which would lead them to redemption and a more righteous (*vis à vis* Western) way of life. The aim of Hursthouse (1857: 185-187) was to establish a native affairs commission, who would hold an essay competition, where the prize winner would win £100. The essay would include four sections:

1. Explain the fact that the Māori race is decreasing.
2. Point out the reasons for the decrease.
3. Explain that their traditional ways are wrong – including clothing, housing and diet.
4. Inform Māori that Europeans were at one time savage also, but are now enlightened (*ibid*).
The two winning essays would then be printed "in the form of a neat dozen-page book" to be distributed to every village in the North Island for the Māori to "read and discuss" and for the eventual 'digestion' of its content (ibid: 187).

While a 'book of life' was not published and distributed, there were other means in which Pākehā could put forward these messages, especially those pertaining to educating Māori on eating the 'right' foods and that was through the publication of recipe books.
5.0 Māori Cookbooks

In the previous chapter, both the Māori and European responses to the introduction of European foods and methods were outlined. It was shown that Māori adopted several European foods and cooking methods and that some of these adoptions (like fermented corn) were not looked on favourably by Pākehā. Furthermore, it was seen that Pākehā believed it was their duty to improve the diet of Māori. The first part of this chapter will discuss one of these remedies, which came in the form of the first published cookbook in New Zealand written by Lady Martin (1869). The second part of this chapter will be an examination of the historical contexts in which the range of explicitly Māori cookery books of the 1970’s to 1990’s were published. The impact the Māori renaissance had on their publication will be assessed, and consequently what impact these cookbooks had on the transmission of Māori recipes. Lastly, the recipes within the cookbooks are analysed to show what affect the aforementioned adopted European foods and technologies have had on a Māori culinary tradition.

5.1 The First Cookbook

The first cookbook to be published in New Zealand was written by Lady Mary Ann Martin in 1869 and was entitled He pukapuka whakaatu tikanga mo nga rongoa mo nga kai (A book explaining how to make medicine and foods). It was a collection of recipes, for both medicines and a range of European-style foods. Five non-medicinal recipes were included, and these were all designed to improve the quality of life for Māori, both nutritionally and economically. These recipes are Bacon, Sugar Beer, Rewena and Butter (Martin 1869:19- 23).

Lady Martin was born on the 5th of July 1817 to a very religious family and this evangelical upbringing would lay the foundations for her relationship with Māori in New Zealand. Furthermore Lady Martin and her husband (Sir William Martin) would be

---

73 Māori cookbooks have been defined as those cookbooks which cater to a predominantly Māori audience.
74 The medicinal recipes featured in He pukapuka whakaatu tikanga mo nga rongoa mo nga kai will not be examined in this thesis.
75 While there are five main recipes, a sixth recipe for soup is also given in the preface and followed up in the bacon recipe (Martin 1869: 19-20) See appendix.
heavily influenced by Bishop Selwyn, who took a sympathetic stance towards the Māori plight (Barton 2007). This coupled with the Martins’ determination to civilise Māori through Christianity would be the basis for the recipe book.

Even before Lady Martin arrived in New Zealand, her impression of the country and its inhabitants and the role that she was to play was firmly etched in her mind. She stated:

> One thing, however, had been clearly impressed on my mind by my husband, the first Chief Justice, who had sailed nine months before, namely, that the aborigines of our new country were to be cared for and worked for, and this lesson was by example as well as by precept daily brought before all of us on board by Bishop Selwyn. (Martin 1884:1)

This attitude of caring for and working for Māori, was exercised throughout the Martins’ lives. So much so, that they were known as “philo-Maoris” (Dalziel 1992: 90) and, Sir William Martin’s judicial status often came into question because of the rigour with which he defended Māori rights (Barton 2007).

Lady Martin herself took a very keen interest in Māori affairs, especially those relating to Māori well-being in general. Her journal entries, which were published after her death as a book entitled *Our Maoris* (1844), often described the living conditions of Māori, and she took a keen interest in the nutritional state of Māori. For example she stated:

> The best of their summer crops had been sold to the English, and often the poor people were compelled to eat the seed potatoes on which their next year’s supply of food depended. When things were at the worst, the women used to go out to dig up the root of the edible fern. This was boiled and pounded till all the stringy fibres could be removed, and then baked into thin cakes. The taste was not unpleasant, but it was a very indigestible food, and was the cause of much suffering. So also was their rotten corn, which was always prepared in the autumn for winter consumption. The Indian corn was laid in a pit (carefully built round with stones), well soaked with water and covered over; when opened a month or two later, the corn was all in a pulp and sour through fermentation. (Martin 1844: 83)

Like most commentators during this period, Lady Martin showed dissatisfaction and distaste over the consumption of ‘rotten corn’, as she concludes with “How disgusting!” (*ibid*). However, she is aware of her judgemental remarks and is quick to point out the
similarities between this dish and the 'sophisticated' palate of Europeans, with their “cheese in a decayed state, and...Sauerkraut” (ibid), indicating an appreciation for this dish, or that Europeans have equally “disgusting” foods!

It is also evident that Lady Martin recognised the importance of trade to Māori, and the fact that they would often be left with no relish to complement their now staple potato (ibid). Because of this ability to empathise with Māori, and to recognise the value that was placed upon trade, it is of no surprise that recipes within He pukapuka were specifically targeted at trade. Furthermore, Lady Martin also saw a need to supplement the Māori diet with kinaki as well as kai, and to ensure that there would be plenty of food left over once a transaction was completed.

In her recipe for bacon she states that “this work has two benefits to the Māori people. One is to sell the two sides to the Pākehā. There is a good price (for this bacon) in the towns. The other is for making soup” (Martin 1869: 19). Here she is clearly commenting on the benefits of pork for the purpose of trade, and how the ‘leftovers’ can be made into soup. “The ribs and the backbone, should be chopped up, spread with salt and boiled to make soup” (ibid).

Sir William and Lady Martin were both advocates of educating Māori. They were both involved in a number of boarding schools created for Māori children both informally and formally (Sir William was appointed official inspector of native schools (Barton 2007). Their keen interest in the schools, especially St. Stephen’s, where they were in charge of the school for several months in 1860 (Martin 1844: 150), was one that reflects their ideologies regarding the Māori people. Her domestic influence on the women there was evident, as she states “Soup-making, too, was a daily harass. Most of the women knew as little as our poor about cooking” (ibid: 151) yet by 1869 she notes that “the people at St Stephen’s know how to make soup” (Martin 1869: 18).

76 This has been translated from the original Māori text for the ease of the reader. For the full recipe in te reo and its translation see Appendix 1.
The Martins believed in a sort of ‘by Pākehā for Māori to Māori’ ethos. This was exemplified in the range of schooling institutions where their aim was to assimilate a number of Māori children into the Pākehā culture and in turn, have them take that knowledge back to their own kainga (villages). According to Jenkins and Morris-Matthews (1998: 88) “it was hoped that with the teaching of new ideas, worshipping God and practising Pakeha ways, that the kainga would be more quickly transformed, paving the way for assimilation of Maori into Pakeha society”. Lady Martin herself stated that “this faithful band was being trained to go forth and help teach their people” (Martin 1844: 151).

The girls were educated in the manner of “English middle-class Victorian girls” (Jenkins and Morris-Matthews 1998: 89). This included daily lessons, as well as domestic practical instruction. They were taught “(1) plain cooking and general household management; (2) cutting out and making up garments for personal wear; (3) music, and voice culture elocution or singing; (4) any other subject in art or science...” (ibid: 90). There was an obvious tendency towards the domestic as opposed to the academic. Clearly what was deemed as valuable knowledge for young Māori women at that time was to have the skills to run “Pakeha-style homes” (ibid: 90).

There are parallels between the recipes written by Lady Martin and the aim of domestication in the boarding schools. Both were trying to establish ‘brown Pākehā women’ who would in turn create ‘brown Pākehā communities’. For example, when giving directions on how to make soup Lady Martin explains that “according to Pakeha, carrots, turnips and pumpkin are good in soup” and that it was “also a good thing for a Maori person to grow these vegetables in their garden; from these foods you will have an excellent soup” (Martin 1869: 18).

The type of recipes included in this cookbook also reflects Lady Martin’s aim in educating Māori women in basic domestic duties. Recipes such as those for bread and butter demonstrate a strong domestic emphasis. For example, in the recipe for making butter Martin says:
If the person does not like making butter they should milk cows and the milk should be used to feed babies, used in tea, used for rice, and for paraoa kororirori as a way of cooking it well. The milk should be boiled beforehand, and the flour should be stirred into a pannikin and dissolved with water and then pour it into the boiling milk, stir again; keep on a low flame least it is burnt. (Martin 1869: 23)

Here, Lady Martin is explaining how to make good paraoa kororirori, while at the same time giving several distinctively European uses for milk that include having it with tea, with rice and using it to feed babies.

This cookbook by Lady Martin was a product of her 'philo-Māori' attitude. The recipes within reflect her empathy towards Māori, as they not only include recipes deemed to be important by Pākehā, but she has also endeavoured to include aspects of a Māori worldview, such as trade.

### 5.2 The Māori Renaissance and Māori Cookbooks

Prior to 1975, Lady Martin's *He Pukapuka* was the only explicitly Māori cookbook. Then in the mid 1970's a string of Māori cookbooks emerged, the first of which was published by the Māori Women's Welfare League (MWWL) in 1975. The emergence of Māori cookbooks during this time period is reflective of the political and social revolution occurring within Māoridom.

Although important events occurred before 1975, this date is often employed to indicate the start of what is now known as the Māori Renaissance (Royal 2002: 77). The overall theme of this movement was a pursuit of self-determination or *mana* Māori and “the unlinking of Māori society and culture from the apparatus of the state and the placement of this culture upon a more sounder (its own) footing” (*ibid*). The earlier vision installed by Pākehā was one of assimilation where similarities between the two cultures were identified and promoted. The emphasis lay in a homogenous nation; one that was

---

77 This claim would be negated by the discovery of another cookbook, which, given their location within kitchens as opposed to libraries is a probable occurrence.
dominated by Pākehā doctrines. Therefore, in order to deconstruct this notion and for Māori to obtain autonomy it was necessary to highlight the differences between Pākehā and Māori. Furthermore, it was essential to re-construct Māori frameworks and ideologies to assert mana Māori and for New Zealand to be recognised as a heterogeneous nation.

During this time period there was an outpouring of energy and action that resulted in numerous “by Māori, for Māori” endeavours. The establishment of immersion education and the installation of the Waitangi Tribunal are just two examples in a long line of political and social reorganisations that occurred. While these events were taking place, a less publicised movement was occurring within Māori households and kitchens due to the advent of Māori cookbooks.

As stated previously, the earliest known Māori cookbook to be published since 1869 was Recipe Calendar 1975 (1975) by the MWWL. It is appropriate that this organisation be the proverbial vanguard in the transmission of Māori kai to Māori as it was their first President Dame Whina Cooper who led the famous land march of 1975. It is also important to note that the recipes were “By Māori, for Māori” as was the intention of the Māori Renaissance Movement.

Other Māori cookbooks were seemingly less political in nature, such as Glenfield College’s Maori Kai (1977), Fuller’s Māori Food and Cookery (1977), Riley’s Māori Vegetable Cooking (1988) and Paul’s Māori Cookbook (1996). However the aim of these cookbooks was the same: the transmission of Māori recipes by Māori for Māori, in order to advocate Māori autonomy. Spooner and Aranui (1992) develop this idea further through an iwitanga based concept as opposed to the others centred in Māoritanga, therefore transmitting a Kahungunu cooking culture to Kahungunu.

This process of transmission of Māori recipes may be perceived by some to be an “invention” of a Māori cuisine, as opposed to a reaffirmation of it. Hanson (1989) in his article ‘The Making of the Maori: Culture Invention and its Logic’ criticised the Māori Renaissance arguing that through the process of self-determination, Māori had
"distorted" the authentic and in turn "invented" contrasts to those aspects of Pākehā culture that were less attractive. He goes on to state that

the reality of traditional culture and history is so irredeemably shrouded behind multiple veils of distortion, some woven from imported fabric and others homespun, that no effort at objectivity could be sufficient to strip them away. But that would miss the distinctive feature of both examples: that the "distortions" have been accepted by Maoris as authentic to their heritage. (Hanson 1989: 897)

There might be some justification for Hanson's view if post-1975 Māori cuisine claimed to be original or authentic pre-Pākehā cookery without any evidence for continuity. But Māori cuisine of the later 20th century utilised 20th century technology and foodstuffs in Māori ways, which can be traced within a continuous and evolving tradition back to first contact with Europeans, and beyond.

The Māori Renaissance and the subsequent production of Māori cookbooks have therefore acted as a vehicle for the transmission of an already evolving culinary tradition.
5.3 Analysis of Māori Cookbooks

The recipes were first analysed by categorising the foods and methods based on their original genesis. Thus, Māori foods in the following graph (Figure 3.) are those of pre-European origin. European foods are all foods post 1769, such as potatoes and corn, even though when processed using particular methods they are deemed to be Māori dishes. Similarly European methods are those based in a European cuisine and Māori methods are those pre-Pākehā. For example, a dish such as the boil-up of pork and puha is in the category EF + TF + EM. That is, European food (Pork) + Māori Food (Puha) + European Method (boiling in a pot). Colonial dishes are generally breads, and their variations as these were dishes specifically taught to Māori by Pākehā.

Over half of the recipes (53.8% n=276) found in the six Māori cookbooks (excluding He Pukapuka) contained both European and traditional Māori foods and call for processing by non-traditional methods (TF+EF+EM). Recipes using the same combination of foods but processed using traditional methods, made up only 3.31% (TF+EF+TM n=17). Colonial style recipes are the second largest contributor to the cookbooks, with 75 recipes (14.6%). Recipes that use Māori foods only but process them using European methods make up 13.6% (n=40 EF+EM). There were also recipes that did not contain either Māori foods or traditional methods and these made up 7.8% of all recipes (n=40, EF+EM). Finally recipes that used both traditional foods and traditional methods were the second smallest contributor, making up only 6.8% of all the dishes (n=17, TF+EF+TM). In total, 398 of the recipes contained Māori foods, whereas 333 contained European foods. Fifty two recipes used traditional methods to prepare the dishes compared to the 386 dishes that were prepared using conventional European methods.
These figures show us that Māori cuisine has evolved from its traditional beginnings through the incorporation of European foods and methods into its dishes. The contrast seen between the use of traditional Māori methods and their European counterparts is most likely due to the fact that traditional methods of food preparation were time-consuming and required a great deal of man-power and these have thus been exchanged for the simpler European methods, usually aided by new technology. However, many of the recipes can be traced back to an ancient origin regardless of their ingredients or cooking methods. The Pre-European preparation methods outlined in Chapter 3.0 are prevalent throughout the Māori cookbooks and are discussed below.
The largest proportion of recipes are contemporary in origin (43% n=227). However, 57% of the recipes have a Māori origin, especially those using Māori preservation methods and the Polynesian Puddings. Colonial recipes make up 8% of the dish origins, and fermentation 5%. Umu cookery and the boil-up together make 7% (five and two percent respectively), and finally steamed food and raw food make up 2% of dish origins.

5.31 Colonial

Colonial recipes consist mainly of breads and their equivalents; this is because their origin lies in the colonial teachers, such as Lady Martin and the other numerous missionaries and settlers who sought to impart this knowledge. However, these recipes in spite of their European origin have become so entrenched in Māori cuisine that they are now considered “traditional” by many Māori and Pākeha today. As discussed in Chapter four, wheat and flour were rapidly adopted by Māori due to the texture, which Māori had been trying to produce with aruhe, raupo etc. Also, the rigour with which bread was promoted to Māori in the 19th Century by Pākehā, such as Lady Martin, has also led to its modern popularity.
What is interesting to note with the ‘Rewena Paraoa’ recipes is their endurance. Lady Martin’s recipe (Martin 1869: 22) is almost identical to those seen in Māori cookbooks published over one hundred years later. The chief differences are that the modern recipes no longer increase the proving speed of the yeast by adding the residual sugar from home-brewed sugar beer (ibid: 22), nor do they state that *taro* can be substituted for *potatoes* (ibid: 19). It can thus be assumed that both of these practices have become redundant among the majority of Māori cooks. This is further exemplified through the absence of any sugar beer or *taro* recipes within Māori cookbooks.

The omission of certain foods and practices is relatively common; there were some European techniques and foods that were not embraced by Māori, just as there were some traditional foods and techniques that were abandoned with the advent of a novel cuisine. One colonial practice that was retained by Māori was cooking in a camp-oven. Bread baked in a camp-oven was popular among Māori during colonial times, and this practice has continued through into the Māori cookbooks. One recipe in particular ‘Paraoa Ihigor’\(^79\) or ‘Yeast Bread’ (Mana in MWWL 1975: 15; Glenfield 1977: 14; Fuller 1978: 25-26; Paul 1996:12\(^80\)) is prominent within the range of Māori Cookbooks.

Conversely, several bread recipes have evolved from the standard *rewena* recipe. For example recipes for ‘Paroa Parai’ or ‘Fried Bread’ were also featured extensively throughout the Māori cookbooks (Maraea in MWWL 1975: 12; Glenfield 1977: 15; Fuller 1978: 27; Spooner and Aranui 1992: 26; Paul 1996: 13). This recipe uses *rewena* as a base, but develops it further by frying the dough in lard, rather than baking it.

The colonial recipes demonstrate that Māori were actively selecting which European foods and methods to adopt and or transform, and which traditional foods to eliminate.

---

\(^79\) The name “Ihigor” is probably a transliteration of “*Ahi kōhua*”, literally translated as “fire pot”. This seems likely as the camp ovens were placed directly onto the fire to cook, in the same manner as the *kōhua*. However in this recipe, the camp ovens are placed in the oven.

\(^80\) This recipe is called ‘Camp Oven Bread’ in *The Maori Cookbook* (Paul 1996: 12).
Moreover, it establishes that early appropriation of cooking methods and foods can result in the dishes becoming a part an integral part of contemporary Māori cuisine.

5.32 Preservation

Preservation of food was very important in pre-European times due to seasonal food availability, and requirements for long journeys and feasts, among many other reasons already outlined in chapter three. While many of these reasons are no longer relevant in contemporary society it is obvious from these recipes that this practice has continued. Moreover, this practice has in some circumstances been transplanted to European foods and incorporated European methods. The recipe for ‘Preserved Trout’ (Hiria in MWWL 1975: 37) or ‘Trout Preserved’ (Fuller 1978: 73) highlights this point:

Clean and wash trout, cut into pieces and pack into ½ litre (1 pt) preserving jars. Into each jar put 1 teaspoon common salt, 2 teaspoons vinegar, 1 small knob of butter. Put lids on the jars, stand in a preserving pan of water and boil slowly for 4 hours. Put a little boiling water in the jars to top up if required, let stand in the pan overnight, re-tighten lids and store. A pressure cooker will accelerate the above process. (Fuller: 1978: 73)

Trout is not a native fish and the methods employed here are not traditional, yet this recipe is, according to these cookbooks, Māori. It is significant that these ideas can be transplanted onto European foods; however, it must be noted that not all trout dishes are ‘Māori’. What makes this dish significant was the method employed in its creation, and while the introduction of European methods of preservation has altered the form of the food, the underlying kawa has persisted. Similarly not all dishes using kaanga (corn) are Māori, just when the fermentation process is applied to it.

The traditional methods of food preparation described in Chapter three were present within these cookbooks, but they were often concealed under a European guise. For example ‘Pipi Appetisers’ (Mere in MWWL 1975: 44; Glenfield College1977: 38; Paul 1996: 72) demonstrates how seemingly European methods are embedded in ancient traditional Māori methods:
Gather pipi and place in cold water to rid fish of sand\(^{81}\). Place in a large pot and clamp on a lid. Allow the fish to steam. Remove fish and place in a container and place in the warmer of an electric stove to enable fish to dehydrate gradually. Sun-drying is preferable if time is plentiful. If properly prepared, the pipi are very tasty and rattle like beads when poured into a dish. Very nice served up with sprigs of watercress. (Mere in MWWL 1975: 44)

Here the fish are steamed in a pot and then placed into an electric stove to be dehydrated—an obvious European method. However, the idea of dehydrating the shellfish is traditionally Māori, and as has been stated in the recipe, “sun-drying is preferable” (ibid). Furthermore, it is interesting that pipi prepared this way is identified as being an “appetiser”. This is reminiscent of the traditional practice of serving shellfish as *kinaki* with vegetables (in this instance, a European vegetable, watercress, which came to be used more by Māori than Pākehā).

Another recipe which had its basis in traditional preservation practices but used both contemporary foods and methods was ‘Poaka Tahu’ (Maata in MWWL 1975: 24; Glenfield College 1977: 28; Fuller 1978: 24). A mixture of pork and beef dripping was rendered in a pot and the pork cooked separately before being added to the pot of fat. The pork and rendered fat were then placed into containers and sealed (ibid). This technique was employed widely in Pre-European times to preserve birds and *kiore*\(^{82}\), and is still prevalent in the processing of *tītī* (Beaton & Beaton pers.comm 2006). However, in traditional times the material culture was different and as Mrs Kohere (300 Choice Recipes 1908: 13) explained in her *huahua* recipe there were a number of protocols associated with this dish\(^{83}\).

Although many of the recipes for preservation were contemporary in nature, there were some recipes that used both traditional food and methods. For example ‘Koura Maroke’ (Maata in MWWL 1975: 17; Glenfield College 1977: 54; Fuller 1978: 72; Paul 1996: 91) used both traditional methods of fermentation and sun-drying in the processing of this

---

\(^{81}\) Original emphasis.

\(^{82}\) See chapter three.

\(^{83}\) See chapter 6.1
dish, as well as applying them to the native freshwater crayfish or *koura*\(^\text{84}\). The recipe is as follows:

Take one bag of crayfish and put into cold water long enough so that you can remove the tail from the body without breaking. Cut the shell from the flesh and hang on hook made from wire and hang them on the line to dry for two days, making sure that the tails are brought in each night. Now pound the tails flat, rehang them on the line until the tails are completely dry. They are now ready for the larder. They are delicious to eat as they are...(Maata in MWWL 1975: 17).

Moreover, this recipe mentions two further additions: one is that “it is possible to dry pipi, paua and kumara in same way except that they are threaded on to strings” and that they can be “cooked with boiled meat” (*ibid*). This indicates that the recipe can be altered to suit the requirements of the consumer by changing either the food, or the final processing stage.

### 5.33 Puddings

The Polynesian Pudding is an ancient concept brought to New Zealand from our Polynesian ancestors, approximately in the 13\(^{\text{th}}\) century\(^{85}\). As explained in Chapter three, the Polynesian Pudding requires a starchy component and a lubricant to create a homogenous consistency (Su’a 1987: 104). This dish has persisted through time, being transformed from its original state in Polynesia, with the addition of new ingredients and the removal of others in New Zealand. However, the dish still retained the basic structure, that of a starch and a lubricant. It is therefore no surprise that with the introduction of European ingredients and technology this method has been incorporated into contemporary dishes.

One of the first contemporary Polynesian Puddings to emerge with the arrival of European foods was ‘Kaanga Waru’ or ‘Minced Corn’ (Maraea in MWWL 1975: 25; Glenfield College 1977: 21; Riley 1988: 14; Paul 1996: 36). Here the “just hardening”

---

\(^{84}\) This preparation method was also applied to *kāmera*, *tuna*, and *mango* (shark). See MWWL (1975: 47-48), Fuller (1978: 65) Paul (1996: 118-119) for a *mango* example.

\(^{85}\) Hogg, Higham, Lowe, Palmer, Reimer & Newnham (2003) date the settlement of New Zealand in “the late 13\(^{\text{th}}\) to early 14\(^{\text{th}}\) century” (*ibid*: 116).
corn is minced and mixed with butter, sugar, milk and grated kumara and boiled in the corn leaves (ibid). The resultant dish, which is a "nice consistency" (ibid), can then be eaten hot or cold. According to the Recipe Calendar 1975 (Maraea in MWWL 1975: 25) this mixture can also be varied by steaming it further with baking powder, corn meal, crushed bananas and/or crushed pineapple.

The contemporary dish 'Kumara Crumbed Roll' (MWWL 1975: 21; Glenfield College 1977: 17; Paul 1996: 28) also illustrates the two required components of a Polynesian Pudding:

Boil kumaras until tender, mash and mix with 1lb veal finely minced, and a little fat from some cooked onions and season with salt, pepper and a little dry mustard. Mix well together, form a thick roll, brush over with beaten egg and sprinkle with breadcrumbs. Bake in a hot oven for ¾ hour. Serve hot with green vegetables and chutney. (Elsa in MWWL 1975: 21)

The mashed kāmera make up the starchy component and the fat from the cooked onions and the minced veal act as the lubricant. These ingredients combined create a homogenous consistency which is required for a Polynesian Pudding. Another recipe, 'Charly's Kumara Loaf' (Spooner and Aranui 1992: 17), also exhibits the characteristics of a Polynesian Pudding. Mashed kāmera (starch) and milk (lubricant) are baked together to form a contemporary Polynesian Pudding.

Polynesian Puddings were also typified by their presence at feasts and gatherings, as they were a highly valued dish, and today we see the presence of other contemporary 'pudding' type dishes that are associated with these events. The old type of European steamed puddings met the requirements set out by Su'a (1987) with suet acting as the lubricant, and sweet flour and breadcrumbs, the starch. Although these recipes are not present within the cookbooks, they would have been typically eaten in the early stages of contact in New Zealand (Leach pers. comm. 2007). The more contemporary versions do not show the typical starch and lubricant characteristics of traditional Polynesian Puddings, yet they are often associated with hui and other feasts, thus indicating a
continuation, regardless of required ingredients. Rather, the status surrounding the dish means they are valued as highly as their traditional Polynesian equivalent.

Many of the recipes for steamed puddings are identified with a specific marae, signifying that different rohe have different recipes for similar dishes. It also establishes that the importance of these dishes is not allocated to just one iwi. ‘Whakaue Marae Steamed Pudding’ presumably comes from Whakaue Marae in Maketu which is situated in the Western Bay of Plenty. This recipe was first submitted by Mrs Hine Potaka of Te Puke to the MWWL Recipe Calendar (1975: 3) cookbook. It was then published in Fuller’s Maori Food and Cookery (1978: 29) to cater for 10 more people than the original recipe.

Another steamed pudding was also published in Maori Kai (Spooner and Aranui 1992: 39). Unlike the recipe from Maketu, this recipe indicates that the pudding be steamed in the traditional umu. However, I suspect that the Whakaue marae recipe could also be cooked in this fashion, as it is common for steamed puddings to be steamed in the hāngi (Interviewee 1, pers.comm. 2006, and Interviewee 4, pers.comm. 2006) as the techniques employed up until the point of steaming are similar, and the containers into which the mixture is placed are also similar. They were both placed in well greased tins and covered with foil (Spooner and Aranui 1992: 39) or greaseproof paper (MWWL 1975: 3; Fuller 1978: 29).

5.34 Fermentation

Fermentation was another very important method in Pre-European times and this method too has been retained in contemporary society, incorporating both traditional and contemporary foods.

Kōtero literally means potatoes steeped in water (Williams 2002: 148); however, according to Recipe Calendar 1975 (1975: 53), Maori Cookbook (Glenfield College 1977: 16) and The Maori Cookbook (Paul 1996: 25), it refers to both kūmara and the European potato. The recipe for ‘Kumara Kotero’ appears to have originated from pre-
European times as the rotting kūméra were taken from the rua (pit) and it is highly unlikely that in 1975 kūméra were still kept in a rua (MWWL 1975: 53; Glenfield College 1977: 16). However, this recipe can easily be replicated in modern times, by purchasing kūméra from a store and steeping them in water before following the subsequent instructions in the recipe.

There are two recipes for Kotero which use potatoes rather than the traditional kūméra. The earlier recipe from the MWWL recipe book (Maata in MWWL 1975: 44) does not give instructions on how to ferment the potatoes, just stating that a “bowl of fermented potatoes (peeled)” is required. Fuller (1978) on the other hand gives details regarding the steeping process. He states:

Select some small potatoes and wash, place them in a kete (flax basket) and leave them in a running stream until they become very soft and the skin is easily removed. Let them drain and remove the skins, mash them up and strain out the water. (ibid: 34)

Maata (MWWL 1975: 44) had obviously presumed that the readers of this cookbook would already know how to steep the potatoes in the same way that many recipes presume that readers know how to create a roux. If this was the case, it is likely that many Māori then would have known how to cook the resultant mash mix, as she states:

Mash potatoes and add rest of ingredients. Shape into croquets and cook in ashes or fry in oil. These were always cooked in ashes, but frying is also delicious. (ibid)

This recipe highlights the evolving nature of dishes as the dish, although traditionally cooked in ashes, has been adapted to be fried.

---

86 A mixture of flour, butter and milk to create a thick white sauce
5.35 Umu Cookery

There are only five examples of how to prepare and cook a *hāngi* within these Māori cookbooks (MWWL 1975: i; Glenfield College 1977: 3-11; Riley 1988: 65-66; Spooner and Aranui 1992: 38). Three of these examples are very detailed, giving a step by step guide (Glenfield College 1977: 3-11; Riley 1988: 65-66; Paul 1996:1-9)\(^7\) whilst the other two are less informative (MWWL 1975: i; Spooner and Aranui 1992: 38), suggesting that prior knowledge of how to create a *hāngi* is required. A smaller number of *hāngi* 'recipes' may indicate that this method of cooking is used less frequently. However, because half of the recipes assume a preliminary knowledge of how to create a *hāngi*, this cookery technique must be widely known.

*Hāngi* have been elevated above their traditional status, where they were used almost daily for cooking, and now characterise *hui* and other feasts. This is demonstrated through the naming of one of these recipes ‘Hui Haangi’ (Spooner and Aranui 1992: 38) and the fact that the recipes are designed to cater for very large numbers, up to 300 people (*ibid*).

Due to the complexities surrounding the creation of a *hāngi*, there are a few recipes that are designed to replicate the flavours, but within the conventional oven.

Prepare this meal in a roasting dish which must have a fitting lid. Heat the oven to a moderate heat. Into the dish sprinkle parsley and a few pieces of diced celery. Lay in a few pork bones and on these place 4 pork chops. Add 4 pieces of pumpkin and 4 potatoes. Over this lay cabbage, enough for 4 and if possible, some watercress. Add 1 \(\frac{1}{2}\) cups water. No salt is needed. Cover the dish and bake 3 \(\frac{1}{2}\) hours. Chicken can be added, or used in place of pork chops. Serves four. (Franci in MWWL 1975: 10)\(^8\)

This recipe demonstrates the way in which cooking methods can evolve with the introduction of different technologies and different foods. While this recipe is

\(^7\) The 'recipe' for how to create a *hāngi* in Paul (1996) is a reproduction of the Glenfield College (1977) method.

\(^8\) This recipe also appears in *Maori kai* (Glenfield College 1977: 13), but is worded slightly differently.
dramatically different to a traditional hāngi, the underlying process can still be seen with
the food being covered in large leaves and the use of steaming.

Similarly, many Māori families (including my own) now utilise wire baskets and railway
iron in the hāngi as substitutes to kete and stones to make the process of preparing a
hāngi easier.

5.36 Steaming
Steamed food (not including umu cookery) also features very little within Māori
cookbooks. These recipes do not use traditional methods of steaming the shellfish over a
fire; rather they incorporate contemporary material culture, for instance ‘Self-Pressure
Cooked Paua’ (Katie in MWWL 1975: 40; Glenfield College 1977: 52; Paul 1996: 61). The pāua are removed from the shell and the waste discarded, the fish is then replaced
back in the shells and placed face down on a pan with a little butter (ibid). The pāua are
then steamed for about 15-20 minutes (ibid).

Recipes for steamed toheroa were also featured (Glenfield College 1977: 52; Paul 1996:
84). This innovative technique ensures that there is thorough cooking of the fish as well
as ensuring that they do not become tough:

Wash the toheroa well and place in a large saucepan. Cover with hot water and
leave for two minutes. Pour off water and cover with boiling water. Put lid on
and wrap saucepan well in towel. Leave for three hours. (Glenfield College
1977: 52)

These recipes demonstrate that new techniques were formed to cater for the introduction
of new technologies. Also, because there were few recipes that were solely steamed, this
indicates a shift to incorporating varied and more contemporary methods of cooking
shellfish. This is evident when examining the large number of shellfish recipes within the
‘contemporary section’.

89 However, a number of recipes featuring shellfish do require steaming before further cooking can be
applied, and these have not been included as steamed food; just those for which steaming is the sole method
of cooking.
90 See Chapter 5.39
5.37 Raw Foods

Raw food in the Pre-European era was eaten generally in times of war or on long journeys. Therefore, in modern times we see very little mention of raw food.

*Kōuka* and watercress salads are the two most prominent raw food recipes. To prepare ‘Kouka Salad’ (Fuller 1978: 34) or ‘Ti Ti Salad’ [sic] (Rose in MWWL 1975: 8) take the “green bulb on the titi [sic] tree (cabbage tree)” *(ibid)* and strip the outer leaves away leaving only the white core. The *koāta* was then sliced very finely and garnished with French dressing. The watercress salad was refrigerated overnight and then combined with tarragon vinegar, bacon and salt and pepper and served (Nola in MWWL 1975: 14; Riley 1988: 21; Paul 1996: 42).

Raw foods within these Māori cookbooks emerge in the form of contemporary salads, indicating a very strong European influence. However, the continued use of *koāta* links this dish back to traditional foods. The small number of recipes also indicates that these were dishes that were not eaten often and that the preferred method of eating watercress was like its traditional Māori cousin *puha*, steamed in the *umu*, or eaten in the boil-up.

5.38 Boil-up

The boil-up has become entrenched in Māori diet to such an extent that when interviewees were asked to state Māori dishes, the boil-up was always first on the list. There are many different varieties of boil-up and these consist of both traditional and contemporary foods.

Boil-up’s within Māori cookbooks make up 4.7% (n=24) of all dishes – a relatively small number given its popularity in contemporary Māori households. One suggestion for this is that it is such a widely known dish that the preparation of it does not need to be transmitted as a printed recipe.

---

* The uncooked centre bulb is called *koāta*, and the cooked product is known as *kōuka* (Simpson 2000: 150). However, the cookbooks also refer to the uncooked bulb as *kōuka*. 
This is exemplified in the type of boil-up's presented within the Māori cookbooks. These dishes are often named, and incorporate special foods (often those not normally seen in a typical boil-up, i.e pork and puha). For example, the boil-up entitled 'Kotutu' or 'Flank Stew' uses 'Huakaroro potatoes' (M.R. of Waitara in MWWL 1975: 13; Fuller 1978: 43). Riley's (1988) version does not mention using these potatoes and is more like a generic boil-up of pork-bones and puha (Riley 1988: 43). It appears that the name 'Kotutu' which means soup ladle (Williams 2002:150), has by 1988 come to refer to any meat and vegetable boil-up.

Another boil-up which contains special ingredients is 'Corned Beef, Puha and Kouka' (Maata in MWWL 1975: 8; Glenfield College 1977: 26; Fuller 1978: 43; Paul 1996: 40). While corned beef and puha are considered common ingredients, kōuka is not, hence their inclusion in the cookbooks. This is further illustrated by the numerous recipes for kōuka (Maraea in MWWL 1975: 8; Fuller 1978: 34; Riley 1988: 56; Spooner and Aranui 1992: 31) that state it should be boiled with various meat cuts such as brisket, pork or corned beef. The following recipe and other related recipes do not state that they are boil-up's; rather, they merely outline the instructions for creating one:

Collect cabbage tree centres when not in flower – select large outer ones – Strip all outer leaves – leaving white centre piece. Peel away strip round the base of the centre. Cook with puha (dandelion) with corned beef or pork. Takes ½ hour to cook kouka. (Maraea in MWWL 1975: 8)

Whilst the recipes for boil-up vary in ingredients, there are a number of similarities and common elements associated with them. Boil-up's are designed to cook the food in one pot, foods are placed in the pot progressively depending on their cooking times, the dish is designed to be re-heated and eaten the next day, the liquid is eaten as a soup and, most importantly, it is versatile, allowing the cook to use whatever ingredients are available to their whim. Other speciality foods such as tītī and fish heads were also cooked using the boil-up method (Fuller 1978: 64, 77; Spooner and Aranui 1992:32, 34, 5).

Similarly, the recipe ‘Corned Beef, Puha and Kouka’ can also substitute for the corned beef various other cuts of meat (MWWL 1975: 8; Glenfield 1977: 26; Fuller 1978: 43; Paul 1996:40).
The contemporary recipes within the Māori cookbooks examined are based upon European cooking techniques and they make up a significant proportion of the total number of recipes (43% n= 225). The most common contemporary cooking technique is making soup (19% n=43). The overall cooking techniques appear to have been adopted by Māori when used in conjunction with Māori foods as 94% (n=213) of these dishes contain traditional Māori (see Figure 5.). In contrast to the dishes that use European foods (6% n=12) (See Figure 5.). Shellfish dishes make up the largest percentage of foods (60% n=135) with paua dishes occurring the most frequently of all the contemporary dishes (27% n= 60).

'Creamed Paua' (Pare in MWWL 1975: 52; Glenfield 1977: 51; Paul 1996: 68; Spooner and Aranui 1992: 8, 18) is one example of the application of European techniques to traditional Māori food. Here the minced pāua is added to a roux with onions and brought to boiling point and then cream is added. It is evident that this recipe does not incorporate any traditional methods, but because this recipe appears frequently within the Māori cookbooks, it has obviously been deemed by the consumer to be a Māori dish most certainly because pāua is the main ingredient.

Furthermore, Spooner and Aranui (1992) demonstrate how a distinctly European method can be further developed to produce a very distinctive yet similar dish. One of their

92 See figure 4.
Furthermore, Spooner and Aranui (1992) demonstrate how a distinctly European method can be further developed to produce a very distinctive yet similar dish. One of their recipes for 'Creamed Paua' (ibid: 8) incorporates the hua (waste or stomach contents) of the paua to the dish:

Remove hua and teeth from 12 paua. Wash sand and grit from paua. Mince paua with two of the hua. (You will find that the hua or puku gives a stronger flavour). In 2 tbsp butter fry 2 medium diced onions for 2 minutes. Add minced paua and cook until tender. Add cream and a bit of cornflour paste to thicken. Add salt and pepper and heat. Serve with thick slices of rewena. (ibid)

This dish is almost identical to the previous dishes, apart from the added hua and the fact that it is served with rewena as opposed to "mashed potatoes" (Pare in MWWL 1975: 52; Glenfield 1977: 51; Paul 1996:68). The inclusion of the hua illustrates a deliberate modification to the recipe, thus re-establishing it as a distinctly Māori dish.

Another example of acculturation by Māori is the recipe 'Baked Kina' (Glenfield 1977: 33; Fuller 1978: 52; Paul 1996: 50). Kina is considered one of the most obvious Māori foods, due to widespread prejudice to it from Pākehā. Therefore, any dish which has kina as an ingredient is seen as a Māori dish, even if that dish has adopted European cooking techniques, as is the case with 'Baked Kina'. The kina is alternated with layers of breadcrumbs in a pie dish and baked (ibid). Even with the inclusion of further ingredients such as bacon and tomatoes (Fuller 1978: 52), this dish still remains inherently Māori due to the inclusion of kina and the fact that dishes can evolve.

There are a small number of dishes that do not contain Māori cooking techniques nor Māori foods, such as 'Tao Mana' (Glenfield 1977: 32; Paul 1996: 47). This dish is obviously held in great esteem as 'Tao Mana' literally means 'prestigious cooking'.

---

94 Tao meaning to cook, in a native oven (Williams 2002: 380) and mana meaning prestige.
This elaborate dish however does not bear any resemblance to traditional Māori cooking techniques:

- 1 leg pork, flap on (approx 4kg)
- 4 slices white bread 1 cm thick
- Salt and pepper
- 1 small stick celery
- 1 tbsp oil
- 8 dried apricots
- 1 small onion
- 1 tsp extra salt
- 170 mls white wine

Remove the H bone and upper leg bone to form a pocket in the pork, but leave part of the flap on. Remove the crust from the bread, cut into 1 cm cubes, place in a shallow dish and pour wine over. Allow to soak for 5-10 minutes, then drain off the surplus wine and reserve. Chop the apricots, onions and celery finely and mix with the bread and seasoning. Stuff the cavity with this, pulling the flap over and secure by sewing with coarse thread or use skewers. Score the pork rind and rub with the extra salt and oil. Have the oven pre-heated to 200°C, put the roast in and reduce the oven setting to 180°C. Bake for 4-5 hours. Serve with a gravy made from the pan brownings, water and the reserved wine. Thicken with cornflour. Accompany with stuffed apricots – combine ½ carton of sour cream with 1 tbsp of peanut butter and fill the centres of 8-10 preserved apricots (Glenfield 1977: 32)

In traditional times, foods that required lengthy processing were often more highly valued due to the amount of effort put into their creation. Therefore, this complex dish, which is time-consuming by modern standards, would be given the same status as those lengthy traditional dishes.

The Māori Renaissance was a movement concerned with *mana* Māori and a reaffirmation of Māori identity. In order to assert this notion of identity there was a great deal of emphasis on the differences between Pākehā and Māori. One of the most significant differences between the two cultures was in the cuisine and this led to the publication of Māori cookbooks. Hanson (1989) may argue that the content of these cookbooks have been “distorted” in order to meet this criterion of ‘difference’. But the analyses of the cookbooks have shown that this is not the case. This is because the recipes within are not ‘authentic pre-Pākehā cookery’, rather they show a continuous and evolving tradition which has incorporated Pākehā foods, methods, and technology.

This continuity can be traced back to ‘authentic pre-Pākehā cookery’, with seemingly contemporary dishes having their foundations in ‘traditional’ food and or cookery. The
European methods and foods adopted by Māori have been utilised in such a way that their ancient origin can be observed. The most common of these origins were based in preservation, the Polynesian pudding and fermentation. Where the recipes have a contemporary origin, either the foodstuffs or the status of that food were founded in a Māori cuisine.

The Māori Renaissance and the subsequent production of Māori cookbooks have therefore acted as a vehicle for the transmission of an already evolving culinary tradition.
6.0 Māori Recipes in Mainstream Cookbooks

This chapter will discuss what role mainstream cookbooks have played in the transmission of Māori recipes. Because mainstream cookbooks make up the majority of cookbooks published in New Zealand it is vital that their influence on Māori culinary traditions is examined.

In order to do this, a textual analysis was conducted to gain an understanding of why Māori recipes were included in mainstream cookbooks. Unlike the Māori cookbooks discussed in the previous chapter, where the intent was to pass on the knowledge of Māori recipes to Māori, the intentions of these cookbooks are varied. It is necessary to understand the reasons behind the inclusion of Māori recipes, in order to gain a greater perspective on a contemporary Māori culinary tradition.

The cookbooks have been discussed according to five themes that permeate throughout the books. These are:

• Educating Pākeha
• Retrospective/Historical
• National Cuisine
• Tokenism
• Transmission.

Assignment of the cookbooks to a given category required both a critical and subjective analysis of the text. For this reason, a hermeneutical approach was applied. Hermeneutics requires an analysis of the whole with reference to the individual parts and the subsequent investigation of these parts in reference to the whole. As Robinson and Arcodia (2006) in their analysis of colonial cookbooks point out, hermeneutics allows the reader to use the text as a portal into the past (and its values and assumptions). This is achieved by oscillating between the text in part, and then as a whole, yet acknowledging the cultural and temporal baggage brought to it by the reader.
The hermeneutical cycle is then complete when the text’s quintessence can be applied, or at least understood in the present. (ibid: 7)

For this reason several aspects of each individual cookbook were considered and then placed in context with the cookbook in its entirety. The criteria established were:

1. The type of publication, i.e. fundraising or celebrity cookbook
2. The target audience: Pākeha, Māori, or both
3. The ratio of Māori recipes within each cookbook
4. The placement of the recipes, for example, scattered throughout or sectioned

The Type of Publication

The type of publication is important in understanding the recipes within the cookbooks. The most common type of cookbook (68%, n=32) in this study was the charitable/fundraising recipe book, or as they are known in America, community cookbooks (Leach 2006: 69). These are generally published by and for the local community in order to raise funds/awareness on certain matters. More often than not the recipes in these cookbooks are contributed by members of community organisations and thus give an insightful account of the cuisine in a given space and time. Non-community cookbooks act in a very different way; they are generally for a mass market and are the instigators of change within a cuisine, as they are often, due to the nature of the market, trying to set themselves apart from the other numerous cookbooks.

The Target Audience

Unlike the Māori cookbooks discussed in the previous chapter, these cookbooks are commonly aimed at a predominantly Pākehā audience. There is very little evidence to suggest that any of the books are designed with only Māori in mind. However there are some instances where the cookbooks do wish to reach both a Māori and Pākehā audience. This is generally outlined in the introduction, or can be deduced by the location of publication95, especially in those areas where there is a high Māori population.

95 This is most typical of fundraising cookbooks, whose target audience is generally within a specific locale.
The Ratio of Māori Recipes

The ratio of Māori recipes within a cookbook can give us an idea as to the importance placed on them. Cookbooks that have a very low ratio of Māori recipes (especially with regards to the seafood section, which as a general rule contain the most Māori recipes) are deemed as being more tokenistic than others. There are of course exceptions to this. For example, one would expect a small number of Māori recipes within a cookbook that has dedicated a large proportion to cakes and biscuits. Similarly, cookbooks such as *Seafood Recipes from Stewart Island* (2002), which contains only seafood recipes, would have a higher ratio of Māori recipes.

Placement of the Recipes

The location of the recipes within a cookbook is vital in understanding the overall theme. Those that have recipes placed within sections are regarded differently to those with Māori recipes scattered throughout the cookbook. Cookbooks that have Māori recipes within a designated section were assigned to a theme based on textual clues. Usually these cookbooks either had a specific purpose, such as presenting a historical view of Māori cuisine, or, the recipes were considered inconsistent with the rest of the cookbook. Recipes that were scattered throughout the cookbook were often more difficult to align to a theme based upon this approach alone, so the aforementioned criteria played a more significant role in their designation. However, as a general rule, recipes that are scattered throughout a cookbook indicate a greater acceptance of a Māori cuisine and therefore will have a higher rate of transmission.

Lastly it is necessary to then consider these parts once again as a whole, and to place them in the context of the time and place in which they were published.

6.1 Educating Pākehā

One reason for the inclusion of Māori recipes within mainstream cookbooks was to educate a Pākehā audience on Māori foods and preparation methods. While many Pākehā
are well aware of the abundant foods available right outside their doorstep, many are less informed on how to prepare these foods for consumption. These cookbooks therefore, are aimed at introducing the Pākehā audience to a variety of methods used by Māori cooks. Many of the cookbooks in this section are those that are published for the wider New Zealand public as opposed to community cookbooks. This generally means that the recipes themselves are ‘tame’ in nature, and omit those foods that are seen as exotic. As Burton (1991: 5) points out, “there is still much prejudice against our more unusual foods such as kina and muttonbird”.

The first of these books is 300 Choice Recipes: Souvenir of all Nations Fair (1908). The Māori recipes were contributed by a Mrs Keita Kohere who was the wife of Reverend Kohere (a prominent Anglican Reverend from Ngāti Porou). Mrs Kohere’s recipes are the only Māori recipes supplied. These recipes all appear to introduce a number of ‘foreign’ foods and procedures to Pākehā, such as kina, puha, pigeons (presumably kererū), hāngi, tahu, and the process of steeping food in water.

Mrs Kohere was well aware of Pākehā prejudice to some Māori foods. For example, when discussing kina, she states that “once prejudice is overcome Kina [sic] will be found juicy, tasty, and wholesome; a fit dish for epicures” (ibid: 6). Additionally, when describing the Māori delicacy puha, she notes that Pākehā regarded it as a weed (ibid: 25). However, Mrs Kohere was hopeful that these foods would rise from their disdained status to one of acceptance and value. With regards to puha she believed that “when puha becomes popular, it will be like the once despised potato, a national boon” (ibid). She had the same high hopes of hāngi stating that “it is not too much to hope that some day Hāngi [sic] parties will become fashionable” (ibid: 11).

It is obvious that most of these recipes were provided as a source of ‘exotic’ interest for the predominantly Pākehā audience. Mrs Kohere’s style of writing is poetic, far removed from its European counterparts. For example she writes:
No one need starve anywhere near the sea, or on a barren rock in mid-ocean, when nature in her own simple and thoughtful way has provided man with such a prolific delicacy. (ibid: 6)

These intriguing recipes were placed in context, for example, with a karakia supplied by Mrs Kohere, which was to be recited when the preserved birds were served at a “great occasion” (ibid: 13).

He ringa rarahu ki te whanga,
Koia te moko hie hie.
He ringa rarahu ake ki tawhake,
Koia te moko rara arara.
A ki te peke ona hatau. (ibid)

While Mrs Kohere was hopeful that the foods and methods she supplied would one day become the norm among Pākehā, it is obvious that at that stage, they were not. One indication is the material culture required to create some of the dishes, of which many would have been very difficult for a large number of Māori, let alone Pākehā to obtain. In her ‘Huahua, or Preserved Pigeons’ recipe, “a large calabash with a carved wooden mouth-piece and feathers” (ibid) was needed to collect the fat, and to store the cooked birds. Furthermore, in this same recipe she described how it was disrespectful to one’s ancestors to use just any vessel for this procedure (ibid) – thus deeming the recipe almost impossible to create without the gourd.

However, her recipes do give us an insight into the culinary traditions of Māori in 1908. It appears that the preservation of foods was still important during this time period. As well as the other traditional cooking methods of steeping foods and hāngi. Mrs Kohere also points out that some of the traditional methods were undergoing change, such as the puha being cooked in a contemporary ‘boil up’ with “a little dripping and meat, preferably corned beef or pork chops” (ibid: 25). Likewise, the hāngi was undergoing simplification; “nowdays [the hāngi is] built more simply by throwing a large dish over it and piling earth around the rim” (ibid: 11).

Moreover, these recipes clearly established that the tikaka associated with kai was still a dominant force in Māori society during this time period. Not only does the karakia for
the serving of kereru fascinate Pākehā, but it plays a much more vital role to Māori, by giving acknowledgement to their tipuna and the kai. The fact that the karakia is not translated into English confirms this, as translating it would diminish the mana of the karakia and thus the mana of the people who eat it. Mrs Kohere also reinforces the important custom of manaakitaka when she states that “an uncooked hāngi is considered by the Māori as a disgrace, a sure sign of some impending disaster” (ibid). It can be concluded then, that although Mrs Kohere is largely catering to a Pākehā audience, the information provided by her plays a significant role in maintaining and transmitting the knowledge of these foods and tikaka to Māori.

Other cookbooks aimed at educating Pākehā do not place such emphasis on the tikaka associated with food and cooking; rather, they are designed to educate Pākehā on creating meals and dishes from Māori foods and methods. Some give a contemporary version of cooking traditional foods, such as the Glenorchy School Cookbook (1975). Here they have produced a recipe for ‘Camp-Fire Fish’ described as “an easy variation of the native way of cooking fish whole in leaves, and is equally delicious if done in the embers of a campfire, or in an oven at home” (ibid: 7). Greaseproof paper along with newspaper was substituted for the traditional leaves.

The Centennial Recipe Book (1995) produced by the National Council of Women of New Zealand, gives an array of Māori recipes that utilise Pākehā cooking methods. For instance the ‘Tua Tua Pate’, uses the traditional kaimoana tutatua, yet is distinctly European in nature.

There are also a number of recipes that provide a substitute for already well-known Māori foods. Pipi, tuatua, or tuaki often substituted for toheroa, due to the almost nationwide ban of toheroa in the 1960’s⁹⁶. The Centennial Recipe Book (1995) describes tuatua as “the toheroa poor relation” (ibid: 18), whereas the toheroa has been described as being on

⁹⁶ In 1984 the toheroa numbers in Auckland were estimated to have been less than 100,000 – a significant drop from the 5 to 10 million of ten years previous. (Harvey 1988: 182-184). Due to this drastic depletion, a ban was placed on the harvesting, and this still exists in many parts of the country. However, Māori still have customary rights in Oreti, Southland (Whaitiri 2006, pers. Comm.).
par with "caviar, truffles, pâte de foie gras Strasbourg" (Kerr 1969). *Alison Holst's Food Processor Book* (c1980's:15) also substitutes *tuatua* for *toheroa*, explaining that her 'tuatua (or pipi soup)' is the "best way of cooking shellfish that there is! It is closely related to toheroa soup – take my word for it – it's certainly worth a shellfishing expedition" (*ibid*). This also implies that many Pākehā do not frequent the seabed to obtain their food and thus have little experience with its produce. Holst's later cookbook *Alison Holst's Cooking Class Book III* (1988) follows a similar thought, as she provides recipes for cockles, *tuatua* and *pipi* (*ibid*: 9-10). She has also provided a recipe for 'Stir-fried Paua' including how to prepare the shellfish for cooking. In this recipe she implies that *paua* is an unfamiliar food to many, stating that it "looks uninviting to the uninitiated" (*ibid*). It is therefore deemed necessary by Holst to explain the methods surrounding these foods, and to educate the uninformed about these delicacies.

*Recipes from Oban Presbyterian Church* (1983) contains an interesting collection of Māori recipes that are aimed at educating both Pākehā and Māori. It provides recipes for eel, *paua*, muttonbirds and mussels. These recipes are most likely contributed from people within the church and the wider community of Stewart Island. Because the community of Stewart Island is somewhat isolated in terms of commercial food stores, it is highly likely that inhabitants obtain much of their food directly from the land/ocean. This may also explain the large number of preserved shellfish recipes (*ibid*: 52). Furthermore, Mr Roy Traill contributed tips that complement a number of recipes. He gave pertinent and practical advice with regards to cooking eels and muttonbirds, something that the other recipes have omitted. For example, he suggested "using newspaper to get a better grip on the eels when cleaning them" (*ibid*: 39) and to use a "frame made of fuchsia twigs to support the bird during roasting to prevent it from cooking in the oil" (*ibid*: 51). These tips suggest that Mr Traill had experience with cooking these foods, and that he wished to pass this knowledge on to others – both Māori and Pākehā.

*The Graham Kerr Cookbook* (Kerr 1969) gives a step by step guide on how to cook a number of Māori foods. Graham Kerr, a television celebrity of the 1960's, was renowned
for his flamboyant and flavoursome dishes (Macfarlane 2007). In this cookbook, Kerr has used a variety of foods including toheroa, pāua, pipī/tuatua, and kāmera. The language used to describe these foods is interesting and may be reminiscent of Kerr’s British upbringing. For example, he calls pāua abalone or sea-truffle and often refers to the bivalve shellfish as clams.

Kerr also emphasises the effect that the West has had on Māori cookery, when he includes a “fool proof” method of dealing with toheroa, which was taught to him by a Māori friend (Kerr 1969: 34). Because this technique includes a European ingredient (bran, to extract the salt from the shellfish), he implies that a Māori culinary tradition is being consumed by that of Pākehā:

This method was passed on to me by a Maori friend and illustrates not only a foolproof technique but how the western world is having its effect upon traditional Polynesian cookery! (ibid)

The cookbooks within this category illustrate the ever increasing popularity of Māori food among Pākehā. Because Māori are often the teachers in this process it establishes that these foods and dishes have been a part of a Māori repertoire for many years, yet are only just being ‘discovered’ by Pākehā.

### 6.2 Retrospective/Historical

Retrospective or historical cookbooks give an overview of the foods and dishes eaten over a given time frame. Subsequently these cookbooks ‘fix’ a recipe to that moment in time and portray it as static - being anchored in a historical context. Generally these cookbooks are targeted at a Pākehā audience, as the recipes look at a “New Zealand” history, and how Māori foods and dishes have contributed to a National identity.

Both Great Grandmamma’s Kitchen (McCallum 1977) and A Taste of New Zealand in Food and Pictures (Munro & Munro 1977) portray their Māori recipes from a historical view. Great Grandmamma’s Kitchen (1977) provides a number of recipes as well as anecdotes from various settlers in the 19th Century. After a recipe for “Pipis”, which is a
concoction of *pipi*, tomatoes, potatoes, onion and bacon, an anonymous quote is inserted regarding Māori knowledge of seafood:

*The intimate knowledge the New Zealanders possess of the habits of fish, and their success in fishing, are indirect proofs that much of the ancient food of the people was derived from this source.*

(McCallum 1977: 12)

This observation, whilst interesting, does not add any substance to the recipe itself. The quotations persist throughout, shedding light on early settlers’ attitudes to the foods encountered in New Zealand and how the settlers adapted to them. For example, a small narrative from a settler, Catherine Chapman, describes how she used a number of traditional Māori foods in a uniquely European fashion:

*We have a fern tree, the leaves of which when boiled and a little acid mixed with it makes a capital imitation of apple marmalade; we often make tarts of it... Another tree called the Nikau is said to be very good; I have had a little bit and found it was very nice, but was told that what I had was of very inferior quality. It sometimes forms part of a dessert being something like nuts, and sometimes boiled which way is said to be best. Several of the berries – they can scarcely be called fruits – make good preserves and also wines; I shall try what is to be done in that way this year as sugar is very cheap.*

(Catherine Chapman ‘Homewood’ Karori, 3 November 1844 in McCallum 1977: 30).

Many of the recipes are written from a historical perspective, for example, the recipe for ‘Mutton birds’ does not have any instructions on how to actually cook the birds. The recipe states:

*These birds are procured in great numbers by the sealers, and are salted for use. The eggs are good and largely used, and the feathers are made into beds of a rather fishy odour.*

(McCallum 1977: 22)

However, what this cookbook does contain, that appears very seldom in other cookbooks, is a pudding section containing a number of distinctly Māori foods. Many of the recipes are rudimentary, contradictory to the elaborate Polynesian puddings. The ‘Konini
Pudding’ is just a quantity of Konini (berries of the native fuchsia, Fuchsia excorticata) which “may be stewed with honey” (ibid: 31). There is also a ‘Kumara Pudding’ which reads: “Cut the kumara into small pieces and sprinkle with powdered ginger. Boil it in a plain crust. A syrup may be made from fruit juice and a little sugar added after cooking” (ibid).

Interestingly, there is another kumara recipe entitled ‘Baked Kumaras’. This recipe is described in other cookbooks as a pudding known as ‘roroi’, yet, in Great Grandmamma’s Kitchen, it is placed in the vegetable section (ibid: 28). The ‘Baked Kumaras’ is similar to the roroi dish in the MWWL cookbook (1975: 28), although the kumara is sliced rather than grated.

In addition to these puddings, there is also a ‘Maori Plum Pudding’ (McCallum 1977: 31). It may be described as Māori for two reasons. The first is that one of the ingredients used in making the pudding is yeast, the recipe for which is provided under ‘Bread and Cakes’ (ibid: 37). This yeast is distinctly Māori in composition; it contains a shredded blade of flax as well as potatoes. Secondly, the pudding may well be reminiscent of the fact that Māori sought to retain the highly valued ‘Polynesian Puddings’ and have thus taken on board the esteemed European plum pudding as a substitute. A number of Māori plum puddings also appear in various other cookbooks supporting this theory.

A Taste of New Zealand in Food and Pictures (Munro & Munro 1977) was produced by a couple who were originally from the United Kingdom (England and Scotland respectively). They were discouraged by the fact that the foods they had encountered on their arrival in New Zealand, some thirty years before, were not being cooked by the “new generation”. In their cookbook they have attempted to “bring up to date some of the recipes which would have stood the test of time” (ibid: ii). Due to their heritage it is of no

---

100 It should be noted that one of my interviewees described her mother’s plum pudding as a recipe that has been passed down for many generations.

101 In Aggie’s Cookbook (1980), there is a recipe for ‘Hangi Steamed Pudding’, which also appears in most of the Māori cookbooks. Because these hangi puddings are generally eaten at special occasions, it is in line with the characteristics of the Polynesian Puddings, that were classified as such, due to the special occasions at which they were consumed (Su’a 1987).
surprise that their interests lie in the dishes created by European settlers and how “the original British recipe was adapted using the ingredients available locally” (ibid). Some of these recipes include ‘Pukeko Pie (ibid: 116), ‘Toheroa Soup’, ‘Stewed Eels’ as well as a number of pāua recipes (ibid: 29). They have however “included a number of Maori recipes” (ibid: 1) most of which are Colonial in nature, such as ‘Maori Bread’ (ibid: 32) and ‘Maori Corn’ (ibid: 33). There are also more contemporary recipes for puha, muttonbirds, and a description for creating a hāngi.

The narratives here often describe traditional Māori food preparations, but they nevertheless return to how the given food affected or affect Pākehā. With regards to puha, they state how it was

used as a green vegetable long before European settlement and [is] still popular with the Polynesian people. Few Pakehas now trouble to explore its culinary qualities, but in the early days it was not despised. (ibid: 86)

Based upon the narratives, one could presume that the Māori recipes here serve as a memento of times past, and are not in accordance with their authors’ aim of bringing these foods “up to date” (ibid: ii). However, what sets this book apart from those under the ‘token flag’, are the recipes themselves. Examining the puha recipe, we can see that it is not just a settler version of a Māori food, but a Māori adaptation of settler techniques – an up to date, contemporary recipe.

Wash puha thoroughly. Put into boiling water and boil for 5 minutes. Rinse thoroughly under cold running water, then return to boiling water and cook for about ¼ hour or until the bitterness is gone. Drain thoroughly. Lightly steamed mussels may be cut into pieces, mixed with puha and served with mashed potato. Pork bones or pork strips are often cooked with puha and it usually takes about ¾ hour for the meat to cook thoroughly. The liquid left makes a base for soup if left overnight, the fat then removed, and a few vegetables added. (ibid)

This recipe for ‘pork and puha’ is not labeled as a boil up, but it most certainly is one. It is one of a very few recipes for this distinctly Māori dish within mainstream cookbooks. It appears as though the informant(s) (who are not named after each individual recipe, but
are acknowledged in the preface (ibid: i) are people who prepare these dishes on a regular basis as the instructions given are precise, and easily to replicate.

Many of the Māori recipes published in these mainstream cookbooks (as well as a number of Māori cookbooks) are reproduced from the MWWL cookbook (1975); however, the recipes contained within the Munros’ cookbook are not. Interestingly, these recipes are not written to ensure the survival of Māori cuisine, as is the case with the MWWL book (and other Māori cookbooks). Instead, the inclusion of these Māori recipes was a by-product of recording and transmitting settler recipes.

*Maretai Beach School Centennial Cook Book 1881–1981* (1981) is another retrospective cookbook which gives numerous old recipes which “can still be used today, or with a little imagination, adapted, as those before us did, to suit each situation” (ibid: 1). The Māori recipes here thus give us an insight into how colonial women adapted their cuisines to the New Zealand environment. The best example of this is “Tripe with Kumara Topping” (ibid: 15):

Wash and free from fat 1 lb tripe and cut into strips one inch by two. Cover with water and simmer for an hour. Drain the tripe and place in a pie dish. Sprinkle over 1 onion which has been finely sliced. Now cover with a thick layer of kumaras which have been par boiled and cut into inch-thick slices; season to taste and dot with small knobs of butter which have been rolled in flour. Fill up pie dish with milk (skim milk will do), grate a little nutmeg over and bake three quarter of an hour to 1 hour in a moderate oven. A tasty dish for a cold day. (ibid: 15)

Tripe is a dish from the Old World which had obviously been brought to Aotearoa with the colonial women. In order to create diversity in their diets, and because some ingredients were difficult to obtain, settlers’ wives often had to spice up their dishes with local ingredients. The *kūmara* would have appealed to settlers in the same way that the potato appealed to Māori. Similarly, just as Māori were educated in the processing of potatoes, so too were Pākehā educated by Māori in relation to *kūmara*. This recipe is similar to the *kūmara* dish - *roroi*, with segments of *kūmara* being baked with butter, and to the numerous casseroles in the Māori cookbooks that use *kūmara* as a topping⁴⁰².

⁴⁰² For example Favourite Brown Stew with Kumara Topping in Glenfield (1977: 16)
Hokonui Heritage (1990) gives a historical insight into Southland’s colonial past and is “dedicated to pioneer women, covering a wide spectrum of years” (ibid: 3). This cookbook differs from that of the Munro’s (1977) and the Maretai Cookbook (1981), in that the Māori foods are removed from the other recipes and separated into their own section entitled ‘Maori Food and Remedies’. There are a relatively large number of Māori recipes (fifteen) and some are more ‘traditional’ than others.

Hokonui Heritage (1990) is similar to the other retrospective cookbooks in that narratives are provided to supplement the recipes. The narratives here discuss the more traditional methods of preparing food, for example an account of “New Zealand Seafood” (Hokonui Heritage 1990: 19) is provided:

At Riverton in the 1830’s Maori ate mussels, paua and sea eggs. They ate shags which were not cleaned but encased in a wet clay plaster...Mussels were eaten raw or cooked in a kelp bag...A Seaweed called carrageen was collected and dried for making jelly. (ibid)

Interestingly, there is a recipe for toheroa soup within this group of Māori recipes that states that it is “Not traditional” (ibid). It is the only recipe in this section to state this. One must ask, then, are all other recipes within this section traditional? Clearly, the recipes such as ‘Takakau’ (a bread using flour, milk, and baking powder), ‘Kaanga Wai’ or ‘Pork and Puha’ are not traditional in the full sense of the word. It appears therefore, that the toheroa, especially when turned into soup, is regarded as a national dish rather than Māori.

6.3 A National Cuisine

Cookbooks that define some Māori foods as being part of the wider national cuisine are generally targeted at a mainstream, predominantly Pākehā audience, and in some instances cater to an international audience. Community cookbooks as well as nationally distributed cookbooks contain these recipes, although cookbooks designed for the tourist market are normally the latter. Generally, the ratio of Māori recipes is low, and the recipes are normally scattered throughout.
David Burton’s *New Zealand Food and How to Cook it* (1991) contains a repertoire of what he calls “national dishes” (*ibid*: 4). He states that his book will prove that New Zealand has “national dishes in their own right, quite apart from those which must be considered unique to New Zealand because they use indigenous delicacies” (*ibid*). However, he then goes on to list a range of so called “genuine national dishes” such as;

toheroa soup, whitebait fritters, curried crayfish, colonial goose, pork bones and puha, pavlova, afghans, anzac biscuits, hokey pokey biscuits, pikelets, belgian biscuits and tararua biscuits. (*ibid*)

Contradicting his former statement, four of these dishes use Indigenous foods, and at least one of these recipes (pork bones and *puha*) is undoubtedly Māori. What we see occurring in this cookbook is the transformation of Māori foods and dishes into national foods and dishes.

This act of transforming Māori foods and dishes into national dishes becomes most apparent when discussing *kai moana*, especially *toheroa*. Furthermore, there seems to be a ‘culinary hangover’ that emerges from our colonial past and that is ‘if in doubt - make soup’.

This is noticeable in *Favourite Recipes of Marsden School Old Girls* (Messenger 1957), where the only Māori recipe is one for ‘Toheroa Soup’ (Castle in Messenger 1957: 7). Similarly *Tastefully Yours* (1968) contains only two Māori recipes, both of which are for seafood soups — ‘Toheroa Soup’ and ‘Pipi Soup’ (*ibid*: 20-21). Likewise *Southland Basketball Union – Favourite Recipes* (1968:4) contains only two Māori recipes, and these, unsurprisingly for the *toheroa* rich Southland, are for *toheroa* soups. *Flying in the Kitchen* (1974) also only embraces Māori foods that have been converted into soups. Once again recipes for *pipi* and *toheroa* reign supreme (*ibid*: 10-11). The name, ‘New Zealand Toheroa Soup’ (*Sgt Sams Round the World Gourmet Cooking* 1980: 27), solidifies the seafood soup as a Kiwi dish. In spite of this, Helen Leach (pers. comm. 2007) asserts that because there is no British prototype for the Toheroa Soup (based on a
British mollusk later replaced by *toheroa*, the creation of this soup may have been learnt from Māori.

There are other recipes that are regarded as being part of a national cuisine. *A Meal for Tonight* (Tremain 1967) has presented some recipes that will entertain overseas visitors and “will give them pleasant memories of New Zealand food” (*ibid*: i). These recipes are placed in the section titled ‘New Zealand dishes’. Tremain states that he has added this chapter for those of you who are occasionally presented with a trout or a leg of venison or a wild duck to cook. These New Zealand delicacies also make an excellent meal if you are entertaining overseas visitors. First, some recipes for New Zealand fish, opening with one for our large and delicious trout. (*ibid*: 59)

Other recipes within this section such as those for trout and venison are deemed New Zealand foods because of their association with Pākehā New Zealand. Similarly, Tremain includes *paua* and *toheroa* for the same reason. Both *paua* and *toheroa* are viewed as national dishes.

While this may be the case, what is important to remember is that these dishes are also seen by Māori as being Māori dishes. The shift in a mainstream New Zealand diet, to one of acceptance of these foods, does not diminish the much longer association that Māori have with them. Moreover, Māori are able to see these dishes as being part of a wider national cuisine, as well as a Māori cuisine, as Māori have the right and the privilege of being both Māori and Pākehā.

6.4 Tourism

There are a small number of mainstream cookbooks that endeavour to promote New Zealand and its cuisine internationally. Unsurprisingly, these types of cookbooks use Māori cuisine to aid in their promotion. As Heldke (2003) discusses, there is a tendency among Western people to include native foods in their repertoire, because the West often feels as though they have no culture of their own. She states that she wanted to “own an exotic ‘Other’” as a way of making herself “more interesting” (*ibid*: 177). This is
especially true of New Zealand cuisine, as it is often thought of as “a poor cousin of British cookery” (Burton 1991: 4). Therefore the inclusion of Māori foods distinguishes it from that of Britain and consequently aids in the promotion of New Zealand to tourists, who are also seeking a taste of the unique.

*The Kiwi Kwickie Kookbook* (La Touche and La Touche 1990) has included a number of New Zealand recipes that allow “overseas visitors go away with a souvenir of their wonderful holiday here with a taste of New Zealand” (ibid: 9). The recipes, as the title suggests, are also meant to be quick and are “designed to inspire you when there is no time for complexity” (ibid).

The recipes have brief introductions to initiate the reader. In the “Tua Tua Soup (Too Too Much)” introduction the author provides an evocative and nostalgic setting for the gathering of this food. This description is not entirely befitting the recipe which is a basic white sauce with minced *tuatua* added.

*At low tide on any beach in New Zealand during the summer holidays you will find groups of people at the waterline digging with their toes or hands for these elusive little blighters which bury themselves just below the surface of the sand. To the uninitiated it looks like some strange ritual. But the initiated know the rewards that await their efforts. All that digging, soaking and mincing is worthwhile.*

The introduction for *paua* on the other hand is less nostalgic, focussing rather on its appearance, which “may look like the sole of an old boot” (ibid: 25). But they are quick to point out that looks can be deceiving and that “you will forget this and enjoy only their meaty juiciness” (ibid). Two recipes for *paua* are provided, one for ‘Paua in Garlic Butter’ and the other for ‘Paua Fritters’ (ibid: 24-25).

There are also two recipes which feature *kūmara*, both of which are contemporary in nature. The first is a ‘Kumara and Pork Casserole’ (ibid: 40), and the second is ‘Kumara Chips’ which is described as being a “sweet, tasty and different dish” and has been named
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after “New Zealand’s timber town where they produce a lot of chips... the wooden kind” (ibid: 49).

*Backpacker’s Banquet* (c.1980’s), which is a book for trampers in New Zealand, contains a mixture of “prepare before you go” and “prepare on the spot” recipes. The Māori recipes in this book are placed in a section entitled “Living off the Land (don’t count on it)”. This title emphasises that the recipes within this section should be used as a last resort even though there are several recipes that use traditional methods, as well as foods, that could easily be replicated, as outlined below.

There are two recipes for *puha*, and one of these recipes in particular states that this is a Māori food:

> Puha or rauriki has long been used by the Maori people as a valuable, free green vegetable. It can be found growing in the bush margins, along roadsides, and sometimes along exposed stream edges. Gather as much as you need or can find for this recipe – get the young green leaves (ibid: 30).

There are also three recipes for eel, and two of these give a traditional method of preparation. The first method includes hanging the eel in a tree by the head, and making a circular cut through the skin below the head. The eel “should then be coated in ash, to remove the slime” (ibid: 35). The skin is then pulled downward “as if removing a pair of socks” (ibid: 35). Lastly, the eel is boiled and then fried in a little butter. The second recipe uses the traditional method of wrapping the eel, however foil is employed as opposed to the traditional leaves (ibid).

Once again, the inclusion of these recipes in cookbooks for tourism does not detract from the fact that these dishes are based in a Māori cuisine. These cookbooks raise many issues such as cultural appropriation for economic gain. Where the recipes are not correctly attributed to Māori also raises questions regarding intellectual property rights and cultural appropriation for economic gain. Unfortunately, these issues are outside the scope of this thesis and will not be discussed here.
6.5 Tokenism

Tokenism refers to a policy or practice where an “underrepresented group is operating on the turf of the dominant group, under license from it” (Laws 1975: 51). With regards to cookbooks, the Māori recipes are the under-represented group that are ‘encroaching’ on the mainstream recipes, having been placed there by the dominant group. These cookbooks are those that have included Māori recipes that give a false impression of inclusiveness, whether this is intentional or not. Often the recipes are highlighted in some form, and are portrayed as exotic, reinforcing the notion of the ‘Other’.

*Cooking with the Church Calendar* (1990) has placed the Māori Fried Bread – ‘Paraoa Parai’ in the section entitled “Children’s Cookery” (*ibid*: 87), the implications of which are precarious. Because children’s food is seen as simple and requiring little skill or experience, this subsequently diminishes the mana of the food and renders it next to worthless, as there is indeed a great deal of skill and experience required to produce a good ‘paraoa parai’. This becomes especially pertinent when it is situated alongside ‘Fun with Scone dough’ (*ibid*).

Oddly enough, this cookbook does have Māori recipes situated throughout the cookbook – ‘Paua with Pineapple Sauce’ (*ibid*: 16) and ‘Whakamaru Bread’ (*ibid*: 24). Whakamaru bread appears Māori in name only; there are no other clues as to it having its origins in a Māori cuisine. The term *whakamaru* means to be bruised or crushed (Williams 2002: 184), most probably referring to the buttered tin and the top of the bread being sprinkled with sesame seeds or cracked wheat (*ibid*: 24). However, it could be referring to the town Whakamaru, near Taupo. The use of *te reo* indiscriminately is also a form of tokenism.

Similarly, *Flying in the Kitchen* (1974) has aimlessly inserted a recipe with a Māori name. This recipe for ‘Korowai Banana Loaf’ (*ibid*: 117) has no connection to the other Māori breads (such as *rewena paraoa*) and includes ingredients that are not regarded as Māori. This reduces other bona fide Māori breads to being inauthentic.

‘Paraoa Parai’ has also been estranged from the other recipes within *Rangeview Cuisine* (Webb 2004). Here it is placed in the section “International Cookery” under a New
Zealand heading (ibid: 82). The recipe itself has been submitted by Whaea Rongo, a teacher of te reo at Rangeview Intermediate, who in one of her classes recreates this recipe. As to the placement of the recipe, it was placed in the international section “for its uniqueness...like you would the pavlova...but also in recognition as a favourite Māori food” (Em Shephard, pers. comm. April 2007). The placement of this recipe into an international section generates a sense of exoticism, or in the words of interviewee “uniqueness” which consequently infers that the recipe is not a widely prepared or consumed food.

_Favourite Recipes_ (Christie 1971) also positions Māori food in an ‘International Cookery’ Section. This too places emphasis on the exotic nature of Māori food, thus rendering it as a food with little relevance. It is peculiar that the recipe for ‘Wholemeal Paua Fritters’ (ibid: 55) (which can use either paua or mussels) is placed in this section, as it is unquestionably a local food that has some prestige with some members of the community (Green Island, Dunedin). The contributor’s local knowledge becomes apparent when she/he states that “the large mussels collected from the rocks around Brighton Beach are most suitable” (ibid). This not only implies that the contributor prepares this food, but others within the community are aware of the abundant seafood found at Brighton Beach. However the exotic connotations surrounding this recipe allow it to be regarded as an interesting artifact.

Sometimes, as was the case with well known journalist Harry Dansey, the contributor is made aware of their status of ‘token Māori’ before the cookbook is published. Dansey, as a frequent commentator on Māori affairs, was almost certainly asked to contribute some Māori recipes to the cookbook _This Land of Food_ (1967), and on realising the token role he was to play, he has appeared to ‘take the Mickey’.

For example his recipe “Crayfish a la pa” is a concoction of mashed potatoes and crayfish fashioned into a terraced pa. It is best described in the words of Dansey himself:

> Arrange the crayfish on the terraces in the manner of defenders – or the pieces of crayfish, in the likely event the little fellow provided too elusive. Mass
round the base sliced lettuce or whole leaves if you prefer your salad unmassacred. This is the forest surrounding the pa, and in its place, as attackers, the rest of the crayfish. Assume you are a third force or a fifth column and demolish with knife and fork friend, foe and fort (Dansey in *This Land of Food* 1964: 12).

Here he is playing upon the stereotypical warrior, and in the process deconstructing that stereotype, turning it back on the viewer. It is as if he is goading the reader, perhaps showing them what they expect to see of a stereotypical Māori dish.

Another recipe supplied by Dansey takes a similar unconventional approach. In ‘Muttonbird with Foveaux Garnish’, he states “take your muttonbird gingerly and remove the few feathers that they’ve left to prove it would have flown if they’d left it” (*ibid*: 12). Here, he is obviously poking fun (at the expense of the reader). However, hidden behind these innuendos is the recipe, ‘Stuffed Muttonbird’ which is seen in *Hokonui Heritage* (1990: 18). Similarly his jocular take on ‘Pork and Puha’ (*ibid*: 12) also reveals the recipe, and highlights the “delicious soup” that can be acquired if the liquid is “kept overnight and reheated after the fat has been skimmed” (*ibid*).

Interestingly, Dansey’s approach to the hāngi is less jovial, and takes on a more serious note. This may be out of respect for his mother-in-law, Mrs Huna Hikaka, who taught him the art of creating the perfect hāngi (Dansey 1967: 61).

Dansey’s attitude towards his role in this book is obvious, he is aware of the cultural significance of imparting the knowledge of kai, and has adapted the recipes in accordance with this. By ‘inventing’ dishes, such as ‘Crayfish a la pa’, he can fulfil his role as contributor, (and token Māori), without diminishing the mana of genuine dishes. In contrast, by taking a serious approach to the transmission of hāngi he has highlighted its value and status among Māori. He is also conscious of the fact that the Pākehā audience will almost certainly not partake in these dishes and has contributed accordingly. Dansey sums up his attitude when he states:

And if you decide not to try any of the foods suggested, have the wine, anyway. And may Te Atuapukunui, who is a newly invented ancient god of
good food and good fellowship, look kindly upon your endeavours. (Dansey in *This Land of Food* 1967: 12)

Therefore, what we see emerging from these books that include token Māori recipes is a mixture of two things. Firstly, the *mana* of the food and the subsequent dishes have been diminished (unless mitigated by methods such as Dansey’s) as their status and value is exoticised. And secondly, despite all of this, the recipes are still circulated throughout the community, and they may play an important role for disenfranchised Māori, because the recipes are all too obviously Māori, and therefore more recognisable. Furthermore, because Dansey’s token Muttonbird recipe is seen almost thirty years later in *Hokonui Heritage*, a retrospective cookbook containing apparent ‘historical’ recipes, we know that this dish was, and more importantly *is* still consumed.

### 6.6 Transmission

There are a number of cookbooks that do include a genuine representation of Māori recipes. All of these cookbooks are community based and were generally from locations that have a high Māori population. Because these cookbooks contain recipes that are both Pākehā and Māori both groups are targeted for readership. There is generally a large ratio of Māori recipes, and the recipes are both scattered and placed in sections.

*Waharoa Kai Mana Recipe Book* (1970) has a large proportion of Māori recipes (27.6%) that are contributed by “our Māori friends at the Waharoa Homework Centre” (*ibid*: i). The majority of the recipes are featured in a section entitled “Kiwi Cooking” (*ibid*: 44), however, a number of the recipes are scattered throughout the cookbook as well. The recipes range from “Pipi Soup” (*ibid*: 4) to “How to Prepare a Hangi” (*ibid*: 45). These recipes are inclusive of both traditional and contemporary methods, indicating variation. Furthermore, the recipes are pre-1975 and although many of the recipes are similar to those in the MWWL cookbook (1975), they are distinctive. This indicates that these recipes were cooked and eaten independently of those published under the influence of the Māori Renaissance.
Because this is the first cookbook found thus far that targets a Māori audience, it is not surprising that the transmission of the recipes differs to those post 1975. The recipe for “Rowena Bread” (ibid: 46) in particular provides a greater understanding of the transmission of recipes within Māoridom. While many recipes for rewena provide the instructions for creating the leavening or starter plant from scratch, this recipe does not:

First, you must ask someone who has a rowena leaven plant to give you a start. You keep it in a jar with a lid. Every third day you feed it 2 tblsp sugar and 2 tblsp flour, and fill the jar up to \( \frac{1}{2} \) full with water. Once a week use potato water instead of plain. (ibid: 46)

This illustrates several components of Māori culture. Firstly, that it is an oral culture, and secondly that it is a culture based on whanaungatanga (sense of family connection). The spelling of the term “rowena” exemplifies how Māori knowledge is transmitted orally. The spelling is indicative of someone who has never seen the word written down, yet knows how to create the dish, demonstrating that cookbooks pre-1975 were not widely used, to transmit Māori recipes.

Similarly, the oral transmission of knowledge is further illustrated in the recipe itself. This recipe does not describe how to make the rewena, only that it must be acquired. To obtain the rewena the reader would have to first find someone who is in possession of a starter plant, and secondly, ask them for a piece of their almost certainly prized bug. And in order to do this, family connections would need to be first established.

Moreover, it also indicates that during this time, and in this region, there were probably a greater number of people in possession of rewena, due to their seemingly being no prior recorded recipe (excluding Lady Martin’s 1869 recipe). Therefore, in order to bake this bread, it would have been necessary to procure a starter plant from someone in the community.

---
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“Ewing Steven’s Phone People” (1993) is a cookbook (with remedies and household hints) that has incorporated recipes submitted by listeners throughout the years. The nature of talkback, and the subsequent literature would relate to a Māori audience:

I have always argued that openline talkback radio is very much like family talk around a dinner table. One never knows where the conversation will start and where it will end....So the unpredictability of talkback radio spawns its own kind of literature (ibid: 3).

Of the six Māori recipes within this cookbook, five are variations of rewena paraoa from different contributors throughout the country. This illustrates that there is more than just one recipe for this bread, and that these are well known to members of the community. Furthermore, these are recipes that have not been seen in any of the other cookbooks indicating that at least in the case of rewena paraoa, oral transmission is still the preferred method.

In relation to Māori recipes, the principal objective of mainstream cookbooks is to transfer knowledge regarding Indigenous foods and cookery methods to a mainstream public. This is done retrospectively, as an ‘exotic’ interest or for consumption by Pākehā. Furthermore, the repetition of certain dishes, such as toheroa soup, creates a connection between Pākehā New Zealanders and the dishes, so-much-so that they become a component of Pākehā culinary tradition.

Although there are exceptions, especially where the cookbooks have considered Māori in their target audience, such as Waharoa Kai Mana Recipe Book (1970) or Ewing Steven’s Phone People (1993). Similarly, where the contributors were known to be Māori, particularly Māori with great mana, such as Mrs Keita Kohere, Mr Roy Traill and Mr Harry Dansey, the dishes too were attributed with mana. Because of the mana associated, the recipes would be more likely to be selected and accepted by Māori. However, it appears that mainstream cookbooks are not the primary source for the transmission of culinary traditions. Nevertheless, they do play a part in presenting an evolving Māori culinary tradition.
7.0 Culturally Transmitted Rules

The previous two chapters have shown that there is continuity with regards to Māori foods and food preparation. However, in order to satisfy the argument that there is a distinct Māori culinary tradition, it is imperative to discuss the culturally transmitted rules that culinary traditions are reliant upon. While cookbooks are a valuable source in terms of highlighting a continuum with Māori foods and food preparation they can not fully express a continuity of culturally transmitted rules. While there were some attempts to try and incorporate cultural concepts within a number of cookbooks, these were more often than not to portray an historical or tokenistic point of view. Therefore the aim of this chapter is to illustrate that like Māori foods and methods of preparation, culturally transmitted rules are also part of the continuum that creates a distinct Māori culinary tradition.

Historically Māori were an oral culture and this medium of knowledge exchange has persisted through to the present day. Taurima and Cash (1999) argue that although Māori have produced a number of literary texts to transmit *matauranga Māori* the primary exchange of knowledge today is conducted “by meeting together, often in ritual face-to-face exchanges such as through ceremonial meetings” (ibid: 5). Therefore, interviews and excerpts from literature (which were based on oral interviews), will be drawn upon to provide evidence of continuity of culturally transmitted rules.

Culturally transmitted rules can be likened to *tikaka* associated with *kai*. Ka'āi and Higgins define *tikaka* as

a system of protocols that are observed within *te ao Māori*, based on cultural traditions, practices, values and beliefs. The word *tika* means right or correct, therefore the extension of the word to *tikanga* implies an appropriate way or customary way of behaving within Māori contexts (Ka‘ai and Higgins 2004: 18).

Therefore culturally transmitted rules are the appropriate rules surrounding the traditions, practices, values and beliefs associated with *kai* and these are handed down through subsequent generations. However, as Metge (1995: 21) asserts, *tikaka* is not static, she
says that “while the principles are deeply entrenched, there is always scope for choice and flexibility in the way they are interpreted, weighted and applied in particular situations”. She goes on to say that it is the role of the succeeding generations to adapt tikaka Māori to the needs and goals of the time (ibid). Accordingly, culturally transmitted rules are also flexible, having the ability to change through time and space and are mediated by each successive generation.

A number of these “rules” were provided by Reihana (2002) and have been adapted to the following table105 (see table 1). These culturally transmitted rules are born out of cultural concepts within Māoridom. At times, to an outsider, and sometimes to the participant themselves, the connection is not made between the practice and their basis in a Māori epistemological framework. Instead they are thought of as being practical extensions of a given practice. Stevens (2003) acknowledges the role of practicality and pragmatism with regards to these frameworks, he states:

> My poua sees links between the quality of and quantity of titi and species of fish caught by large trawlers in New Zealand waters. These fish in turn also affect paddle crab numbers, which in turn affect the health of toheroa. My point is that while his [Te Maire Tau’s] poua uses words like whakapapa and mauri to describe these links, my poua uses words like inter-connected and healthy. Though things are different, they are also the same; while there is change, there is also continuity (Stevens 2003: 30).

It should also be noted that tikaka associated with food incorporates all aspects from the gathering and preparation through to the serving, thus, all of these aspects will be discussed herein.

> If the person is clean culturally, doing things the right way (traditionally), it means they have a sweet hand and the food will turn out sweet and nice. If the person has a sour hand, the meal will turn out sour (Joanne Durdy in Smith 2006: 1).

---

105 By no means is this table comprehensive, it merely serves to illustrate some key examples that are still applied today. Also, many of the examples will differ from īwi to īwi, and this table is here to serve a generic purpose only.
When menstruating, women should not gather seafood or pick vegetables. This will cause the food to spoil. Do not gather from tapu areas. This includes the marae, the cemetery, and areas of recent drownings.

When menstruating, women should not step over food. This will cause the food to spoil. Do not even diminish the mana of that person.

The kitchen sink should be used for washing food and dishes only. Do not even bathe babies in the sink. Do not pass food over the head of anyone. This will cause the food to spoil prepared.

Articles which come in contact with the body should be washed separately from articles which come into contact with food. Tea towels, tablecloths etc should be washed separately from clothes.

Never comb or cut your hair in the kitchen. Never sell food gathered from the sea.

Visitors and kaumātua should be served first.

Do not sit on the kitchen table, the sink top or work benches where food is prepared.

Never take the female of the species. Do not take food from the shallow ‘nursery’ pools. The young should be allowed to grow. Never sell food gathered from the sea.

Do not eat seafood in the water, or the sea will become rough.

When fishing, always let the first catch return to the sea.

Seafood should be gathered from a stream or seabed that is not polluted.

Planting should occur three to four days before or after a full moon. Grace should be offered after the first harvest.

Table 1: Tikaka Surrounding Food Gathering, Preparation and Serving of Kai. Adapted from Reihana 2002: 49-50.
7.1 Food Gathering

As stated elsewhere in this thesis, the notion of tapu governed all aspects of traditional Māori life. This is especially true of food due to the complex whakakapa structures, where food is identified as being kin to humankind. Because of this, there were many restrictions surrounding all aspects of kai and many of these restrictive concepts are still adhered to today. For example rāhui, which is the practical application of tapu, is defined by Williams (2003: 140) as:

The ritual setting aside, by Manawhenua, of a resource. It could be for a set time or an indeterminate period. Thus it may be that the resource was reserved for an upcoming special occasion, or given time to regenerate after overuse.

Williams (2003: 140) goes on to discuss the practicalities of rāhui, stating that rāhui were not imposed because of the sanctity of the resource, rather it was a purely a “human consideration, imposed by humans and enforced by humans”. A rāhui was imposed because of a depleted resource or the pollution of a specific area. This pollution could be either physical or spiritual, and it refers to the pollution or mixing of mauri. This practice has continued through to modern times. Rāhui put in place because of a drowning is probably the most identifiable form for Pākehā and Māori, and as recently as November 2007 a rāhui was imposed on the gathering of seafood off the coast of Paihia when a German tourist was found drowned (Milne 2007).

European laws have also had some bearing on the concepts of tapu and rāhui, forcing many Māori to re-establish these terms to fit in with a Pākehā ethos. Here Kereopa informs Paul Moon about the direction taken by elders when regulations on hunting kererū were first established:

And then the law came. The law came in and said ‘No more killing of pigeons.’ So Te Rua and his council got together to decide what they were going to do. So they decided that they would send all the mauri of the kererū back to Tane (Hohepa Kereopa in Moon 2005: 105).

Presumably this action was taken by Te Rua and his council, to firstly ensure the survival of the kererū, as there was a genuine concern regarding its fate (ibid). Secondly, they
were ensuring that the *mana* of the *iwi* would not be diminished because of a lack of dialectic discussion with government. By placing the laws into a Māori context and imposing *tikaka* Māori to the situation they were also seen to be actively asserting *tino rangatiratanga*, consequently the *mana* of the individual, the *mana* of the *iwi* and the *mana* of the *kererū* remained intact.

The gathering of *kai* and restrictions associated with it, were also closely aligned to *mana atua* (*mana* of the gods). It was imperative to acknowledge the acquisition of a resource from the specific *atua*. This is exemplified in a modern context as one informant talks about the gathering of *kina* within the domain of Takaroa:

> For us the old way when we were kids and we used to go to the beach with our nannies, in Taranaki they had this thing you go out to the beach you get your first *kina*, you open it up, and you turn back towards the land, you open the *kina* up, and you chuck it back towards the sea, that was one of the old things...that's your respect to Tangaroa...it like when you do your first *kere*, you give that back, or you give it away, that shows that your sharing your knowledge, this is the respect for the sea, so as kids we were always taught to do that and then you go dive for your kinas (Interviewee 1 pers. comm. 2006).

The preceding quote, also demonstrates how this knowledge was passed on. For the above informant, it was acquired through their “nannies”106. Most of the informants attributed their knowledge of food and *tikaka* surrounding food to their grandparents or an equivalent person. The significance of this is described by Paki (2007: 84):

> The intergenerational transmission of knowledge...grandparents or the older generation play a much larger role. The relationship between the child and grandparents holds significance in the transmission of knowledge through passing down traditional knowledge through the traditions and tikanga Māori held within whakapapa (ibid).

Paki (2007) goes on to argue that often this information was passed down without the utterance of a word, rather, it was through observation of the act: “Looking and listening

---

106 Nannies is another term for women who are seen as grandmothers even though they may not necessarily be. Due to the structure of *whānau*, all women of a certain age would be seen as ‘grandmothers’ or ‘nannies’ and were thus labeled as such to acknowledge their *mana*. Similarly, others within the community are ascribed titles such as ‘auntie’ or ‘uncle’ as a sign of respect. I have many aunties and uncles, that are not related by blood, but are still treated as such.
was one way I learnt as I would learn to interpret each expression as another way of talking” (Haig 1997: 3).

Just as cultural considerations surrounding the gathering of *kai* could be transmitted inter-generationally so too could methods of preparing the food for consumption. One informant notes that it was a *kuia* (female elder) who taught her the following method for preparing *kina*:

I think for kinas and that when we brought the kinas back, we brought them right back to the house, we shelled them...out in the Hokianga, a lot of us don't like eating it straight off on the first day, we usually immerse them in cold water for about 3 days, and then we open them up and eat them like that. Cause there's a slight tang on it when it's freshly done, and you eat them on the third day, you'll find they become a lot more creamier and richer. Now today's new thing I hear, they're cooking it; they're starting to cook the kina now. You can actually blanch, believe it or not, blanch it in cream and...it actually counteracts each other, and you find the cream loses the cream and the kina loses the kina richness and it's actually really nice. It's almost like they fuse each other, it's quite amazing that, we learnt that from a *kuia* years ago, who used to do that with her kinas. I think that's how we've always done it (Interviewee 2 pers. comm. 2006).

This idea, along with the aforementioned examples of food restrictions are based in the concept *kaitiakitanga* (stewardship). Williams (2003) defines *kaitiakitanga* as a concept with two key dimensions:

At the metaphysical level it refers to the ways in which atua manifest themselves to support the present generation, each atua having its own area of concern. On the practical level, the practice of kaitiakitanga requires the people who are linked with a resource in a particular locality to mirror the kaitiakitanga of the atua for the good of the descent group as a whole (Williams 2003: 17).

In other words, *kaitiakitanga* is the way in which Māori protect and provide for the resources and the land, reflecting the attitudes of the *atua* in its application. From the interviews, the practical manifestation of *kaitiakitanga* is apparent especially with regards to the gathering of *kai*. Restrictions, both physical and spiritual aid in the ability of the people to care for the resources.
This is further implemented in the serving of food. According to the interviewees, there was a strong link between the amount of food gathered, where only enough should be taken for the family or event, and the idea that food should not be wasted.

We’re not wasteful. We mustn’t be wasteful. If we’ve got excess food, we share it out. All those sort of things, I guess morals, the way you were brought up was a quite a good thing to always have and share it on (Interviewee 3 pers. comm. 2007).

Consequently there is an emphasis on the reprocessing of foods, as well as the consumption of foods that are deemed ‘less desirable’ by the greater population, such as terotero or kina. This notion is strongly represented in the following personal account from Pikihuia Reihana:

A typical day for a Maori woman was to rise early maybe before daybreak and light the kitchen range. The kitchen range lit nice and early meant warmth for the family, a morning meal, maybe heated food from the night before such as stew, boiled meat with puha, cabbage, watercress, or it could be Maori porridge (boiled milk with half mixed flour and water) or ordinary porridge, or even a fry up of potatoes with fresh chops and eggs or terotero (intestines) and fry...Lunch may have consisted of another reheat of the pot of hai (last nights meal) or just bread and tea or cocoa or hot water with lashings of freshly made jam...The evening meal would consist of fried bread, bread and karingo [sic] (seaweed), maybe bread and pipi, or bread and potato or maybe just bread (Reihana 2002: 48).

The overall ethos of not wasting food is captured in Reihana’s meal plan due to the reheating of the same meal at least twice, and the inclusion of some dishes which would be sure to receive a slight grimace from a number of the general public.

The Boil-up
It is appropriate here to waver from this discussion briefly to address how this notion has influenced the contemporary Māori dish – the boil-up. The preceding chapters have revealed that many of the so called “contemporary” dishes within the cookbooks are in reality modified versions of traditional methods and recipes, kaangawai having its roots in the fermentation process of karaka berries for instance. While the boil-up has been seen to have its traditional predecessor in umu cookery its implementation can also be
seen within tikaka Māori, more specifically within the concept of kaitiakitanga and the innate sense of not wanting to waste kai. Hohepa Kereopa reinforces this when he states that “We believe food is a gift and it is wrong to waste it” (Kereopa in Moon 2005: 87).

Lady Martin’s recipe for soup which notes that the leftover cuts of pork should be used (Martin 1869: 19) would have thus appealed to Māori when introduced because it allowed for all parts of the animal to be utilised. Similarly, the abstract from Pikihuia Reihana raises an interesting detail, that it is a dish which can be eaten for breakfast, lunch and tea. Here, the persistence of the same dish being consumed until there is nothing left, illustrates the fact that wastefulness is considered an undesirable trait.

Furthermore, the boil-up is a dish which does not require any specific ingredients per se. The boil-up recipes contained within cookbooks illustrate this point by indicating that a number of meats and vegetables can be employed and substituted. One interviewee also makes reference to this when describing her ‘recipe’ for boil-up:

Oh pork bones and puha, or pork bones and watercress, or beef bones you know...brisket they call it, and puha, that’s quite nice, I quite like that now and again, I do it now and again myself, I go round and pick puha out of the garden and get some stewing chops, and boil it up, put it all in the one pot...I cook the meat first, and just before the meats ready, you put all your cabbage, or silverbeet or puha, depending what you’ve got. On the top of that...I take a bit of water off it first and then put it on the top, and the potatoes and that on the top and they actually steam. It’s quite nice. That’s how I do it (Whaitiri pers. comm. 2006).

Pita Sharples in his address at the University of Otago (2007) also questions the origin of the boil-up, proposing that it lies in “values of our cultural practices which give priority to conservation, to preservation, and are opposed to the wastage of kai” (ibid). However, he goes on to suggest that the boil-up may be symptomatic of an over-representation within the lower socio-economic strata. While there may be some credibility in Sharples’ latter statement, it is the opinion of this author that his judgment is blurred by political motivations, and the boil-up is not a product of colonisation and any subsequent alienation. This can be illustrated by its high status at hui. One informant described how
the boil-up was used to prepare pikopiko at special occasions, even likening it to the Greek “food for the Gods”:

I know that in my time we only ever used [pikopiko] for special occasions, they weren’t an everyday staple food it was always when you had manuhiri travelling from other hapu, or from down the line, those things were a speciality, and we always got those things for our kaumatua and kuia...And we just used to boil them with meat. It was one of those special foods, even myself, very rarely do I eat that, unless were at the table with our dignitaries or kaumatua and kuia (Interviewee 2 pers. comm. 2006)

Returning to the definition of kaitiakitanga set forth by Williams (2003), the boil-up is therefore a practical modification of a resource that “mirrors” the kaitiakitanga of the atua for the “good of the descent group as a whole” (ibid: 17). The “kaitiakitanga of the atua” mirrored here is the concept that food is a gift, and it must therefore not be wasted. Therefore, we can see that the foundation of the boil-up is firmly grounded in the concept of kaitiakitanga, and the opposition to wasting as well as the practical substitution of the kohua for the umu.

7.2 Food Preparation

Food preparation within a contemporary household is markedly different to that of pre-European times primarily because of the environment in which the food is prepared. Traditionally food was cooked and eaten outside, which allowed for the separation of food (which is noa) and humans (who are tapu). Nowadays food and people are in constant contact and this has required modification to several cultural concepts. The most frequently noted concept mentioned throughout the interviews was that of personal tapu.

Personal tapu still holds much significance in a number of Māori households; however it has been modified to fit into their environment and lifestyle. Nevertheless, the intentions and the origins can still be seen to be deeply rooted in a traditional Māori framework. One informant describes how the notion of tapu reigned over their kitchen table:

Well most things were acknowledged, about putting bums on tables, and hats and things like that. It was a place for food, strictly for food, you
know. I know, Dad and Mum never even smoked at the table, they both smoked, but I never ever saw them smoke at the table, they always went back to their seats, and sat back and smoked you know. I don’t think anyone; I can’t ever remember anyone smoking at our food table...
(Whaitiri pers. comm. 2007)

The penalties for breaking *tapu* varied, depending upon the transgression. For example, breaking the *tapu* of an area by collecting food from a prohibited area could result in “a curse of some kind upon the family” (Reihana 2002: 49). Less severe breaches of *tapu*, such as sitting on a table, would result in a ‘friendly’ reminder from a *whānau* member (*ibid*), or in the case of the above informant “a short shift” (Whaitiri. comm.. 2007).

Many of the informants did not understand or did not convey an understanding of the root of this table etiquette, yet it is still strictly adhered to. The general consensus from the informants was that it was just “common sense”.

You get some people that put there bums on *kai* tables, that’s just a no no. It’s just not on. But you know they just do it, without even thinking...And I can’t believe sometimes I actually I have to sit down and tell these women why you don’t sit your bum on a *kai* table (Interviewee 2 pers. comm. 2006).

A similar transgression of *tapu* is seen with regards to the kitchen sink. Because food is prepared in this area it must be kept free from any other personal use, such as washing your hands after going to the toilet. One informant draws on an experience of a friend who brushed their teeth in her kitchen sink. The informant was mortified to say the least:

A sink is for special things, like I said some friends come and put the toothbrush in the sink, and it’s just not the done thing...I always think to myself, it’s just bloody common sense. For goodness sake (Interviewee 3 pers. comm. 2007)

The same notion applies to the washing of linen associated with the kitchen. This must be kept separate from all other household washing as the following passage demonstrates:

Then you had towels, you always separated your things, like the tea towels and all that, you never put them in with your own washing. Same with women’s things, you know, your undies and all those sort of things.
The justification for these practices could be perceived to be a practical institution based solely in a hygiene context, and in some respects this is true. Like rāhui, these rules are practical and are put in place to protect the individual, as well as the whānau and hapū. However, this is not the sole reason, if it were, Pākehā would have also implemented these same practices, and from experience this is not the case. To Māori these notions are just common sense, they have become so ‘normalised’ that it is strange when others are not aware of the social breaches. In spite of the ‘common sense’ tag that surrounds these rules, there is also somewhat of a deeper understanding as well:

You know those things are kept clean and separate. We always say that’s good for your spiritual side, because you’re looking after your spiritual side as well...because when you look after yourself here, your looking after your inside as well, which is your wairua, which is so important (Interviewee 1 pers. comm. 2007).

These rules have originated from within an ancient Māori kaupapa that asserts that food (and the extensions of food) will diminish the mana and therefore the tapu of an individual who willingly places themselves in that danger. Although the environment has changed, the persistence of personal tapu is still strong.

7.3 Food Service

“One of the things that needs to be talked about, Paul, when you are talking about food, is the concept of manaaki” (Kereopa in Moon 2005: 84) states Hohepa Kereopa. This is because in almost all circumstances, the terms manaaki and kai are collectively exhaustive, one not occurring without the other. According to Mead (2003: 9) “all tikanga are underpinned by the high value placed upon manaakitanga – relationships, looking after people, and being very careful about how others are treated”. The demonstration of manaaki through generosity and hospitality not only ensures the physical, mental and spiritual nourishment of the recipient (Metge 1995: 99), but it also enhances the mana of the provider.
Manaakitaka was expressed by all the participants, their experiences. However, it was the latter which was given the most attention. This is presumably because most people do not advertise their own generosity, as the pepeha says ‘the kāmera does not advertise its sweetness’. So, while manaakitaka is of the utmost importance in the dealings with people on a daily basis, the interviewees did not discuss this. Instead they actively practised manaaki. After each interview I would leave with a more than satisfied puku!

In light of this, the following passage from Hohepa Kereopa has been quoted at length:

We were told to manaaki. If we saw anybody, we would always call out to them. And when people talk about karanga, they think of the marae, but for us, the karanga was always practised here. When you saw someone going past on the road you’d karanga them, and offer them a cup of tea. And when they accepted your offer, you would race around trying to figure out how you were going to get a cup of tea. And our people have always said, even if it’s just a cup of water, the most important thing is that you offer it. So what is the most important – the feeding or the offering? And they are both just as important. And that is the respect you show somebody if they are going by. And for that person to respect you, he will say ‘Kei te pai,’ or ‘I’ve already eaten,’ so that leaves both parties with their rangatiratanga. But you always get one who might come in and catch you off guard. So that tells us that manaaki is not just about nice words, it’s about being able to back up your words with actions (Kereopa in Moon 2005: 84-85).

Therefore in the everyday expression of manaaki, both the offering and the actualisation of the offer is important. But what is served is less important. Conversely in formal occasions such as hui, the food served is very important. Often the atmosphere of the hui is determined by the quality of the kai served. Moreover, the attitude of the cook when preparing the food also attributes to the overall atmosphere.

So if you are angry when you are about to prepare food, walk away, and do it later. Because what happens if you prepare that food while you are angry is that you upset all the mauri of that kai, so that food will not have the mauri that will be able to benefit the people who eat it. It will be all contaminated with anger (Kereopa in Moon 2005: 85).

Food in these formal occasions act to whakanoa the participants, and is therefore served after the completion of the powhiri (welcome ceremony). This is an important part of marae protocol and according to Tauroa (1989: 24) a visitor should partake of the meal in
order to show respect to the host, “to refuse the hospitality is to reject the tangata whenua for it is in the sharing of the food that the manuhiri become part of the marae”.

The manuhiri (visitors) must also bring a koha (gift), and often this is in the form of kai. This is especially pertinent at tangi, as it is an expression of aroha (love/care). Stevens (2003) states

At Bill’s\textsuperscript{107} takiaue, my poua gave on behalf of our whanau, a koha of a poha-titi to the Solomon whanau. While my poua, cousin and myself and others from Awarua were busy opening tio for the hakari, a kaimahi from the kitchen came back, poha in hand asking what he should do with it? “Eat it!” came multiple and unitary terse replies. Had Bill been alive, he would have been approached for instruction, and the titi would have been offered to him first. The role of poha eater is an important one within Kati Kuri (Stevens 2003: 39)

Here the koha not only served to show aroha, but the kai was also relevant to the deceased, as he was the “poha eater”.

Trade

Trade was important in pre-European Māori society as it allowed for the establishment and reinforcement of inter and intra tribal relationships. It also became an important aspect during the time of contact, by increasing the mana of the iwi who traded with Pākehā. Today, trade is still important, the following exemplifies how the traditional importance of trade has remained relevant to the informant:

Growing up in a family of muttonbirders, the notion of trade is still relevant. I often remember travelling to Invercargill with my father in the pursuit of timber; we would take about 10 salted birds, a few dozen oysters, and a trailer. Dad would head indoors with the food and leave with a load of two by fours (Interviewee 4 pers. comm. 2006)

This is not an uncommon practice in Murihiku as Tiny Metzger explains: “(We) would swap ... kanakana and whitebait (for fff with) the Barretts...they were pretty proficient birders” (Stevens 2003: 43). This notion was also mentioned by Syd Cormack:

\textsuperscript{107} The late Wiremu Te Haere ‘Bill’ Solomon, former Kati Kuri leader.
Maori custom is share and share alike. I can remember as a boy, the Maoris at Moeraki would pool up enough money to send one man from Moeraki down to Bushey Park, near Palmerston, where there was a good muddy creek where there was a lot of eels. Well, that man would go down on the train to Bushey – the creek was right near the railway station. He could go and get the eels, and then come back home by the next train, with as many eels as he could carry in a bag on his back. That would go all around those people (Cormack 1997: 42-43).

Another aspect of trade was the gift giving at hākari. One relatively contemporary example of this was during World War II, pōha and barrels of tītī were sent to the 28th Māori Battalion and to Kai Tahu in other army units and the other armed services. Tom Duff recalls meeting up with Rangi Ellison serving with the Māori Batalion in North Africa:

I’m dosing [sic] in Rangi’s pup tent and it was blowing a howling gale too... We had the old greycoat collar round the neck to keep the sand out, and Rangi said, “How would a bit of muttonbird go... We had muttonbird yesterday... and we saved the bones to suck on later. You’re welcome to them.” God I never tasted anything so beautiful in my life, sucking on the bones in the dark (Stevens 2003:64).

Although Māori today do not trade tītī for the same reasons and for the same goods as their ātipuna, the notion nonetheless is born out of a traditional kaupapa. One based on the traditional practise of kai-hau-kai, and it is still an important facet in today’s society.

This chapter has recognised that the fundamental culturally transmitted rules of pre-European Māori have been passed down through the generation and that the transmission of these rules is normally achieved orally or through direct observation. This chapter also acknowledges the fact that tikaka surrounding food encompasses all aspects of food preparation, including the gathering and the serving. It has also established that the rules are not static, and that they are often subjected to change due to the changing nature of the environment. Furthermore it has established that culturally transmitted rules influence the production and consumption of certain foods and this is represented in the origins of the boil-up. Most importantly this chapter has established that in spite of any changes, the underlying philosophy remains, and that any modifications are only occurring on the surface, with the roots deeply embedded in a Māori epistemology, thus indicating continuity of culturally transmitted rules.
Conclusion

The hypothesis set out in the introduction stated that the ‘Māori culinary tradition absorbed European foods, preparation methods and material culture and integrated them into an evolving Māori tradition’. This has been confirmed and allows us to recognise the existence of a distinct Māori culinary tradition in contemporary New Zealand.

The colonisation of New Zealand brought about many changes in traditional Māori society, and this meant Māori cuisine was affected. Newly introduced foods, methods and material culture were often readily adopted by Māori, especially if traditional dishes, and subsequently meals, could be reproduced using these modern additions.

The literature review established that foodstuffs are more likely to be adopted by a culture if they are similar in flavour, texture, smell and taste. These novel foods are then processed using known techniques to create dishes which are already in that culture’s repertoire. It is widely accepted that during the colonial stages of New Zealand Māori experimented with Pākehā foods, creating dishes that were sometimes abhorred by Pākehā like kangawai or kōterō. These dishes were processed using European foods and traditional Māori methods, because maize was similar to karaka; and potatoes to kūmara. However, what was not known, and not discussed in previous writings on Māori cuisine, was whether this notion of processing foreign foods with Māori methods persisted through to the present day. Through the analysis of the Māori cookbooks, there is strong evidence to suggest continuity in this regard. At first glance, many of the recipes look to be European in nature, yet, on closer inspection, there are several clues to show that there is a Māori core to the recipes, in fact over half of the recipes in the Māori cookbooks employed Māori preparation methods, albeit, these were often not “traditional” methods, but adaptations.

Cwiertka (1997) argued that the material culture associated with a culture is a good indicator for the prevalence of preservation of a culinary tradition. While Māori do not
widely use traditional material culture on a daily basis, there are many aspects of modified material culture that persisted. For example the introduced camp-oven, along with the pot which was used as a means of cooking ‘one-pot’ meals, reminiscent of *umu* cookery, is still extant. Once again, these are not “traditional” *per se*; however they are based on traditional Māori cooking methods. This continued use for over 100 years illustrates preservation as well as an ability to adapt.

The adoption of European food, methods and material culture was shown to be based in a Māori epistemology. Not only were features of a European cuisine adopted, but they were often adapted to fit into a Māori worldview; thus indicating a conscious decision. Māori defined what they would appropriate from Pākehā and what they would drop from their own cuisines and this has led to a distinct Māori culinary tradition today, which is based firmly on cultural values and rules. The fact that the origin of these values and norms is often unknown, illustrates their antiquity. The rules are adhered to because—that is the way the old people did it. These rules act as guidelines, to ensure that any modifications to the cuisine are in line with a Māori worldview. Furthermore, the rules have been shown to be flexible, enabling change to occur while still retaining their inherent qualities.

The results obtained from the cookbooks did not show a Māori culinary tradition in its entirety. It was only through discussions with Māori, that the bigger picture could be seen. A culinary tradition can only be seen when examining it as part of a worldview, as it is the worldview which determines the path of that tradition. However, the cookbooks produced by Māori for Māori did enable a thorough investigation of the recent cookery methods and foods of Māori. These cookbooks were published as a consequence of the Māori Renaissance of the mid 1970’s. This revolution among Māori society was a way of re-affirming Māori identity and *mana* and it was achieved by asserting the cultural differences between Māori and Pākehā. Consequently, because Māori cuisine was distinct from that of mainstream New Zealand, this was one area highlighted for promotion by
the movement. These cookbooks were an accurate account of Māori cookery at that time, as they incorporated contemporary as well as more traditional dishes.

Conversely, the principal objective of mainstream cookbooks was to transfer methods of preparing Indigenous foods to a mainstream public. These cookbooks therefore uncover more about Pākehā attitudes to Māori cuisine than the state of the Māori cuisine. The important point to be established from the study of mainstream cookbooks, was that the primary transmission of Māori recipes is still oral, further giving support to the notion of a continuous cuisine.

This thesis has shown that there is continuity in the Māori culinary tradition, and because of this there is scope for further research, especially with regards to Māori nutrition. According to the findings of the 2002 National Children’s Nutrition Survey (New Zealand Ministry of Health 2003) nearly half of Māori children up to the age of fourteen were either overweight or obese, figures being even higher for Māori girls. Māori Party Leader Pita Sharples also addressed this issue and asked for a “culturally competent way” of determining the value in “traditional diets” and the “practices of manaakitanga; around cultural norms of respect, hospitality, appreciation and protocol” in order to find ways to combat obesity in our children (Sharples 2007).

Because this research has determined that Māori do have a distinct culinary tradition, it is probable that our cuisine is a contributing factor to the obesity epidemic in our children. For example, it would be pertinent to examine alternative ways for preserving foods that did not require such large amounts of fat, or perhaps when frying, olive oil could replace the consistently used lard. However, any research conducted in this area must look at the issue holistically, because a Māori cuisine is holistic. It is not a matter of merely substituting one item for another, but any changes must be based on a Māori worldview. For instance, as Pita Sharples (2007) commented, the rules surrounding food such as manaakitanga and hospitality should also be explored further to understand what role they are playing in this epidemic. Ways need to be found to incorporate these cultural values, while striving for a healthier Māori population. It is significant that Māori cuisine
is highly adaptive and there is no reason why it cannot adapt to modern healthy lifestyles. It is not stuck in the past with old dishes being retained simply because they are traditional. Rather, the evolution of Māori cuisine comes from a conscious decision to change; therefore any further changes must also come from a Māori intention. Consequently, this research could be considered a starting point for creating healthy alternatives based upon the core Māori values presented in this thesis.

This thesis also raises questions regarding who should study Māori issues, especially those of a contemporary nature. During this research I have often drawn from my own experience with food and what is cooked by my family. Sometimes it is difficult to establish what is ‘normal’ by mainstream methods, and what is not. For example, like the interviewees, there were many aspects of cookery that I did not realise were based in my cultural values. It wasn’t until I encountered a substantially different set of rules, that I became aware of my own. When I first went flatting, my flatmates washed the tea towels with their clothes – I was astounded and mortified by this action. But to my flatmates, this was their cultural norm. Similarly, I am still not aware of the origins of certain dishes cooked by my poua – are sweetbreads, ox tongue, or lambs’ tails part of a Māori cuisine? Or are they just a part of my own family’s culinary experience? However, being Māori has enabled me to raise these issues with other Māori from within the community, as well as having an innate understanding of the cultural values within their wider context. As Jim Williams (pers. comm. 2002) argues, just as an emic view does not allow one to see the wood for the trees, an etic view does not allow one to see the trees for the wood. On this train of thought, it may be necessary in further studies, to implement a comparative study, which would highlight the differences and similarities in the two cuisines, thus incorporating an ‘etmic’ view (Williams 2003: 39).

This research has also had an impact on my own perceptions of what being Māori is. At the beginning of this thesis I described how my family could be considered “tanned Pākehā”, yet by having a deeper understanding of my own cultural norms, I have realised that my family are more than tanned – our identity is based firmly in our culinary tradition – we are tahu’d, we are preserved.
He Pukapuka Whakaatu Tikanga mo nga Rongoa mo nga Kai (Martin 1869:18-23)

HE TIKANGA MO NGA KAI.

Ko etahi kai pakeha e kore pea e mohio i nga tangata maori te tunu, engari ko etahi e taea ana te tunu. Ki ta nga Rata katoa e kore e ora te tangata i te kai riwai anake, engari me waiu, me tara, me hupa; koia hoki i tuhia ai ki tenei pukapuka, te tikanga mo te hanga rewena hei pokenopeko tara; kia tupato ki te hanga kia mama ai te tara.

Tenei ano te korero mo te hanga hupa kia reka ai. E mohio ana nga tangata i noho ki te kura i Tipene ki te hanga hupa, otiia he hoha pea no etahi ki te mahi, ka whaonga te piwhi, te poaka ranei ki te kohua ka tahuha te ahi kia nui rawa, ka utaina te kohua ki te ahi, a ka waiho kia nui rawa te koropupu, no reira ka maro rawa te piwhi, te poaka ranei, e kore e ngawari, he wai kau hoki te hupa, e kore e pai. Ki te kainga e te tangata ka taimaha ki roto i tona kōpu; ko te mea tika kia tapatapahia rawatia te piwhi, te poaka ranei kia ririki, ka whawhao ai ki te kohua ka panga ai he tote, he aniana, (onion) he raihi, kia rua pune nui, ki riringi ai he wai kia ngaro nga kikokiko i te wai, ka whakatu ai ki te ahi ka taupoki a i te kohua kia koropupu, ka whakaiti ai i te ahi kia ata koropupu te hupa; Kia roa ai e tunu ana kia pai ai. Ki te pakeha ka nui te pai o te kareti, (carrot) o te tonape, (turnip) a te paukena ki roto ki te hupa.

He mea pai hoki kia whakatupuria enei kai ki roto ki te kāri a te tangata maori; te kareti, te tonape, te aniana, ma enei kai hoki kia tino pai ai te hupa.

HE WHAKAA TU TIKANGA TENEI MO TE POAKA TOTE WHAKAMAROKE.

BACON.

E rua nga pai o tenei mahi mo te tangata maori, ko tetahi ki te hokuna nga taha e rua kite Pakeha ka nui te utu mo taua kai (Bacon,) ki nga tāone. Ko tetahi, ma tenei hoki e whai mea ai he i hanga hupa.

E kore e rīka kia totea te poaka whakamaroke I te raumati kei pirau, engari it e hotoke.

Me whirihirihiri i te poaka momona kia kotahi pea ona tau ka patu ai. Pai atu te poaka toa i te uha mo tenei mahi.

Whakatakotoria nga taha e rua o te poaka ki runga ki te tepu, ki nga pahi papa ranei kia pai hoki te kokoti atu i nga peke i nga huha; ka ata tango marie i nga wheua katoa, I te iwi tuara, i nga rara. Kia piri tonu te maripi ki nga wheua kokoti ai kei riro mai tetahi wahi o nga kikokiko i runga i nga wheua. Ki te kitea tetahi wahi kua kino i te toto me kokoti atu; ka mutu ka pani ai ki te tote, kia kotahi panikena tote, kia kotahi pune tote pita (salt petre,) me tuki te tote tita kia pepe rawa, ka pani ai ki te poaka.
Kia toru nga ra e takoto ai nga taha, (kia rima nga ra kite poaka nui) me muku atu te tote o te paninga tuatahi, kua kino hoki i te toto; muri iho ka paní ai ki te tote, me whakaranu kia kotahi pauna tote, kia kotahi pauna huka pakaka (brown sugar.) Kia kaha te paní i tenei ki te poaka i ia ra, i ia ra, kia ma ano ia nga ringaringa te horoi i te mea e pani ana.

Heoi ano meatanga ki te tote; engari ko te mahi mo ia ra, mo ia ra, he mirimiri tonu i nga wahi katoa o aua taha e rua ki te tote ano i paní tua matua na ki runga, me te hurí ano i to runga taha ki raró, i to raró taha hoki ki runga; me pena tonu te mahi i nga ra katoa, a toru noa nga wiki e pena ana ka whakairi ki te wahi auahi, me te ata titiro, me te hongi hoki. Ki te kitea he wahi mirimiri tonu i nga panya, a, maroke noa.

Tenei ano te tikanga mo nga hams, ara mo nga peke mo nga huha.

Ringitia he wai ki te kohua ka houata ai kia toru nga pauna tote ki roto, ka whakatū ai ki te ahi kia nui te koropupu, ka taaki ai ki tahaki: kia matao ka maka atu ai i nga hams ki roto ki taua wai; a, toru noa nga wiki e takoto ano i roto i taua wai ka tango ai ki whao; ka hoatu kia kotahi kapunga tote, kia kotahi kapunga huka ka paní ai i ia ra i ai [sic] ra, a, whitu noa nga ra. Me tui he peke mo tenei mo tenei o aua hams, kei tomo hoki te ngaro ki roto a ka i i te iroiro kutukutu; ka mutu ka whakairi ki te wahi auahi, a, maroke noa.

Ko nga rara, me te iwi tuara. me [sic] tapatapahi ka paní ai ki te tote ka kohua ai hei hupa. p.20

SUGAR BEER 5 GALLONS.

Hoatu kia 6 karani wai ki roto ki te kohua, ka whakatū ai ki te ahi. (Ko te nui o te karani ko tahi, e waru panikena wai.) Kia koropupu ka maka ai ki roto kia ⅔ pauna taimaha hapi (hops.) Kaua e tino pauna rawa kei kawa te pia.

Waiho kia koropupu tahi ano te wai me nga hops; kia puta hoki te kaha o nga hops ki whao; muri iho ka tatari, ka riringi atu ai kia 6 pauna huka pākākā (brown sugar) ki roto ano ki taua kohua, ka korori ai; ka mutu te korori, ka riringi ki roto ki te kaha e rite an ate nui ki nga karani kua kohuatia. Na ko te toenga me riringi ki roto ki etahi pouamui.

Me waiho ano te kowhao o te pangu o waenganui o te kaha ki puaere ana; hei putanga ake mo te te kaha mo te paru hoki o roto o te pia. Kia matao ka riringi atu ai kia kotahi panikena rewenia, (yeast) ki roto ano ki taua kaha.

Kit e puta ake te huka it e kowhao i whakapuaretia, me koko ake ki te pune ka hoatu ki roto ki tetahi rihia, aha ranei. Ka mutu te koko ake I te huka, me riringi te wahi i ringitia ki roto ki nga pouamui hei whakaki ake ano mō te kāho.

Me pena tonu te mahi i nga ra katoa, a kia 7 nga ra, kua pai te pia. Katahi ano ka puru i te pangu kia mau rawa; ka wiri ai he kowhao iti ki tetahi pīro, ka kuhu ai i te korere mai mo te pia ki roto ki taua kowhao. Ki te mea te tangata kia 10 karani pia, me kohua kia 11
karani wai, kia 1 1/2 pauna hops, muri iho ka tatari, ka mutu te tatari, ka riringi ki roto ano ki taua kohua kia 11 pauna huka, kia rua panikena rewena (yeast.)
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MO TE HANGA REWENA.
YEAST.

Kia toru kia wha ranei nga riwai rarahi, kohutia kia maoa, ka tuki ai kia pēpē, kia kotahi pune nui paraoa, ka kororitia enei ki roto ki te panikena nui, aha ranei; me te wai mahana ano. Ka oti, me riringi ki roto ki nga pounamu. Kaua e u rawa te pangu ka whakatū ki te taha o te ahi. Kia ahua kake te rewena ka pokepoke ai i te paraoa.

Tenei ano tetahi tikanga mo te hanga rewena. Kia oti te pokepoke o te paraoa katahi ka tapahi i tetaki wahi iti. Ka tuku ki te rihi me te paraoa maroke. Ki te mea te tangata kia hānga ano he tario, katahi ia ka riringi i te wai mahana, i te huka, ki taua mea kawa i waiho ka tuku ki te taha o te ahi kia kake ai, ka riringi ki te pounamu. Tera ano tetahi mea e tere ai te kake ake o te rewena, ko te huka o te pia i koropupu ake i roto i te kāho. Kaua e mauamauria taua huka engari me riringi ki roto ki nga pounamu; hei te hanganga o te rewena ka riringi mai ai kia kotahi panikena o taua huka pia ki roto ki te rewena kia hohoro ai i te pupuhi ake o te rewena.
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MO TE HANGA PATA
(BUTTER.)

Kua mohio etahi tangata Maori ki te hanga pata. Ka ringihia e ratou te waiu i nga ahiahi ki roto ki te rihi nui tini (tin) ranei, aha ranei. Hei nga ata ka koko ai i te kirimi (Cream) ka tuku ki tetahi atu rihi, panikena nui ranei, ko te kirimi anake ta ratou e koko ai; ka nui te Cream katahi ka riringi ki roto ki te pounamu waha nui ka puru kia mau te pango. Ka ruiruia kia whai pata ai. Ekore [sic]e ra ko te nuinga kua pata, ko te waiu e toe ana, hei kai tena ma nga poaka. Ko tetahi tikanga tenei ma te tangata maori, me riringi te Cream ki roto ki te rihi hohonu, me patupatu tonu ki te pune rakau, kia whai pata ai.

Ki nga Pakeha ka hokona he poaka rakau hei hanga pata, ko te ingoa o taua pouaka he Churn. Ka nui ta ratou tupato ki te horoi tonu i te Churn, i nga rihi, ki te wai wera, ki te wai matao, kei piro te Churn, kei kino te pata.

Ka kore e pai te tangata ki te hanga pata, me whakatētē i nga kau ko te waiu hei whangai i nga pepi, hei kinaki ti, hei kinaki raihi, hei kinaki paraoa kororirori. Ka nui te pai o te paraoa kororirori. Ka nui te pai o te paraoa kororirori ki te miraka, ki te pai hoki te tunu. Me whakakoropupu te waiu ki mua, ko te paraoa me kororirori ki roto ki te panikena kia makū katoa i te wai, katahi ka riringi ki roto ki te waiu e koropupu ana, me kororirori ano: kia iti te ahi kei wera te kai.
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A book on how to make correct medicines and foods (Lady Martin 1869: 19-23)

English Translation

CUSTOMS FOR FOOD.

Maori cannot cook some Pakeha food, however they can cook some food.

According to the [Rata] eating potatoes only is not healthy, however milk, taro and soup, is. This is the reason why I wrote this book about how to make rewana by kneading taro; be careful, least the taro becomes soft.

This is also about how to make sweet soup.

The people at St. Stephen’s know how to make soup, furthermore, to some it is a nuisance to make soup, put the beef or pork into the pot, light the fire and set it to full, put the pot on the flame and leave it until it starts steaming, and if the beef or pork is too hard it won’t be soft, if it is not soft the soup will be watery. If the person eats it, it will sit heavily in your belly.

The correct thing to do is to slice thinly the pork or beef into small pieces, then put it into the pot with some salt and onion, two large spoons of rice, pour in some cold water to harden the fat in the water, put it on the flame again until it steams, reduce the heat and carefully boil the soup; let it cook for a long time. According to Pakeha, carrots, turnips and pumpkin are good in soup.

It is also a good thing for a Maori person to grow these vegetables in their garden; from these foods you will have an excellent soup.
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INSTRUCTIONS ON HOW TO MAKE DRIED SALTED PORK.

BACON

There are two good things about this work for the Maori person, one thing is to sell the two sides to the Pakeha, for a good price in town. Another thing is you can use the leftovers to make soup.

It is not correct to salt the dried pork in the summer, least it rots, it is better in the winter. You should choose a fat pig that is about one year old to kill. A female pig is better for this work.

Lie both sides of the pig onto a table or a bench to enable you to easily cut the forequarters and the thighs. After that carefully take all of the bones out, the backbone and the ribs. Place the knife close to the bones least some flesh is left on the bones. If a
bloody part is seen cut it out; afterwards smear it with salt, one pannikan of salt one spoon of salt petre, you should crush the salt petre till it's soft and smear it over the pig.

Lay the sides for 3 days (5 days for a larger pig) wipe off the excess salt, from the first smearing, the blood has been drawn out; after that smear again with salt, mix together 1 pound of salt and 1 pound of brown sugar. Smear it on thoroughly every day. Then wash your hands of it.

That is it for using the salt, however the daily task is to massage all areas of both sides, below and on top, with salt again, it should be like that every day for three weeks and then hang it in a smoky place, look at it carefully and smell it. If you see a rotten part on the meat, cut it off.

This is also the custom for hams.

Pour some water into a pot and add three pounds of salt and then put it onto the flame to boil, place it to the side to cool and then put the hams in some water, let it sit in the water for three weeks and then take it out; put one cup of salt and one cup of sugar and smear it on daily, and, leave it for seven days. You should sew a bag for the hams, least it gets infected by maggots; then hang it to smoke and let it dry.

You should cut the ribs and backbone, smear them with salt and boil it as soup.

SUGAR BEER 5 GALLONS.

Put 6 gallons of water into a pot and place on a flame. (The size of a gallon is 8 pannikans of water). Let the water boil and place in ¾ pound of hops. Do not put too much in or the beer will go sour.

Leave it to boil so the water and the hops become one; let the hops reduce; after that wait, put in 6 pounds of brown sugar to the same pot, then stir it; when finished stirring, pour the water into a barrel the same size as your pot. Furthermore pour the leftovers into some bottles.

Leave the stopper to the side to allow it to breathe; as a way for the sugar and residue to leave. Let it cool and then pour in one pannikan of yeast, into the same barrel.

If the sugar escapes from the hole, you should stir it with a spoon and put in a dish or something like that. When you have finished stirring the sugar you should pour it into the bottles that were used to fill the barrel.
You should be doing this every day, for 7 days so that the beer is good. And then place the stopper in firmly; drill a hole at one end, to place a tap into for the beer.
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If the person says 10 gallons of beer, you should boil 11 gallons of water, 1 ½ pounds of hops, after that wait once you have finished waiting, pour it into the pot with 11 pounds of sugar and two pannikans of yeast.
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FOR MAKING REWENA.

YEAST.

Three or four large potatoes, boil until cooked, and soft, large spoon of flour, stir these and the warm water into a large pannikan or something else. When finished you should pour it into a large bottle. Do not put the stopper on and then stand near the flame.

When the yeast starts rising knead with flour.

This is also another way for making yeast. Once finished kneading the bread, cut off one small piece. Place it on a floured dish. If the person wants to use taro, they should place it into warm water with sugar and the aforementioned dough that has been put to the side, put it near the flame to prove then pour it into a bottle.

There is also one way of speeding up the proving of the yeast, using the sugar from the beer which has bubbled up. Do not waste the aforementioned sugar but pour it into the bottles; once the yeast has matured pour in one pannikan of the aforementioned beer sugar into the yeast to quicken the proving of the yeast.
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TO MAKE BUTTER.

Some Maori people know how to make butter. In the afternoon milk will be poured into large tins or something like that by them.

In the morning beat the cream and place it in a large dish or large pannikan. Cream is the only thing that they beat; use lots of cream and then pour it into a bottle with a wide mouth, and then put the lid on. And then shake thoroughly to make butter. It won’t be long until most of it is butter, the leftover milk will be used as food for the pigs. Here is one way for Maori, cream should be placed into a large dish and stirred with a wooden spoon to make butter.

According to Pakeha a wooden box should be bought as a way of making butter, the name of this box is churn. They should be very careful to keep the churn clean, with hot water, then with cold water, least the churn gets smelly, least the butter go bad.
If the person does not like making butter they should milk cows and the milk should be used to feed babies, used in tea, used for rice, and for paraoa kororirori as a way of cooking it well. The milk should be boiled beforehand, and the flour should be stirred into a pannikan and dissolved with water and then pour it into the boiling milk, stir again; keep on a low flame least it is burnt.
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