In his great work *Die polynesischen Tabusitten*, F. R. Lehmann has subjected the sources of Polynesian religion to a rather thorough evaluation. He writes (1930: 3) that one should expect in the texts in the original language to find the most important sources, but then adds: “Jedoch darf man sie auch wiederum nicht überschätzen und etwa glauben, allein durch ihre Analyse die endgültige Lösung zu finden. Denn schon in der Aufnahme des Textes, vor allem aber in seiner Übersetzung und Interpretation, können Fehlerquellen liegen, die von den beteiligten Personen und Umständen herbeigeführt sein können und auf die wir noch ausführlicher zu sprechen kommen. Vor allem ist bei Texten, die von den Eingeborenen selbst aufgezeichnet worden sind, die Gefahr einer mindestens unbewussten Europäisierung der Berichte zu gross, als dass man sie übersehen dürfte. Denn das Schreibenkönnen der Eingeborenen ist ja selbst ein Zeugnis ihrer Europäisierung.” Lehmann actually goes further than suggested by these words; for the texts play quite a subordinate part in his two papers on *mana* and *tabu*.

I hope that my work—particularly the section on *mana*—shows what a risk is run by setting the texts aside as secondary sources as compared with reports of travellers and ethnographers. In the case of the Maoris, there is no doubt that it is among the texts that we have to look for the sources of the very highest value. It is of the greatest importance that the texts allow us to become familiar with the notions in which a people has itself expressed their experiences, also such concepts as may be missed by the ethnographer.
in the field. Add to this that texts that, like those of the Polynesians, contain myths, legends, and sagas are full of living samples of the life of the people, which release us from the rigid generalizations and cultural blinkers which one risks to find in travellers and ethnographers. To a certain degree, translations of Maori traditions and intelligent accounts of definite events may therefore also offer serviceable material. So I have in this work acted on the principle of making texts take precedence of other sources and of studying concrete situations and events rather than of using general formulations.

When the texts are placed in the front rank it is especially necessary to recognize the correctness of Lehmann’s caution, but to practice it in a better way so that we do not throw out the baby with the bath water. The task is therefore that of eliminating the less good texts, i.e. such texts as in a considerable degree bear traces of European influence.

This task involves great difficulties. Old age is in itself a poor criterion, because most texts of importance have been taken down at a time when the Europeanizing was in rapid development. A comparatively late text from an unaffected region may be of greater value than an early text from a region Christianized at an early stage. Even a combination of age and place offers a criterion of limited value, provided that this information is available and can be utilized at all. The age, memory, character, and personal attitude of the informant in question towards the European influence play a dominant part here, so that we are mainly referred to internal criteria.

There is yet a reason for attaching importance to the internal criteria. Through the centuries there have been constant transformations in the oral traditions, through which new versions of myths, legends, and sagas have arisen. All these new formations of course have equal rights as sources of Maori culture as long as this is essentially the same. This process of re-creation was continued after the arrival of the Europeans; strictly speaking it is a minority of texts which do not bear at least small traces of this process. So we are confronted with the question: where to draw the line? It is important to realize that the answer must depend on the purpose for which the texts are to be used. When the task consists in drawing a portrait of the Maori’s personality as determined by culture the answer may be formulated as follows: Europeans, guns, saucepans, and cotton do not change the picture as long as the Maori thinks them into his old thoughts about honour, vengeance, mana, gift, etc. His experience of vengeance does not suddenly change its character because he can shoot his enemy; the gift is not changed because he can make presents of tobacco, cloth, etc. In return, we must reject a source the moment we discover that its originator thinks new thoughts about these fundamentals, and it is of no interest at all if the text does not make any reference to guns and other novelties.
Te Rangi Hiroa has—no doubt rightly—expressed a certain skepticism with regard to some details in The Lore of the Whare-Wananga, Part II, (Rangi Hiroa, 1950: 16 f., 29, 38, 48). It is certain that the historical parts of this work have benefited (if it is a benefit!) by the extended geographical horizon which the Europeans brought with them. Furthermore, many of the names introduced are undoubtedly unauthenticated. Still, this does not make the work unserviceable for the present task (but indeed for others). To mention an example, it is very possible that Tamatea was never given the new names attributed to him (Whatahoro 1915: 236), but the custom of taking new names is well authenticated from olden times in Maori culture; therefore the passage may very well be adduced so long as the subject is customs as such (1915: 128 f.). A similar view may be applied to some of the criticism which can be directed towards the first volume of the same work (see e.g. Rangi Hiroa 1950: 435 ff.), but it is evident that whenever we study mythology and the contents of the myths as such, this criticism becomes of the greatest importance. This new problem, to the solution of which we shall try to contribute in later publications, will require and give rise to new criteria. Even though the results of the different kinds of criticism are not, of course, quite independent, it will be difficult to collect the whole of the critical investigations in this place; so we shall in the main keep to the criteria which are most important for the subjects treated in the present publication. It is evident that if we shall distinguish between the sources in which the original Maori thoughts are still fresh, and those which express a European renewal of the Maori, we must necessarily avail ourselves of inner criteria.

The inner criteria must be sought partly by a comparison of the texts between them, partly by an evaluation of the probability that individual features can be due to European influence. The difficulty is that the former kind of criteria is only found as the work with the texts proceeds, and furthermore this includes a danger that a subjective estimate can interfere in the evaluation. Fortunately, however, there are in linguistic usage criteria which are both so well-defined and well founded that the danger of the investigator being carried away by his own points of view is almost nil.

As a matter of fact we find in certain texts a usage which with certainty can be characterized as a rupture with that of the past. Such words as inoi and mana are of special interest. Yet they cannot claim the same importance as criteria. When inoi, “pray,” is used instead of karakia, “recite a ritual text,” a completely extraneous thought is indeed introduced, namely that “prayer” should be concerned; but certainly it cannot be said that the word inoi itself has become without meaning; it only introduces an extraneous meaning. We cannot beforehand reject the possibility that the author knew that actually the word to be used was karakia, but he thought that he might be more easily understood by the Europeans for whom the text has been written, by using inoi in the
same way as the missionaries; indeed, it is not precluded that he interpreted the Christian prayer as a karakia so that the leap in meaning is actually very short.

It appears that matters are quite different in the case of the word mana.

Maning already noticed that mana was wrongly used, for he writes: “The word has been bandied about a good deal of late years, and meanings often attached to it by Europeans which are incorrect, but which the natives sometimes accept because it suits their purpose.”

In Maning’s surroundings the incorrect use of the word by the Maoris must have been conscious, at any rate in his opinion. This is hardly the case as regards the erroneous applications to which Hare Hongi takes exception in Tarakawa. Hare Hongi’s remarks are of interest also because as a half-blood Maori he stood in an immediate relation to the language. He summarizes his criticism in these words: “I feel much concerned about these things, for if it is allowed to go forth that such utterances are tika, that a man has mana after his death and that a man has mana ki te whenua, which has wrongly been said of late, then it is a corruption and perversion of the word more serious in its effect than the jangle of a discordant musical note, which is bad enough.”

Hare Hongi’s words are strong, but not exaggerated.

Now, there are some texts in which the following two turns of phrase occur:

Mana ki tetahi mea, “mana to something”;
mana ki runga ki tetahi mea, “mana over something.”

These two turns of phrase jar against Old-time Maori usage and can with certainty be characterized as false for the following reasons:

1. The texts in which they especially occur are often of such a character that they arouse our distrust for other reasons as well. This applies in particular to White (1997a: 148-163), where merely a superficial reading will convince us that we are confronted with an otherwise interesting attempt at reshaping the Maori traditions on the model of the Bible. The writer both sets up a number of “prophets” who preach the pure Maori religion and execute judgments over the infidels, and relates a legend of the Flood which not only decidedly deviates from the one otherwise known by the Maoris, but furthermore clearly copies that of the Bible.

Tarakawa’s contributions to The Journal of the Polynesian Society are

1. Maning 1906: 210 (written before 1863, see Introduction, xi).
not quite so openly at variance with old tradition, but the more one studies them, the more suspicious things are found (e.g. the use of the word *tuahu* about the hand, Tarakawa 1894c 207). The feeling gradually forces itself upon the reader that Tarakawa is something of a poet—in a good sense, too. Unconsciously he places his ancestors and their deeds in a slightly dim and mysterious light. This may be illustrated by part of the speech which Tarakawa lets Te Wera make while he is running his eye over the large number of enemies which have been killed in revenge of his son (i.e. nephew): “My son! You will come forth from these men’s stomachs and from their teeth, while I, your father, will search for you and be caught by yearning for you.”

The rest of the speech expresses pride of the great vengeance which has been achieved. Christian resurrection and pagan vengeance have here been fused in an effective way. He often gives colour by means of strange rituals; but especially does he use the word *mana* to provide a mysterious and pagan atmosphere. There are few texts in which the word occurs so frequently as in those written by Tarakawa, just because the word is to serve as an interesting and suggestive element of his style and to throw a romantic light on the ancestor, all of it of course unconsciously and only possible because Tarakawa has lost immediate touch with the old days and got a romantic view instead.

(2) Maning’s information and Hare Hongi’s criticism, which pounces upon one of the two expressions (*mana ki tetahi mea*).

(3) Both expressions are probably imitations of English idioms:

- right to—*mana ki*
- authority over—*mana ki runga ki* (or *ki runga i*).

(4) While all other applications of *mana* give a connected picture of the meaning of the word, these expressions fall completely outside, indeed are actually senseless according to the proper meaning of the word. Just here is the decisive difference between incorrect use of *inoi* and *mana*. A man who naively writes or says “*mana kī*” or “*mana ki runga kī*” has in this way confirmed the fact that on a very central point he stands completely outside the old Maori culture. It is due to this that in the application of the word *mana* in a text we have an excellent criterion for the value of the text as a source, a criterion which is as objective as can in any way be provided.

We can then compile the following list of texts

4.  Tarakawa 1900c: 70.

5.  Another characteristic passage is found in Tarakawa 1894c: 204, where he obviously wants to demonstrate his superiority to the old traditions.
which are less good sources or at least suspicious.

White (1887a: 4-15). The text cannot be criticized as regards *mana*, but it contains information which Best (1923: 10) considers doubtful, and furthermore, the use of *wairua* may be wrong, see p. 240. The text has therefore been used with some caution.

White (1887a: 47-49). We find here a place in which *mana* is used without its referring at all to the surrounding world (“by his own *mana* he (viz. Tawhaki) became healthy again;” White (1887a: 48). As this is unique, I am of opinion that this text should be omitted from the discussion about the meaning of *mana*.

White (1887a: 148-163). Both usage with regard to *mana* and contents are of such a character that this text should be completely disregarded.

White (1888a: 23-45). “*Mana ki runga ki*” is used in one place only (White 1888a: 37), and the text as a whole does not give a bad impression. It has been disregarded in respect of *mana*, but otherwise it should be possible to use it with caution.

White (1888b: 45-49) according to White is a reprint of Grey (1855: 147-149), but contains the word *mana* in some passages which are not found in Grey (1855); it will therefore be the most cautious method to confine ourselves to Grey (1855: 147-149). On White’s rendering of texts see p. 266 ff.

Tarakawa’s texts. 1893: 220; 1894a: 59; 1894b: 168; 1894c: 204; Tarakawa and Ropiha 1899: 122; Tarakawa 1899a: 179; 1899b: 235; 1900a: 47; 1900b: 65; 1900c: 133 (which, however, mainly consists of old songs; thus it is not Tarakawa’s own text); 1909: 205; 1911a: 39; 1911b: 185. *Mana ki* and the like occurs in several places: 1893: 223; 1894c: 204; 1900b: 66, 70. *Mana* is mixed with concept of *tapu*. 1893: 226-27.

An anonymous text dated “Omahu, Oketopa (i.e. October), 1880.” Anonymous 1912: 83. The expression “*mana ki*” occurs once.

Whatahoro (1909: 90). “*Mana ki runga i*” is used once. He may also be responsible for these idioms with an English stamp (Best 1919: 95; Whatahoro 1927: 349). It is of special interest that Whatahoro can make such a mistake, because he has mediated a good number of texts, particularly the *Lore of the Whare-Wananga*. The idiom occurs twice there (Whatahoro 1913: 52 and Whatahoro 1915: 46). It is
very possible that Whatahoro introduced it in both places; for if the total number of pages of these texts are taken into consideration, it must be admitted that these two passages stand greatly isolated, exactly as might be expected by a mistake on the part of the recorder. But otherwise the text must be estimated in two parts according to the two chief informants:

Nepia Pohuhu. (Whatahoro 1913: 18-53; Whatahoro 1915: 170-174, to which should be added Whatahoro 1923: 1-4). Although I am greatly inclined to the opinion that the unfortunate part of the text (Whatahoro 1913: 52) was introduced by the recorder, I have as regards mana, to be on the safe side, disregarded his texts, the more so as his view of the fate of the spirit after death has a Christian colouring (see p. 251). As a whole he must, however, be considered a fairly reliable source, although not on a level with

Te Matorohanga, who is the source of all other texts in Lore 1-11 (Whatahoro 1913 and 1915 apart from Whatahoro 1915: 24-26 and 144-148). Considering the size and the general quality of the text, we dare with fair certainty assume that the idiom (Whatahoro 1915: 46) cannot be due to him. Texts due to Te Matorohanga have therefore been used also for the investigations into mana.

Tikao (1921: 16-18). Tikao has communicated a text to Beattie, but unfortunately we know it only through Beattie’s translation. This text has had the undeserved honour to be included by Richard Thurnwald in the Religionsgeschichtliches Lesebuch (1927). Tikao here gives an explanation according to which “the mana of the Maori was nothing but sacred fire;” the whole is mixed up with cosmological speculations. This text has been disregarded here for three reasons:

(1) It occurs only in translation.

(2) It stands quite isolated. Therefore it is most improbable that it should express old Maori thought.

---

6. See further Williams 1937: 105 ff., where Williams critically throws light on the genesis of the work and on Te Rangi Hiroa’s criticism mentioned above. The question of the value of the work will be resumed in connection with the Io-mythology in a later paper.
(3) Even if so—indeed, for that very reason—what can after all be expected from an attempt at an explicit explanation of such a concept as mana? It seems obvious to me that such an explanation for a start is practically worthless. Any explanation must of course start from conditions which seem clear and obvious; but if the person who explains them is rooted in Old-time Maori culture, such conditions will be radically different from those of the European, and hence the explanation must refer to quite a different basis. In other words, if the explanation is correct from a Maori point of view, it is not the explanation needed by the European. Add to this that if it is at all a somewhat artificial thing for a primitive person to write down or have written down his traditions, it is a many times more unnatural situation to explain the things which for centuries have been obvious presuppositions. When a “theology” in this way is lured from primitive people, we must in any case be on our guard.

The criticism of the texts advanced here has its special validity on the study of mana and furthermore of words of a related character. Besides, it can contribute materially to a general criticism of the texts. We cannot, however, take it for granted beforehand that the correct use of words like mana should necessarily give rise to a good rendering of versions of myths. Apart from the fact that some texts can already now be completely or partly rejected, the question of the criticism of the texts must be resumed in connection with the study of the contents of the myths. On the same occasion, the conditions under which the texts have been collected will also be adduced with the greatest benefit. Therefore I shall here omit further reasons why some texts communicated by Best during his last years have been used with great caution (e.g. the Appendix to his Maori Religion 1924a and Best 1926a: 21-30. Cf. also Te Rangi Hiroa 1950: 353 on The Whare Kohanga).

On John White’s Ancient History of the Maori.

There are special reasons in favor of inspecting White’s collection of texts in more detail; for such severe criticism has been directed against it that I should hardly have dared to use the collection if, amongst other things, the war had not prevented this criticism coming to my hands until after the present work had been almost finished. I am, however, of opinion that the result in the main justifies the use of White’s collection and that the criticism far overshoots the mark. As furthermore this collection, both by its size and by the considerable interest attaching to many of the texts, is of the greatest importance, I am in so far grateful for the play of chance which has made me finish the work in ignorance of the criticism.

Considering that White’s collection is so important, both in general and
for my work in particular, the question in what follows is to be made the
object of a special study. As a general condemnation of White’s collection
would demand a recasting of part of my work, I may be biased in favor of the
said collection, but I am confident that the discussion will convince the reader
of the justification of my view. I shall first adduce in a chronological order the
rather varying evaluations of the collection which I have come across; next I
shall try to determine how justifiable is the criticism of White’s work.

In 1896, W. E. Gudgeon (1896: 3) wrote of White’s work that it
is not reliable. The best that can be said of it is, that it is the natural
result of the system on which the material for the work was collected.
Manuscript books were sent round amongst the Maoris, with a request
that some member of each tribe would write therein their history
and traditions. These books did not as a rule fall into the hands of the
old and learned men, for the very good reason that they did not write
with sufficient facility to justify them in undertaking such onerous work,
hence it developed upon younger men, who not only had no real knowl-
edge of their own, but furthermore had not the authority necessary to
overcome the deeply-rooted feeling of distrust that may be observed in
any old Maori if you venture to write down his words.

The severest attack was made by H. W. Williams in the preface to his
*Dictionary of the Maori Language* (1917: xiv), where he gives his reasons for
his moderate use of White’s texts in the dictionary. Having established that
they are full of misprints, he continues: “Another factor is the obliteration, in
most cases, of accurate indications of the origin of his material. Where these
indications are given, a comparison with the original will almost invariably
disclose an unpardonable recklessness on the part of the editor. This being
his method of dealing with works previously published, small reliance can be
placed on his fidelity in presenting matter which has come into his hands in
manuscript.” For illustration, Williams adduces a piece of text from White
(1887b: 86), which has been taken from Grey (1855: 112), the differences
being marked out in print. This sample must give the reader an impression of
an almost incomprehensible arbitrariness on the part of White in his handling
of the texts.

With reference to this criticism Friederici (1929: 482) rejects the
traditions about the *kumara* found in White, which traditions do not
fit into his theories and contain self-contradictions and impossibilities.

In 1936, J. C Andersen in a review (1936: 160) remarked that White told
the Maoris stories from Shakespeare, Byron, and Walter Scott in order to draw
them out. “In return, he gathered a wealth of their stories, as may be seen in the
six volumes of his work referred to (viz. *The Ancient History of the Maori*).”

In 1941, George Graham in 1941b: 120 f., advanced some rather
sensational views as to how the texts in both White’s and Grey’s collections came into existence. He writes, being especially interested in the sources of Marutuahu’s history:

My researches among the available original Ms. material of these writers (deposited in the Auckland Public Library), seems to show that these accounts were drawn up first in English from a large number of scrappy and disconnected Maori narratives, and evidently taken down verbatim from time to time. From these sources the histories above quoted appear to have been compiled in English, and then translated into Maori, probably by John White.

This applies more or less throughout both these books (viz. Grey 1855, and White 1887a, 1887b, 1887c, 1888a, 1888b, 1890), with the exception of some narratives by Hone Nahe, the original Mss. of which are wholly in that old chief’s handwriting.

Finally, Johannes C. Andersen in 1947 issued a pamphlet, “White’s Ancient History of the Maori” (1947b) in which not much credit is left for White. While Andersen in 1936 mentioned how White collected his material, in 1947 he only dwells on the fact that he borrowed Mss. from Wohlers, Stack and Shortland and rewrote them; for instance Wohlers’ Ms., which was written in the dialect of the South Island, was rewritten in the dialect of the North Island, etc. He sums up the whole as follows: “The history must not be regarded as original material, but original material which has passed through the alembic White—and only occasionally may it be known how it has changed in the passing.”

Several of these judgements on White when taken separately are rather crushing; collectively they are perhaps not quite so effective, among other things because the critics more or less disagree on the point on which White is so execrable. We shall now attempt a general appraisal of the whole matter, deciding it into three questions which can be mixed up only to the detriment of clarity:

What value can be ascribed to The Ancient History as a source of history in a European sense?

Are his texts genuine traditions, which originate from good informants? (We are thus here thinking of the value from a Maori point of view.)

How did White handle the collected texts as their publication?

The first question has only been included because it should be clearly emphasized that the value of a tradition as a source of knowledge of definite events from the past of the Maoris should not be confused with the other two questions, as is done in Gudgeon and Frederici. The traditions concerning the introduction of the *kumara* into New Zealand are undoubtedly genuine enough. Frederici is of course right in distrusting the historical reliability, but
this is simply due to the fact that they are ritual myths (and as such of great value and interest), for which reasons their defects are sources of objective history should neither be blamed on informants nor on White.

The second question is mainly about what informants were used by White, but this is inextricably bound up with the question how the texts were procured. This was done in three ways.

Some material has been taken from already published texts or from Mss. borrowed from Wohlers and others, as stated by J. C. Andersen. This is beyond doubt since White himself states this in his prefaces.

Other texts have been taken down by the Maori’s themselves. White says so himself in a preface (White 1887a: pref. V), it also appears from the texts themselves (White 1888b: 144f., 160 ff.), and the last-mentioned place furthermore confirms that Gudgeon is right in stating that books with blank leaves in which they might write were distributed.

Finally, some material was undoubtedly taken down from dictation. White himself says (White 1887a: v): “The Maori version is given as written by, or from the dictation of, the priests.”

As to the informants in the last two cases Williams is right in writing of “the obliteraton in most cases, of accurate indications;” only it is a little unjust to White to let this statement stand alone. As a matter of fact, Grey does not give the least indication of his sources and Wohlers only in part does so, whereas it is White’s merit always to state from what tribe every text originates, and furthermore in the preface to vol. 1 (White 1887a: vi-vii) to give the names of a number of Maoris who were informants. Actually White’s collection represents progress as compared with the early text editions. Furthermore even later publications in The Journal of the Polynesian Society often leave much to be desired as regards this kind of information.

Looking at the informants whom White offers his thanks, we find such names as Nepia Pohuhu, Te Whatahoro, and Honi Nahe, people who are in high (perhaps too high) esteem for their insight into the traditions. These must even be among the youngest and therefore—on the whole—the poorest informants, as White writes that most of them were dead at the time in question (1887). Accordingly, there do not seem to be any reason for making special complaints against The Ancient History on this point, as done e.g. by Gudgeon.

We shall now consider the last question: how did White render the texts? The criticism raised against him in this respect is so severe that if we accept it, it must be asked: to whom do the texts give expression, White or the Maoris? The question crops up of its own accord when we look at the

7. I hope to discuss this question fairly thoroughly in a later publication.
comparison made by Williams (1932: pref. xiv). White there makes innumerable small and large alterations in the text, replaces kua by ka, ka pouri tonu taua tamaiti muringa by a ka pouri a Mauipotiki, exchanges Maui with his mother, etc.

On this there are various things to be said. In the first place, Williams has selected a passage which is apt to shock the reader. If instead he had compared Grey (1853: 136) with White (1890: 197 f.), the picture would have looked quite different. Even if we make a comparison with thirty lines from this page (while there are only twenty in the section adduced by Williams), we find only seven deviations; two of these are reasonable connections since Williams himself has introduced them in his edition of Grey. Of the remaining five, two are ordinary misprints (he for te, waha for waho), two consist in ia being altered into a ia, and finally the two members in i Whakatiwai a Hotumui have been transposed. These alterations are of a fairly innocent character, misprints are misprints, and it is obvious that White’s work is richly provided with them, although it is hardly much worse than Grey 1853. Among the deviations those concerning punctuation are not mentioned, but White’s edition at any rate represents great progress on this point.

We can now divide the texts which White according to himself took from Grey into two groups. The first includes the stories about Hotunui and Paoa (White 1888a, 197-210, 215-236). The sample just mentioned is fairly typical of the whole group. White has corrected some misprints, but introduced nearly as many new ones. Only a very few and superficial alterations of the text have been made. In a few places some words have dropped out, in some places some explanatory words have been inserted, generally in the way that the speaker’s name has been put in before the speech, and the like. Even though we cannot of course, approve of these alterations, it must be said that for our purpose it makes no difference. In any case these texts are rendered in quite a different way from group no. 2. This group includes the sections “Maui” (White 1887b: 84-101), “Puarata raua ko Tautohito” (White 1888b: 45-49), and “Ka patua a Kaiwhare e Hakawai” (White 1888b: 49-50) here there is hardly one sentence which is not a little different from Grey’s edition; furthermore several lines have been removed or added in some places. The section “Ka patua a Kaiwhare e Hakawai” is actually so different from the corresponding section in Grey that one would hardly consider Grey to be the source, if White had not himself made a statement to this effect.

The great difference between the two groups is suggestive. Is it reasonable to take group two as a sample of the way in which White renders texts? Should we not rather imagine that group one is typical of White and then ask the question: What can have induced White to make such comprehensive alterations in group two that whole periods are interpolated in some places? The possibility stares one in the face that White probably had another version
which was interwrought with Grey’s text—if the facts are not the inverse, that White rendered a single version and Grey interworked them, as we know that he actually did, even to such a degree that he exchanged proper names! (Williams 1906: 179; Biggs 1952: 179-183; cf. Percy Smith 1900: 257). White might very well have such slightly deviating versions from the time when he acted as secretary to Grey and printed them with a reference to Grey’s collection, and might—with the slovenliness of which he cannot be acquitted—have failed to think of or notice the differences.

This is of course a hypothesis only, but it gives a possibility of understanding how there can be such a great difference as that actually found between the two groups, and this difference at any rate makes it difficult to subscribe to Williams’ complete condemnation of White.

Whereas Williams otherwise, as he generally is, is very sober, this adjective can hardly be used about Graham when he criticizes White. According to Graham, there is on the whole no relationship at all between the original text and the one published; it seems as if the stories have been translated into English, worked together and translated back into Maori. The theory does not seem probable; it is not easily imaginable what should tempt White or anybody else to apply this working method. Johannes C. Andersen is more cautious, but still he is of opinion that White coloured the whole material in a way which can only occasionally be checked. Above we have discussed the cases which can be checked; it applies to the rest of them that if White’s influence cannot be checked, it can only be made the object of guessing.

Graham and J. C Andersen thus will not believe in White’s own assurances (White 1887a: pref. v): “The Maori version is given as written by, or from the dictation of, the priests,” indeed, Graham is of opinion that the texts have been written by White more than by the Maoris. But if Graham is right, we must wonder at the dialectal and other peculiarities found in the various texts. Although I have not made any studies with a special view to dialects, I have especially in White’s texts come across several dialectal peculiarities; see e.g tupu (p. 40, note 47), manawareka (p. 231, note 60), ngakau about a song or thing that is to enlist avengers (p. 234, note 102), ma (Prytz-Johansen 1948: 23). If so, such peculiarities about the texts as the use of mana in White 1887a, 148-163 (see p. 264), i and ki after noho (Prytz-Johansen 1948: 38) would be remarkable, too. Finally, it may be asked if White’s critics do not stumble over one another when one of them (Williams) criticizes his translations, and the other maintains that he himself wrote most of the Maori texts; one would think that he could translate the Maori he wrote himself. The fact is that there are parts which White hardly understood and consequently did not write.

If we are to add up the result it seems to me that we cannot with certainty
say anything worse about White than that he was a somewhat slovenly editor, the rest is conjectures. We therefore end where this critical appendix began: the proper appraisal must be made on the basis of inner criteria; at any rate until we get an unprejudiced and thorough appraisal, based on the archival material which seems to exist in New Zealand.\footnote{Critical evaluations of the literature on the Maoris (books of travel and ethnographical descriptions) are found in Best 1912: 4, and Lehmann 1930: 5-54. On John Rutherford’s contributions to “The New Zealanders,” see Williams 1890: 453ff. There is reason to call attention to the fact that Makereti’s book does not, as one might think, mainly contain original material; but that this is only the case to a limited extent. Much has been adduced from Best’s works without any reference to the source, sometimes in a rather remarkable way (cf. e.g. pp. 315 and 333 f. with respectively Best 1919: 86 and Best 1924b: 438 f.). It is hardly necessary to emphasize that Rout’s and A. C Wilson’s books are only of interest to throw light on the transition between old and new in Maori culture; the traditions recorded are by no means of the age imagined by the two authors.}