

Patterns in the Names of Māori Representative Sportsmen in New Zealand 1884–2007

Philip W. Matthews
New Zealand

Abstract

Since the late nineteenth century, just over 2,200 men have represented New Zealand in rugby union, rugby league and cricket. Of these men 310 are known to have Māori ancestry. In this paper six questions are asked of these Maori representatives. These are:

- (1) What are the players' given names and surnames?
- (2) What are the languages of the players' given names and surnames?
- (3) What patterns occur, by languages, for the players' combined given names and surnames?
- (4) What changes have there been in the patterns, by languages, of the combined given names and surnames, over time?
- (5) What societal pressures might the parents of the players have been under when naming their sons?
- (6) What naming choices did the parents have in regard to those pressures?

Explanations for the findings and changes are sought in early naming practices, missionary and church naming practices, government policies about the nature of New Zealand society (e.g., in education, naming, housing and language), internal Māori migration patterns and intermarriage patterns. In conclusion, Māori activism in the 1970s and its possible influence on given and family names are commented on.

GLOSSARY (the four terms have the same form in the singular and plural)

Māori: a New Zealander whose ancestors arrived in New Zealand in about the twelfth or thirteenth centuries

nonMāori: any New Zealander not a Māori (e.g., a Pākehā, a Croatian, a Samoan, etc.)

Pākehā: a New Zealander of European descent

Pākehā Māori: a nonMāori of any origin who lived amongst Māori as a Māori

Note: In the past, spelling and capitalization of Māori and Pākehā has varied considerably. In quotations the original forms are used.

1. Introduction

New Zealand's British colonists brought with them a range of sports unknown to Māori. The administrators of three of the sports – rugby union, rugby league and cricket – kept records from the time they were organized at the local and provincial levels and, subsequently, at the national representative level. Hence, more than a century of nearly complete records are publicly available for these three sports.

Since the late nineteenth century, just over 2,200 men have represented New Zealand in cricket, rugby league and rugby union in the period 1884 to midway through 2007. Of these 310 are known in various ways to be Māori (hereafter the players) (CricinfoNew Zealand; Montgomerie 2004; Neely and King 1986; New Zealand Rugby Football Union [Incorporated]; New Zealand Rugby League; Palenski 2007; and Wood 2008) (see Table 1).

SPORT	DATE OF FIRST NZ REPRESENTATIVE TEAM	NUMBER OF NZ REPRESENTATIVES	NUMBER KNOWN TO BE MAORI	PERCENTAGE KNOWN TO BE MAORI
cricket	1894	397	2	0.50
rugby league	1907	745	162	21.74
rugby union	1884	1,071	146	13.63
TOTALS	—	2,213	310	14.00

Table 1: Data about cricket, rugby league and rugby union representatives

This paper investigates the names of the players from 1884 to 1987, and the patterns those names form, and seeks to explain any changes in the names and the patterns that are identified. To this end the following questions are asked:

- (1) What are the players' given names and surnames?
- (2) What are the languages of the players' given names and surnames?
- (3) What patterns occur, by languages, for the players' combined given names and surnames?
- (4) What changes have there been in the patterns, by languages, of the combined given names and surnames, over time?
- (5) What societal pressures might the parents of the players have been under when naming their sons?
- (6) What naming choices did the parents have in regard to those pressures?

2. Traditional Māori Naming Practices

Precontact Māori “names have always a signification, and are never given at random” (Taylor 1974:157) and the “names carried histories of people, places and events” (Smith 1999:157). Amongst other things names could be commemorative (Williams 1912 and Anderson 1942:72), describe the person (Taylor 1974: 157), or refer to a person's occupation. Most people had only one name but persons of high rank could have at least two: a baby name and a later name. Names could be changed, e.g., by taking the name of a dead person, by celebrating success in a battle or some other activity (Cody 1953: 16), and by adding to the existing name.

3. The Languages of the Players' Names

The names of the players are divided into three language categories (see Table 2): Māori, NonMāori and Māorified names (see Table 2). Māori names (hereafter referred to as M names) are those that originate both historically and contemporarily from within the Māori branch of the Polynesian languages; NonMāori names (N) are those from languages other than Māori; and Māorified names (X) are those taken from a NonMāori language and shaped to fit Māori pronunciation, spelling and syllable rules.

Māori names (M)

Given names Hikatarewa, Mauriohooho, Tutekawa, Te-Whata
Surnames Kuiti, Kururangi, Pouwhiuwhiu

NonMāori names (N)

Given names Andrew, Carlos, Edmund, Kees, Sana, William
Surnames Erceg, Henry, McLeod, Mayerhoeffler, Stanaway, Warbrick

NonMāori language names that have been Māorified (X)

Given names Hemi, Henare, Manuera, Tiaki
Surnames Hemi, Omana, Reke, Nepia, Wiremu

Table 2: Examples of Māori names (M), NonMāori names (N) and Māorified names (X)

4. The Players' Names

Players' given names

No Māori player has only one name. Of the 310 players 5 have two sets of public names: (1) Arapeta Wharepapa = Albert Paurini Asher; (2) Te Keepa Pouwhiuwhiu = Ernest Asher; (3) Teone Kerei Taiaroa = John Grey Taiaroa; (4) Tiaki Omana = Jack Ormond; and (5) Joseph Rukingi Reke = Joseph Rukinga Rogers. Thus the total number of names considered is 315. In total the players have 617 given names between them. There are 63 M names, five of which – Nuki, Rangi, Rukingi, Tama and Whetu – occur twice while 58 M names occur only once. There are 230 different N names. John occurs 27 times, James 24 times and William 23 times. There are 10 other N names which occur more than once and 159 N names which occur only once. One X name – Wiremu – occurs three times and two – Hohepa and Hone – twice. There are 35 X names that occur only once.

Table 3 shows that N names account for 82% of all the given names, with just under half of all the given names being first names and a third being second names. M and X given names both account for about 3% of first names while in contrast M second names occur twice as frequently (6.5%) as both M first names and X first and second names. Third and fourth given names are uncommon: for M names 1.5% and for X names 0.3% respectively of the total.

LANGUAGE CATEGORY	TOTAL GIVEN NAMES BY LANGUAGE CATEGORY AND NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE								TOTAL NAMES	
	1st Name		2nd Name		3rd Name		4th Name			
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
Māori (M)	19	3.1	40	6.5	8	1.3	1	0.2	68	11.1
NonMāori (N)	277	44.8	207	33.5	21	3.4	2	0.3	507	82.1
Māorified (X)	19	3.1	21	3.4	2	0.3	0	0	42	6.8
TOTALS	315	51.0	268	43.4	31	5.0	3	0.5	617	100

Table 3: Distribution of given names by language category and given name position

Players' surnames

There are 256 different surnames (See Table 4). There are 39 different M surnames, which account for 15% of the surnames. Only one M surname, Taiaroa, occurs twice. There are 196 different N surnames which account for 76.6% of the surnames. One surname (Smith) occurs five times, four N surnames (Edwards, Shelford, Williams and Wynyard) each occur four times, seven each occur three times and 25 each occur twice. 159 N surnames only occur once. There are 21 different X surnames which account for 8.2% of the surnames. Only three (Hemi, Horo and Tamati) each occur twice. 18 X names occur only once.

FREQUENCY	NUMBER OF DIFFERENT SURNAMES			TOTAL SURNAMES
	MĀORI	NONMĀORI	MĀORIFIED	
5		1		1
4		4		4
3		7		7
2	1	25	3	29
1	38	159	18	215
TOTAL SURNAMES	39	196	21	256

Table 4: Māori surnames by frequency and language groups

Patterns

Analysis of the players' names on the basis of the language category (M, N and X) and the position of the given names (1st, 2nd, 3rd and 4th) yields, when added to the surnames, 42 different patterns. These can be grouped into six groups:

- A. Māori surname and given name(s);
- B. Māori surname and Māori, Māorified and nonMāori given names;
- C. Māorified surname and given name(s);
- D. Māorified surname and Māori, Māorified and nonMāori given names;
- E. NonMāori surname and given name(s); and
- F. NonMāori surname and Māori, Māorified and nonMāori given names.

Patterns over time

To ascertain pattern changes over time the approximately five yearly NZ censuses have been used as the reference point. The censuses have been joined so the periods used are eight years (1 period), nine years (2), ten years (8) and eleven years (2), a total of thirteen periods. Players are then placed in the period on the basis of the year of birth; the first birth year is 1862 and the last is 1985.

Table 5 shows that even though Group E contains only four patterns it accounts for 63% of the names, while Groups A and C, also with only four patterns, account for only about 2.5% of the names. Group E has been chosen by the parents more than half the time in all but three time periods. Patterns in Groups B, D and F were chosen infrequently in the early years, but increased in the periods 1927–1936 to 1967–1976 for Group F and, for Groups B and D, in the periods 1946–1956 to 1977–1986. As shown, patterns in Groups A and C barely feature in the choices in any period.

What might account for the popularity of Group E, the evident lack of popularity of Groups A and C and the moderate but varying levels of popularity for the remaining Groups? Explanations will be sought in the pressures on the possible choices the players' parents, all of whom would have been born in the period from the 1840s to the early 1980s, could make.

GROUP and PATTERNS	YEARS														TOTAL NAMES	
	1859	1868	1879	1887	1897	1907	1917	1927	1937	1946	1957	1967	1977			
	— 1867	— 1878	— 1886	— 1896	— 1906	— 1916	— 1926	— 1936	— 1945	— 1956	— 1966	— 1976	— 1986			
A: MAORI SURNAME AND GIVEN NAME(S)																
M+M	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	3	6	
M+M+M	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	2		
M+M+M+M	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1		
B: MAORI SURNAME AND MAORI, NONMAORI AND MAORIFIED GIVEN NAME(S)																
N+N+M	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	3	3	3	4	15	34	
N+M	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	1	5		
X+X+M	1	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	4		
Others *	-	-	2	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	3	2	10		
C: MAORIFIED SURNAME AND MAORIFIED GIVEN NAME(S)																
X+X	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	2	
D: MAORIFIED SURNAME AND MAORI, NONMAORI AND MAORIFIED GIVEN NAME(S)																
N+N+X	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	2	1	2	1	8	22	
N+X+X	-	-	-	1	-	1	1	-	-	-	1	1	-	5		
Others **	-	-	-	1	1	1	-	1	1	1	-	1	2	9		
E: NONMAORI SURNAME AND NONMAORI GIVEN NAME(S)																
N+N	-	2	2	2	2	3	1	5	1	5	3	2	2	30	199	
N+N+N	2	3	3	2	6	8	3	9	14	23	26	39	16	154		
N+N+N+N	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	2	2	7	-	13		
N+N+N+N+N	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	2		
F: NONMAORI SURNAME AND MAORI, NONMAORI AND MAORIFIED GIVEN NAME(S)																
N+M+N	1	-	1	2	-	1	-	4	1	1	3	5	2	21	52	
M+N+N	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	3	2	-	-	7		
N+X+N	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	1	1	1	1	-	6		
X+M+N	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	4		
Others ***	-	-	-	1	-	-	3	1	2	3	1	3	-	14		
TOTALS	5	6	9	13	16	15	9	24	23	47	46	70	32	315	315	

* *Patterns & Numbers: N+M+N+M 2, N+X+M 2, X+M 2, N+M+M 1, N+M+M+M 1, X+M+M 1, X+N+M 1*

** *Patterns & Numbers: N+M+X 2, N+X 2, X+M+M+X 1, M+X+X 1, N+N+M+X 1, N+X+N+X 1, X+M+X 1*

*** *Patterns & Numbers: M+N 2, N+M+N+N 2, N+N+M+N 2, M+N+N+N 1, M+N+X+N 1, M+X+N 1, N+M+M+N 1, N+X+M+M+N 1, X+N 1, X+N+N 1, X+N+X+N 1*

Table 5: Patterns by names, years and frequencies

5. Pākeha Māori and Names

From the arrival of the first resident nonMāori towards the end of the eighteenth century onwards there have been sexual relations between Māori and nonMāori. In the late eighteenth and first half of the nineteenth century hundreds of nonMāori from Europe, America, the Pacific islands and elsewhere came to NZ as sealers, whalers, adventurers, deserting seamen, escaped convicts, missionaries and from the mid 1830s as settlers. Many early arrivals lived with Māori for varying lengths of time. These were and are known as Pākeha Māori and were dependent on Māori for their livelihood and existence. They were “treated by Māori as Māori” (Bentley 1999: 9). By 1840 there were 150 known marriages between male Pākeha Māori and Māori women, and a few between Māori men and female Pākeha Māori, i.e., the couple had shared the takapau wharehūi (marriage mat) (Bentley 1999: 197). In addition, there had been hundreds of other sexual contacts.

Some Pākeha Māori “set out to Westernize their wives and children” and “many wives rapidly adopted European ways” (Bentley 1999: 201), “integrated rapidly with the new settler society” (Bentley 1999: 203) and wore European clothes, spoke both languages and had Māori and English given names and surnames. Pākeha Māori started the move for Māori to use surnames as part of a desire for their Māori wives and half caste children to be westernized.

6. Missionaries and Names

Missionaries arrived in 1814 and were regarded as a source, albeit a poor one, of material goods and associated skills (Elsemore 1985: 13). The first baptisms took place in 1825, but from about 1830 baptisms increased rapidly. At baptism Māori had several choices; for example, to:

- (a) retain their own M name, e.g., Te Wherowhero Potatau retained his own name;
- (b) abandon their M name(s) and take either N or X names;
- (c) abandon M names and take X names, e.g., Tarapipipi became Wiremu Tamihana (from William Thompson);
- (d) add N or X names to an M name, e.g., Pautone added Edward Marsh (later Māorified) to his M name, thus becoming Eruera Maihi Patuone; and
- (e) have two sets of names, an M one and an N or X one, e.g., Peter Buck/Te Rangi Hiroa and James Carroll/Timi Kara.

However, over several decades there were widespread counter movements, rejecting Christianity fully or partially and replacing it with a different religion. Consequently, there was a movement by many away from Christian names. For example, Erueti (Edward) Te Whiti formed the Pai Maraire religion and changed back to his birth name Te Whiti-o-Rongomai, while Matutaera (Methusala) Tawhiao formed the Tariao movement and dropped his baptismal name.

7. Institutional Discrimination

In 1840 the British government decided to take over the country and signed a treaty with about 500 Māori chiefs. Under this, the Treaty of Waitangi, Māori agreed in Article 1 to cede sovereignty to the British Crown and hence become British subjects, but kept in Article 2 their rights to all their taonga (treasures) and gained in Article 3 the same rights enjoyed by all other British subjects. The parents of the first players were probably born about the time of the Treaty and into a country controlled by Māori, while all the parents of players born in later years were born into an increasingly Pākeha dominated country. But Māori were subject to institutional discrimination for almost the whole period and except in a few instances were excluded from Pākeha mainstream society, i.e., Māori were marginalized.

Initially the provisions of the Treaty were observed, particularly in regard to Māori ownership of land, and many Māori were able to establish various successful commercial enterprises (Petrie

2006: *passim*). However, with more and more settlers demanding land there was large scale conflict in 1863 and 1864, the Land Wars, which Māori lost. There were many consequences to this defeat.

First, large areas of Māori owned land, including the most productive, were confiscated by the government and given to land hungry settlers. This destroyed the economic base of most Māori with the result that most Māori became impoverished.

Second, Māori autonomy which had been protected in Article 2 of the Treaty was deemed irrelevant and actions were undertaken by government to destroy Māori identity. Hence, from about the 1870s to about the 1970s the focus of successive governments was on assimilating the remaining Māori, by force if necessary. Thus Māori were expected to become brown Pākehā and move from being barbarians to being civilized. Māori culture and language was suppressed and Māori cultural and religious organizations were banned or ignored.

Third, the existing mission schools – agents for Māori language literacy, bilingualism and biculturalism in a Christian context – were taken over by the government and became centres for assimilation. Government passed the Native Schools Act 1867 and placed schools everywhere, even in the remotest areas. English was the medium of instruction and from 1902 the use of Māori was forbidden. In 1967 the Native Schools were closed. “One can’t help viewing the closure as a statement that the government had achieved its mission. Māori language and Māori culture had... been defeated and put on the defensive. Assimilation had, to a large degree, been achieved and now the Māori schools could be mainstreamed and no longer treated as a service meeting the special needs of Māori” (Meade 1998: x). Yet a report (cited in Walsh 1973) showed that educational parity had not been achieved. In 1970 Māori chances of passing the state wide exams at the end of the 11th year of schooling were 1 in 12 versus 2 in 5 for nonMāori and of attending university after the thirteenth year of schooling at 1 in 90 versus 1 in 10 for nonMāori.

Fourth, with education, occupation and income being linked, Māori had lower status work and lower incomes than non Māori. The curriculum in Native Schools focused on rudimentary literacy and numeracy skills, along with basic hygiene, with the expectation that the males would become menial agricultural workers and females domestic workers and mothers and, by the 1930s, would do low level technical work as well (Spoonley 1995: 65–66). The average per capita income for Māori in 1966 was NZ\$330 while that for nonMāori was NZ\$668 and on average one Māori in employment supported 2.33 dependants while one nonMāori supported only one person (Walsh 1973: 24). By 1969 6% and 25% of Māori school leavers went on to further training and unskilled work respectively while 30% and 10% of nonMāori did.

Fifth, by 1900 about 98% of Māori were living in rural areas in substandard reed houses, with no electricity, poor insulation and pit latrines, and it was not until the early 1940s that Māori moved into the towns and cities – about 50% in 1945 and 80% in 1986. However, even in the cities Māori continued living in poor conditions and it was not until the mid 1950s that Māori were able to get government housing loans (Schrader 2007: 70). To further assimilation it was decided “to ‘pepperpot’ Māori, i.e., intersperse them among Pākehā. This, it was believed, would help Māori improve themselves by learning to live like [their] Pākehā” neighbours (Schrader 2007: 70). It would also lessen opportunities for people to learn and use the Māori language as Māori families were now spread around the urban areas and had non Māori neighbours.

Sixth, Māori were devastated by a range of newly introduced diseases and by 1863 some Māori were already addicted to alcohol (Tuke in Hutt 1999: 28). Continued poor education, low wages and substandard housing resulted in poor health for Māori. For example Māori life expectancy in 1951 was 55 years for women and 54 for men, compared to 65 and 68 for Pākehā; infant mortality was 54 per 1,000 for Māori women and 19 for Pākehā women; and the Māori death rate for Māori under 20 years of age was 6.61 per 1000 compared with 1.92 for the same Pākehā age group (Durie 1994: 130).

Seventh, commensurate with the prohibition of use of Māori in the schools and the pepper potting policy there was a gradual loss of knowledge of the Māori language. Several surveys and commentaries (e.g., Beaglehole and Beaglehole 1946; Biggs 1968; and Benton 1978 and 1991) showed that fewer and fewer older people, younger adults and children were fluent in the language and the language was in danger of disappearing.

Eighth, private print mass media tended, from the beginning of the twentieth century, when writing about Māori, to be either hostile or patronizing, racist, sometimes xenophobic and to include “coon” humour (King 1997: 72). Further, “the practice of racial-labelling Māori crime news was widespread, unjustified, and inasmuch as the practice was virtually limited in its use to the Māori people, discriminatory” (Thompson 1955: 33–34).

8. Individual Antimāori Racism

What were Māori experiences of individual racism by nonMāori against Māori? In the early years attitudes about Māori were mixed, with nonMāori in contact with the more isolated Māori being generally favourably disposed while those frequently interacting in the villages with Māori gradually becoming more unfavourable (Erwin 1964: 19).

Though others disagree, James Ritchie (1964:85–87) states prejudice against Māori had never been difficult to find, is endemic and there was a well developed set of stereotypes about Māori. Though it is difficult to measure prejudice without detailed research, some indications of the level of prejudice towards Māori can be gained from the stereotypes that people held. For example, Beaglehole and Beaglehole (1946: 307–315) found that Pākehā described Māori as dirty and sitting about in the sun, wasting their time doing nothing; low-class; dirty; hard-case women, prostitutes; living near the animal level, interested only in food, shelter and sex; liars, stealers, and adulterers; and cunning. Jane Ritchie (1964: 81) found that Māori are of the view that some Pākehā see Māori as ignorant, lazy, coarse and loud, dirty, backward, unreliable and specially suited to labouring, driving, earthmoving and farming jobs and unsuited to professional, financial and skilled jobs. Name calling was common: O’Regan (2001: 20) reports being called “nigger” and “blackie” at school in the 1970s.

As indicated above, sexual relations between Māori and nonMāori have been common. But of his 543 respondents James Ritchie (1964: 95) found that 14% were of the view that interracial sex was a threat to genetic purity, 43% would try to dissuade a son from marrying a Māori and 47% a daughter from marrying a Māori. Harré found respondents usually categorized mixed couples as Māori rather than Pākehā (1966: 120), categorized children as Māori if they were darker in colour (1966:119), and believed that a mixed race couple living together could not possibly be married and therefore was living in sin (1966: 120).

On a closely related matter Pākehā developed a set of widely used derogatory terms about Māori. Some of these were and still are: Māori garden – an unweeded, unorganized garden; Māori manners – rude, uncivilized; Māori boy – an adult Māori male; as cunning as a Māori dog – very cunning or sly; as lazy as a Māori dog – very lazy; and Māori time – a disregard for doing things at the scheduled time.

At the action level there were not unexpectedly many areas where widespread discrimination was reported: in employment (Beaglehole and Beaglehole 1946, James Ritchie 1964 and Harré 1966); in housing (MacDonald 1986); and in hotel and rented accommodation (James Ritchie 1964 and Tamihere 2004).

Overall the parents and the players were subject to institutional and individual racism to varying extents. From being a major participant in New Zealand affairs until about 1860 Māori became more and more marginal to almost everything that was happening in New Zealand from then to the mid 1980s. And in spite of interracial marriage, resulting in most New Zealanders now

having one or more Māori relatives, by 1986 Pākehā were still quite prejudiced towards and discriminated against Māori.

9. Parents' Choices

From the outset of the British invasion of Māori territory Māori parents have been under institutional and individual pressure to change from their traditional naming pattern with M names to the different Western pattern with N names. Pākehā Māori started the trend, missionaries reinforced this new pattern through baptism practices and, in the schools, teachers shortened names or introduced either generic names or nicknames for Māori children (Smith 1999: 157). Though it is clear that many Māori parents changed to the Western pattern within a few years of contact not all Māori did so. For example, Ashton-Warner (1963) refers to children with M names (e.g., Rangi and Rongo), with X names (Amiria, Arapata, Ihaka and Irini) and N names (e.g., Gilbert, Lotus and Joe Joe) in her school classes from the 1930s to the 1950s.

In what ways might the parents, almost all of whom would have been members of the largely marginalized population, have reacted in the naming of their children to such pressures? Broadly, the situations in which the names of the individuals would be important indicators of the identity of the person were (a) in the non Māori New Zealand wide community, (b) in Māori and nonMāori local communities (such as villages and small towns) and (c) in Māori familial groups of the immediate family and other relatives. The parents' choices of names for their children would indicate their own situations and those they expected for their children. While other factors might also have been relevant, e.g., darker or lighter skin colour, the parents had three broad choices: (a) to maintain a public Māori identity, (b) to assimilate (i.e., to publicly identify as a Pākehā) or (c) to pass (i.e., either to publicly identify as both a Māori and a Pākehā according to specific situations or perhaps to test whether assimilation would be possible). Which naming patterns might result from which choices?

Maintaining a public Māori identity in the face of the various societal and individual pressures requires Māori parents to choose a naming pattern which identifies the child as a Māori in the public, community and familial situations. Several groups serve this choice (See Table 5):

- Group A, which has only M given names and surnames, e.g., M+M;
- Group B, which has an M surname and either X or N given names, e.g., X+M and N+M, or a mix of M and N given names, e.g., N+X+M and X+N+M;
- Group C, which has only Māorified given names and surnames, e.g., X+X; and
- Group D, which has an X surname and either an M or an N given name, e.g., M+X and N+X, or a mix of M, X and N given names, e.g., N+X+X and N+M+X.

In these four groups the name, if publicly known, which would immediately identify the person as a Māori, would be the M or X surname. These would be names that would be used in all documents, such as baptismal, educational and medical records and job applications.

Several patterns in Group F, in which there is an N surname, would also serve to identify the person as Māori in all situations. Specifically, when a given name is an M or X name, e.g., M+N and X+N, and is the name that the individual uses in their daily life it would be the used given name that would serve as the Māori identity marker. The result could be similar where, with an N first given name, an M or X middle name was used in daily life.

The pressures on parents to assimilate was considerable for, as O'Regan points out "The motivation behind assimilation into the Pākehā world was... one of survival" (2001:137). Many New Zealanders have acknowledged in successive censuses that they have Māori ancestors, i.e., they have Māori genes, but do not regard themselves as Māori, i.e., they claim they do not hold to any Māori values or beliefs, do not practise any Māori customs and have a completely

westernized lifestyle. In some cases if a person was pressed as to why they looked like a Māori, but were not identifying themselves as Māori, they could claim, as is believed to have happened often in New Zealand, to be of some other ancestry, e.g., Italian, Greek or Spanish.

Deciding that assimilation is desirable for the children entails the parents choosing a pattern that would ostensibly deny any Māori identity. Here Group E, in which all the given names and surnames are N, would be the one chosen.

However, persons given only N names by their parents could also have a set of M or X names. Here the N set would be used for public purposes and the M or X set for Māori community and familial contexts. As pointed out above five of the players had two sets of names; for example: for an all N-all M set Ernest Asher, who was also known as Te Keepa Pouwhiuwhiu and, for an all N-all X set, Jack Ormond, was also known as Tiaki Omana.

Further, in many cases the parents' chosen name pattern could be ignored by their children. Thus, 63% of the names (199 out of 315 – see Table 5) are N names but the players with those names have identified themselves in some way as Māori. It is not known whether these players were brought up as Pākehā or Māori but at some point they went against their name pattern and identified themselves as Māori.

The third choice is to pass, which, in broad terms, is the ability for a person to act in ways that enable that person to be regarded by others as a member of one or more groups other than the one(s) they actually belong to.

Passing can take many forms and can range from minor acts to acts involving the entire person. It can vary in aim, for example, it can be (a) only for specific limited temporary purposes, (b) an attempt to eventually completely penetrate the other group, i.e., to eventually assimilate to the dominant group, and (c) a means of moving freely at one's pleasure between both groups. Passing has been common everywhere where a "racial" or "ethnic" subordinate group has been subject to discrimination towards and prejudice against them by the dominant group and has been common amongst the members of such groups who are, in appearance, like the members of the dominant group. Examples where passing has been common have been by Coloureds in apartheid South Africa, Afro-Americans in the USA and Koreans in Japan.

Passing has long been regarded as an indication of hatred of the group to which one was born into and self hatred as a member of that group, i.e., hatred of the person's own "authentic" identity. But passing occurs when those in the subordinate group want to be like the dominant group so as to have the same opportunities as do the members of the dominant group and it need not involve self hatred. It can be regarded rather like emigration, i.e., those who successfully pass are like emigrants, seeking better opportunities for themselves and their descendents in a new society, in the dominant group. In New Zealand passing and attempts to pass have been common as evidenced by the number of Māori who have assimilated, all of whom would have passed on the way to becoming assimilated. In their 1945 research Beaglehole and Beaglehole (1946: 305) point out the "The Maori families most conscious of this indifference [by Pākehā to their ambitions] are the ones who are most definitely anxious to adapt themselves to pakeha standards and values... in a very real sense these would-be pakeha are balancing uneasily between two worlds". Their attempts to assimilate are not accepted by their Pākehā neighbours. And up to 1986 there were undoubtedly many more Māori trying to pass.

Which naming patterns would facilitate the ability to pass? First, it would be difficult for those with patterns in Groups A, B, C and D to pass as their names would indicate that, in the absence in New Zealand of a tradition of nonMāori getting M names, they are Māori. Thus Tahu Potiki (a Group A name) states "I could easily have just completely ignored the fact that I was Māori, if I wanted to... I could have just slipped in and out of places, people wouldn't have made comments, I wouldn't have ever thought about things... But being called what I was, I didn't have a choice at all in that" (in O'Regan 2001: 66).

Second, some patterns in Group F could also be regarded as passing choices, e.g., N+M+N and N+X+N. Here the parents chose to position the M or X name as a second name (Smith 1999: 157), knowing that the name would seldom be used in any public or even community situations. The M middle name could be claimed to be a mark of respect for a Māori ancestor a long way back. However, if the second name becomes publicly known, the initial identification as a Pākehā could be changed to that of Māori. For example a light skinned respondent, with an N first given name and an N surname and brought up as a Pākehā, reported that “my second name is a Māori one and when we had to say our full names at school [in the 1950s and 1960s] I was so ashamed because in our area Māori were looked on as being on a lower area than any one else” (quoted in Archie 2005: 134). The respondent later identified as a Māori.

Third, persons of any name pattern can pass so long as their M and X names are not known or they can successfully claim to be other than Māori.

What is evident about the names patterns is that Māori parents have made choices about the direction they would like the lives of their children to take, with three sets of choices available to them. However, it often happened that the children, the players, made their own choices by claiming an identity that was not the one that their parents allowed for when they named their children.

10. Conclusion

From the first incursion of the Pākehā, but more particularly from about 1860 onwards and up to about the mid 1980s Māori parents were under increasing pressure to change their way of life. The English speaking British were the dominant colonizers, and had covert and overt aims to civilize Māori by minimizing Māori culture and language with avowedly assimilationist policies. After about 1860 Māori lost political power and became subject to well documented institutional discrimination and to government assimilationist policies. Much less documented has been the extent of individual discrimination and prejudice in all spheres against Māori. The physical aspects of colonization involved controlling or occupying the land and its resources and destroying the strong link between the tribes, their territories and their economies. The mental and spiritual aspects involved replacing traditional knowledge systems with British ones, e.g., for cosmology, religion, social values, classification of living things, kinship, land ownership, names and leadership. Māori were marginalized and were not to be accepted until they conformed to the Anglocentrism that the British wanted to create in their new country. That is, until they became brown Pākehā.

Throughout the entire period since British colonization began there has been intermarriage between Māori and nonMāori. The consequence has been that many New Zealanders are genetically mixed with some identifying themselves as Māori, others as Pākehā and a few as neither Māori nor Pākehā. However, Pākehā have been the dominant group from about 1860 and those who were Māori were marginalized unless they assimilated to this dominant group.

Precolonization Māori usually had only one name but with the advent of the Pākehā Māori, the naming practices started to change. The changes were reinforced by the missionaries, the schools and many other institutions and new naming patterns emerged. The names the parents gave their children, the players, resulted in six naming groups: (A) M surname and given names, (B) M surname and M, N and X given names, (C) X surname and X given names, (D) X surname and M, N and X given names, (E) N surname and N given names and (F) N surname and M, N and X given names.

The different name groups have different consequences for the players. For example, (a) Group A names enable persons to maintain their Māori identity in Māori situations in the wider society, in the smaller communities and in the familial group of the immediate family and other relatives, (b) Group E names would usually indicate persons who had successfully or

unsuccessfully assimilated, i.e., moved from Māori society into mainstream Pākeha society, and (c) some Groups and patterns, e.g., N first names and N surname but with a M or X middle name, enable a person to pass, i.e., to move from a Māori identity to a nonMāori identity, provided that the M and X names were not publicly known. However, the situation has always been fluid. For example some people have two sets of names, one N set (Group E) which is activated in the wider society and perhaps in the smaller communities, and an M or X set that is activated at least in the familial group. Again, some people who have N names have revealed that they are actually Māori; this can be supported by O'Regan's comments (2005: 66–67) that “there are a significant number of surnames of European origin that are well known within the tribe that also serve as markers of Kāi Tahu” tribal identity, such as Davis, Solomon, Ellison, Crofts and Couch. The same is true for other tribes, with, for example, surnames such as Hetet, Tapsell, Love, Vercoe, Williams and Bennett.

This study could be enhanced with investigation of, for example:

- (1) The extent to which birth registrars favoured nonMāori names;
- (2) The extent to which the players have both an M or X and an N set of names;
- (3) The number of players who had surnames that differed from their parent's surnames, i.e., how many parents with M or X surnames gave their children N surnames;
- (4) The relationship between social class factors and naming pattern choices.

This study has been concerned with the past. But what of the future for Māori names? Is Benton's 1986 prognosis about the language's impending disappearance likely to be accurate? Probably not, as since the 1970s there has been a major Māori cultural and linguistic renaissance. For example, in 1974 a petition with 30,000 signatures was presented to parliament seeking Māori language courses in schools with large Māori populations; in 1978 the first Māori-English bilingual school opened; in 1981 the first of three bilingual Māori tertiary institutions opened; in 1983 the first kōhanga reo (a language nest for preschool children) opened; in 1985 the first Māori medium primary school opened; in 1986 the Waitangi Tribunal found that the Māori language is a taonga (in Māori culture a treasured thing, such as artifacts and spiritual beliefs) under article 2 of the Treaty of Waitangi; in 1987 Māori became an official language of New Zealand and the Māori Language Commission was established; in 1994 Te Māngai Pāho was established to fund Māori language programs on television and radio; and in 2004 a Māori television station started operating.

However, these developments do not appear to have yet resulted in significant change in the number of players with M names born in the period 1977–1986 (see Table 5): only three with M only names (Group A), and only a handful in each of the other three M and X name groups and patterns (B, C, D and some in Group F). This is compared to nineteen with all N names (Group E). Perhaps it is simply too soon to expect an increase in M only names.

References

- Andersen, Johannes. 1942. *Maori place-names*. Wellington: The Polynesian Society of New Zealand.
- Archie, Carol. 2005. *Skin to skin: intimate true stories of Māori-Pākeha relationships*. Auckland: Penguin.
- Ashton-Warner, Sylvia. 1966. *Teacher*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Beaglehole, Ernest, and Pearl Beaglehole. 1946. *Some modern Maoris*. Christchurch: New Zealand Council for Educational Research.
- Benton, Richard A. 1978. *Can the Māori language survive?* Wellington: New Zealand Council for Educational Research.

- Benton, Richard A. 1991. *The Māori language: dying or reviving?* Honolulu: East-West Center.
- Bentley, Trevor. 1999. *Pakeha Maori*. Auckland: Penguin.
- Biggs, Bruce. 1968. *The Maori language past and present*. In: Erik Schwimmer (ed.), *The Maori people in the nineteen sixties*. 65–84. Auckland: Blackwood and Janet Paul.
- Clement, C M. 2007. <http://freepages.genealogy.rootsweb.com/~sooty/Pakehamaori.html>. Accessed 2007–2008.
- Cody, J F. 1953. *Man of two worlds; a biography of Sir Maui Pomare*. Wellington: AH and AW Reed.
- CricinfoNewZealand.
<http://content-www.cricinfo.com/newzealand/content/player/country.html?country=5>. Accessed 2007 and 2008.
- Department of Statistics. 1990. *1990 yearbook*. Wellington.
- Durie, Mason. 1994. *Whaiora [Seek Health]: Maori health development*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Elsmore, Bronwyn. 1985. *Like them that dream; the Maori and the Old Testament*. Tauranga: Tauranga Moana Press.
- Erwin, R.N. 1964. Maori stereotypes in some early New Zealand literature. In: James E. Ritchie (ed.), *Race relations: six New Zealand studies*. Wellington: Department of Psychology, Victoria University of Wellington.
- Harré, John. 1966. *Maori and Pakeha: a study of mixed marriages in New Zealand*. London: Institute of Race Relations.
- Hutt, Marten. 1999. *Te iwi Māori me te inu waipiro: he tuhituhinga hitori/Māori and alcohol: a history*. Wellington: Health Services Research Centre.
- King, Michael. 1997. *Nga iwi o te motu [The people of the island]: One thousand years of Māori history*. North Shore: Reed.
- MacDonald, J. 1986. Racism and rental accommodation. Auckland: Social Research and Development Trust. In: Sarah Bierre, et alia. *Institutional challenges in addressing healthy low cost housing for all: lessons from the past*. Wellington: Ministry of Social Development
www.msd.govt.nz/documents/about-msd-and-our-work/publications-resources/journals-and-magazines/social.../30-pages42-64.doc. Accessed 2007 and 2008.
- Meade, Hirini Moko. 1998. He kupu whakataki: Foreword. In: Judith Simon (ed.), 1998. *Ngā kura Māori: the native schools system 1867–1969*. Auckland: Auckland University Press.
- Montgomerie, Bruce. 2004. *Those who played rugby league for New Zealand*. Sydney: Montgomerie Publishing.
- Neely, Don, and Richard King, with statistics compiled by Francis Payne. 1986. *Men in white; the history of New Zealand international cricket*. Auckland: Moa Publications
- The New Zealand Rugby Football Union (Incorporated). <http://stats.allblacks.com/asp/atoz.asp?group=A>. Accessed 2007 and 2008.
- New Zealand Rugby League. http://www.nzrl.co.nz/page/past_caps.html. Accessed 2007 and 2008.
- O'Regan, Hana. 2001. *Ko Tahu, ko au [I am a Tahu tribe member]*. Christchurch: Horomaka Publishing
- Palenski, Ron. 2007. *The AllBlackography*. Auckland: Hodder Moa.
- Petrie, Hazel. 2006. *Chiefs of industry: Māori tribal enterprise in early colonial New Zealand*. Auckland: Auckland University Press.
- Poole, Ian. 1991. *Te iwi Maori [The Māori people]*. Auckland: Auckland University Press.
- Ritchie, James E. 1964. The evidence for anti-Māori prejudice. In: James E Ritchie (ed.), *Race relations: six New Zealand studies*, 85–89. Wellington: Department of Psychology, Victoria University of Wellington.

- Ritchie, James E (ed.). 1964. *Race relations: six New Zealand studies*. Wellington: Department of Psychology, Victoria University of Wellington.
- Ritchie, Jane. 1964. Contact and attitudes in the city. In James E Ritchie (ed.), *Race relations: six New Zealand studies*, 75–84. Wellington: Department of Psychology, Victoria University of Wellington.
- Schrader, Ben. 2007. State housing. *New Zealand Geographic* 86 (July-August), 56–74.
- Smith, Linda Tuhiwai. 1999. *Decolonizing methodologies: research and indigenous peoples*. London: Zed Books.
- Spoonley, Paul. 1990. Racism. Race relations and the media. In: Paul Spoonley and Walter Hirsh (eds.), *Between the lines: racism and the New Zealand media*, 26–37. Auckland: Heinemann Reed.
- Spoonley, Paul. 1995. *Racism and ethnicity*. 2nd edition. Auckland: Oxford University Press.
- Tamihere, John with Helen Bain. 2004. *Black and white*. Auckland: Reed.
- Taylor, Richard. 1974 (1855). *Te Ika a Maui* [The fish of Maui]: *New Zealand and its inhabitants*. Wellington: A H and A W Reed.
- Thomas, David, and Charles Sedgwick. 1997. *Understanding Aotearoa/New Zealand historical statistics*. Palmerston North: Dunmore.
- Thompson, Richard. 1964. Prejudice and discrimination: some problems in assessment and control. In: James E Ritchie (ed.), *Race relations: six New Zealand studies*, 25–40. Wellington: Department of Psychology, Victoria University of Wellington.
- Thompson, R. H. T. 1955. Maori Affairs and the New Zealand Press. *Journal of the Polynesian Society*. 1955. Part 4, 22–34.
- Walsh, A C. 1973. *More and more Maoris; an illustrated statistical survey of the Maori today*. n.p.: Whitcombe and Tombs.
- Wood, Bernie. 2008. Personal communication.

Philip Matthews
125A Marine Drive, Sorrento Bay
Lower Hutt
NEW ZEALAND
philmatthews19@hotmail.com