**INTRODUCTION**

Landsapes of Aotearoa/New Zealand have received little attention in historical archaeology to date (Smith 2004), although this field is potentially rich, especially for the examination of Māori and European relationships, including landscapes of conflict relating to the land wars of the nineteenth century. Both New Zealand and Australia share some characteristics of the ‘settler’ society, and a literature that examines the ‘landscape’ as an important part of the country’s cultural identity (for example see, Harrison 2004; Ireland 2003; Paterson 2005; Phillips 2000; Russell 2012), but there are clear differences in the colonial process of the two countries and the nature of cultural encounter and entanglement. The most evident difference is the existence of the Tiriti o Waitangi (otherwise the ‘Treaty of Waitangi’) as a founding document in New Zealand, whatever its shortcomings. While colonial Australians interpreted the continent as ‘terra nullius’ this was not the case in New Zealand, as the Tiriti itself demonstrates: colonial governments and settler arrivals had to engage with Māori. European engagement with Aboriginal peoples in Australia and Māori in New Zealand took place on quite different terms.

An earlier discussion of a Bay of Islands landscape where Māori and European first encountered each other examined the nature of ‘culture contact’ through the archaeology of part of northern New Zealand in the decades before British annexation in 1840 (Middleton 2003). In that case study, the prehistoric and early nineteenth-century Māori archaeology was dominant, with early European missionary arrivals providing a more recent, almost transparent overlay. The present paper examines a very different, southern landscape on a segment of the Otago Peninsula (Figure 1). The visibility of archaeology in this small piece of Otago is reversed; at Hereweka/Harbour Cone, an early settler archaeological landscape is strikingly intact and beautifully preserved, while the indigenous landscape underlying this is more difficult to encounter, but significant for the link to early occupation that it reveals (Figure 2). These examples demonstrate that in the palimpsest of layers only some components may be immediately visible. This paper explores the makeup of this landscape, looking beneath it to find the meanings associated with Hereweka, the alternative name for the volcanic cone, and highlighting the multiple strands of identity and memory embodied there.
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**Hereweka/ Harbour Cone: a relict landscape on the Otago Peninsula**

ANGELA MIDDLETON

*In 2008 the Dunedin City Council purchased a block of farmland, 324 ha in extent, on the Otago peninsula, near the city of Dunedin in southern New Zealand. This included the old volcanic cone known as Harbour Cone. A survey revealed a pristine archaeological landscape associated with small nineteenth-century dairy farms: stone boundary walls relating to the first cadastral survey, farmstead ruins, disused roads and other related features. However, the Māori name for the area, Hereweka, provides the key to an earlier indigenous cultural layer predating European arrival, repeated in oral history but leaving no archaeological traces. This oral history is associated with conflict between earlier occupants of the south known as Ngāti Mamoe, and their conquest and absorption by Ngāi Tahu, later arrivals from the north, who were dominant by the time of European annexation and Crown land purchase.***
Hoskins (1955) was perhaps the first to explore the analogy of the landscape as a ‘palimpsest’, to be read in the manner of an overwritten text. The associated term ‘cultural landscape’ was originally defined by geographer Sauer (1963:343), first writing in 1925, nearly a century ago: ‘The cultural landscape is fashioned from a natural landscape by a cultural group. Culture is the agent, the natural area is the medium, the cultural landscape is the result.’ A particular landscape may be perceived in quite different ways, recalling and recreating different cultural identities; ‘cultural landscape layering’ may be another term for the palimpsest of landscape, when ‘a given place functions in multiple cultural landscapes’ (Branton 2006:53). In archaeology, the use of ‘landscape’ has moved from the ‘settlement pattern paradigm’ to more inclusive approaches (Spencer-Wood and Baugher 2010), and may incorporate attachment, commemoration and meaning, non-physical characteristics of place (Branton 2009:52). A cultural landscape is a place that evokes memory and identity, often recalled through stories and imagination or read through visible archaeological features. The ‘bounded place’ of the landscape discussed below examines these concepts of memory, identity and place in a southern New Zealand context, one of the last regions of human settlement on the globe, both in prehistory and in later European colonial expansion (Walter, Smith and Jacomb 2006).

In 2008, the Dunedin City Council purchased a block of approximately 324 ha of land on the Otago Peninsula, known as ‘Harbour Cone’, for the volcanic cone that dominates the landscape (Figure 1). An archaeological survey carried out in that same year identified 42 archaeological sites forming a landscape associated with nineteenth-century small dairy farming, on the land titles subdivided in 1863 (Figure 3). The Dunedin City Council now operate Hereweka/Harbour Cone as a working farm park, with a number of public walking tracks to historic and natural features within the area.

NGĀI TAHU, THE TREATY AND THE OTAGO PURCHASE

British annexation of New Zealand/Aotearoa took place in 1840. At this time, tribal regions throughout the country were clearly defined, although subject to change through warfare, marriage and other social mechanisms. Boundaries were also flexible. Traditionally, hapū (sub-tribes) and whānau (family) groups occupied different locations over varying seasons, accessing a range of different resources throughout the landscape, from coastal and marine to inland. This type of economy, the ‘transient village model’ (Walter, Smith and Jacomb 2006), may have been related to the economy of Polynesian homelands such as the Cook Islands, but also...
describes the small hapū or whānau groups ranging across different seasonal resources. Ngāi Tahu was the principal tribal group occupying much of the South Island, with others located to the north, around the Marlborough Sounds area (Mitchell and Mitchell 2004). In the North Island, Ngāti Toa had earlier moved southwards from their original tribal area of Kawhia under the leadership of the warrior chief Te Rauparaha, where he established a new base at Kapiti Island, off the west coast near what is now Wellington. Ngāti Toa was only one of a number of tribal groups occupying different parts of the North Island. Ngāti Kahungunu controlled the East Coast and Hawkes Bay area of this island; in fact this was where the Ngāi Tahu tribe, descended from the eponymous ancestor Tahu Potiki, had originated, before moving into the South Island (Anderson 1998:18, 23).

Ngāi Tahu themselves maintained a rather tenuous hold over much of their territory in 1840. Only four years previously, the final battle against the last war party of Ngāti Toa invaders from the North Island had taken place; Ngāi Tahu killed most of this invading party at a battle site to the south of Otago (Anderson 1986; Tau and Anderson 2008:194-195). This was the final fight in what had been a long and bloody struggle against the northern tribe of Ngāti Toa, led by the notorious Te Rauparaha who remained at Kapiti, where he traded with whalers and subsequently negotiated with European settler arrivals. A ‘final’ peace settlement was agreed between Ngāi Tahu and Ngāti Toa in 1839, and within a year leading Ngāi Tahu chiefs signed the Treaty of Waitangi at three South Island locations, Akaroa Harbour (near what is now Christchurch), Otakou on the Otago Peninsula, and Raupuke Island in the far south (Tau and Anderson 2008:201). While Ngāi Tahu believed the Treaty would bring the benefits of the Pākehā (European) world, it also facilitated the Crown purchase of land. The sale of most of the Ngāi Tahu lands followed. The purchase of the Otago block took place in 1844, consisting of 400,000 acres (161874 ha), sold for £2,400. West (2009:255) gives a larger area of 533,600 acres (215,940 ha) transferred in this sale. This purchase included the Otago Peninsula (known to Māori as Muaupoko), with a reserve for Ngāi Tahu Māori established at Otakou at the northern end of the peninsula (Figure 1). In 1847 the first surveys for the Otago town of Dunedin were carried out and a year later the first settlers arrived at Port Chalmers, the port for this new city.

These events – British annexation and the Crown land purchase – in a sense ratified Ngāi Tahu’s occupation of territory it had only recently conquered. The tribe had fought off the recent northern invaders, but Ngāi Tahu itself was the most recent of three waves of people to migrate from the East Coast of the North Island, finally fighting their way into the south of the South Island where earlier migrants, Ngāti Mamoe, had fled for safety. Demographic pressures in the North Island are likely to have produced these waves of southern migration; there was also the attraction of the large greenstone sources on the West Coast. Ngāi Tahu fought with and conquered Ngāti Mamoe, absorbing survivors through intermarriage, so gaining control over land. Other means of claiming land were through killing and then eating the flesh of chiefl y land holders, or perhaps exchanging lives for land (Tau and Anderson 2008:159). Children born from marriage between a Ngāi Tahu man and a Ngāti Mamoe woman would inherit both mana and political power from their father’s side and also their mother’s ancestral rights to land and other resources (West 2009:128). Māori property rights were clearly defined by concepts relating to whakapapa (descent), mana whenua (rights to land) and political power; such rights were cognatic – they could be inherited through both mother and father. Ngāi Tahu conquest of Ngāti Mamoe lands concluded about 150 years of fighting; this may have occurred around the year 1820 or slightly earlier, not long before Te Rauparaha first led his war parties south in their great war canoes. By this time Ngāi Tahu occupied Pukekura pā (fortified village), on the headland at the southern entrance to the Otago Harbour, while Ngāti Mamoe lived in villages on the coast and inlets close by (Anderson 1998:31, 41; Tau and Anderson 2008:154).

Ngāti Mamoe had arrived in the north of the South Island by around the late sixteenth century and then migrated southwards, while other earlier arrivals, known as Waitaha, had come south during the fifteenth century. These three tribal groupings shared a common ancestral nest in Hawkes Bay (Anderson 1998). As they migrated into new territory, each group ascribed different stories to the landscape, associated with ancestral names and events such as war and marriage (for example, see Anderson 1998:16; Tau and Anderson 2008:71); so too did the Pākehā settlers of the nineteenth century (West 2009). Kahukura was the ancestor who formed the coastline of Otago, ‘eating out’ the Otago Harbour and throwing out the spoil to form the hills on either side, including Muaupoko, the peninsula. He then clothed the land with forests and filled these with stocks of birds and other resources (West 2009:59-60). Otakou, an old name for Otago, brought from the ancestral land of Hawaiiki, applied to the tidal current that enters the harbour (West 2009:68-69).

European settlers migrated to Dunedin, principally from Scotland, from 1848 onwards. At this time, the Otago Peninsula was on the far outskirts of the town, more accessible by boating across the harbour than by land. The first survey of the peninsula was carried out in 1863 and grants of small holdings of Crown land followed (SO 1327; Figure 4). The largest land grants went to William Larnach, a wealthy politician who built his ‘castle’ facing away from the small farm holdings to the east and south. The occupants of some of these farms worked as labourers and servants for the Larnach family. By the end of the nineteenth century William Larnach had consolidated most of these small holdings into his own large farm.

**READING THE SETTLER LANDSCAPE**

Today, Larnach’s Castle occupies a central place in tourist themes relating to the Otago Peninsula. The castle, completed in 1870, is a grandiose architectural anomaly associated with tragic tales of the Larnach family and William Larnach’s eventual demise and suicide.

Behind this, a complex series of archaeological features relating to subsistence dairy farm holdings of only 10 or 20 acres (4 or 8 ha) can be identified. At the time of the first subdivision of Block II, Hereweka/Harbour Cone presented a very different landscape from that seen today. Heavy bush greeted the first European settlers, such as Walter Riddell (n.d.), whose diary for the years 1865 to 1871 documents his efforts to establish farming pasture and clear the bush, dominated by the large tōtara species (*Podocarpus totara* and *Podocarpus hallii*) as well as rimu (*Dacrydium cupressinum*), beechn (*Nothofagus spp.*) and matai (*Prumnopitys taxifolia*), amongst others (Figure 5). This heavy forest cover and the surrounding coastal environment supported a large number of bird species, including moa (West 2009). Although transport was difficult, timber was brought to Dunedin when possible and sold for firewood. Waste timber was sometimes stacked to form fences. Forest clearance and piles of cut wood also led to the hazard of fire, especially during droughts.

The archives and memories of one of Harbour Cone’s early residents, William Leslie, have been used to study the ways in which the components of the Harbour Cone archaeological landscape were integrated. There were two
Leslie households at Harbour Cone, one belonging to Captain William Leslie (senior), the other to his son of the same name. The youngest William Leslie (the third of the same name) was the grandson of Captain William Leslie (senior), who received a Crown Grant for land on the south side of the cone in the 1860s, where he lived until 1908 (Figure 6). In many ways the households the youngest William Leslie described from his childhood days represent typical Otago Peninsula farmsteads of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

William Leslie, born on his father’s farm in 1888, grew up on the eastern slopes of Harbour Cone and recorded his memoirs of the area in the late 1960s (Leslie n.d.-a, n.d.-b). The sites associated with the Leslie families and William Leslie’s narrative provide perhaps the best insight into the settler archaeological landscape at Harbour Cone, where roads, stone boundary walls, homesteads and farmsteads demonstrate on the ground the social networks that tied a small, isolated community together.

The community William Leslie grew up in consisted principally of small family dairy holdings, many still defined by dry stone boundary walls. Captain Leslie’s land in Section 47 Block II Otago Peninsula Survey District consisted of 42 acres (17 ha), south-facing land that was so steep and got so little sun it ‘could hardly be called Dairying land’ (Leslie

Figure 4: Harbour Cone area showing section boundaries and road alignments from the 1863 and 1864 surveys (SO2841).

Figure 5: William Riddell and friends, felling timber. From Hardwicke Knight (1991).

Figure 6: Captain William Leslie’s house (I44/82), also the site of the Harbour Cone Cheese Factory. Photograph is dated 1913, showing later occupants. Otago Peninsula Museum.
The northern boundary wall for Section 47, running along the upper slope of Harbour Cone, once had a post and rail fence built above it; drilled totara posts still stand proud of the stone.

The site of Captain William Leslie’s farmstead sits below Highcliff Road on a terrace surrounded by a stand of pine trees, where the Harbour Cone Cheese Factory opened on 5 November 1877. This was formed by a consortium of local farmers not registered as a company ‘on account of the cost, money being scarce in those days’ (Leslie n.d.-a). Land for the factory was leased from Leslie and a wooden building 14 feet x 24 feet (4.2 metres x 7.3 metres) was erected (Knight 1979:60; Leslie n.d.). Most of the cheese was sold to a Dunedin retailer for around 7 pence per pound, ‘a good price in those days’ (Leslie n.d.-a). The cheese maker, Edmund Ward, lived on another small holding further along Highcliff Road, where flagstone flooring, a stone cow byre and dry stone walling still remain inside a macrocarpa windbreak (Higham 1986; Knight 1979). Edmund Ward was paid a weekly wage of £2 at the cheese factory, but his instructor received £5, while a woman assistant was engaged at the rate of 6/- per week (Leslie n.d.-a). However, the factory was not long-lived; it was burnt down on 14 October 1881 during a severe bush fire, driven by a north-westerly gale (Knight 1979:62). Many other households were affected or destroyed by the fire, and the cheese factory was not rebuilt. William Leslie remembered seeing the burnt-out piles of the factory as a child, and the cheese press stored in his father’s house. When the factory burnt down at the beginning of summer the cows were in full milk and the farmers (or their wives), with no other choice, ‘turned to butter, made on the farm’ as the only possible source of income (Leslie n.d.-a).

Captain William Leslie’s son (the second William Leslie) built his house on 10 acres (4 ha) of land on the north-eastern slopes of Harbour Cone, a distance of perhaps a kilometre from his father’s house, and formed a ‘sledge track’ by pick and shovel across his father’s land to reach it. Timber, iron and bricks were sledged to the house site. The track was so steep that only a sledge could be used on it; the only ‘wheeled’ vehicles used were a wheelbarrow and later, a bicycle (Leslie n.d.-a). Today, parts of the track are still marked by old totara posts, drilled to run wire through them.

The second Leslie homestead was warm and sunny, compared with William’s grandfather’s steep, south-facing land that was very cold in winter. Archaeological evidence of the house site today consists of an area of paved flooring under a macrocarpa tree and other structural remains under a second large macrocarpa. The house the youngest William Leslie grew up in started as two rooms, each with a double brick chimney. There was a dairy, as ‘butter making was the sole means of making a living’; next to this ‘a good wash house with a built in enamelled boiler … next to that was another room which housed a lot of odds and ends, even a chaff cutter turned by hand’ and beyond this, on the ‘sunny side’, a glass house with grape vines. The ‘cooking arrangements’ consisted of a large metal oven, with a fire lit on top or sometimes underneath it. A ‘gantry affair’ (or a ‘fire crane’) about 4 feet (1.2 metres) high, with hooks of various sizes over the fireplace also allowed for cooking in pots or on a girdle (Leslie n.d.-a).

To make butter, the milk, warm from the cow, was poured into wide shallow galvanised iron pans, about 30 inches (76 cm) in diameter set on purpose built shelves, ‘9 or 10 needed for about 12 cows’. After standing for about 12 hours, the cream was skimmed off with a metal skimmer and tipped into a ‘glazed earthenware vessel and allowed to stand until sour enough for churning’ (Leslie n.d.-a). Skim milk was ‘used on the table, and I can well remember liking it too’ (Leslie n.d.-a), and also used to rear calves and pigs. The butter churn had beaters inside, ‘turned by a handle on the outside, it was a man’s job’. After about 20 minutes churning, the butterfat in the cream separated from the buttermilk, and the butter was taken out, salted and ‘worked’ – put through wooden rollers or worked with butter pats, then put into a 1 pound (450 g) mould with a swan impressed on it. The butter was then taken into Dunedin to be sold; one of Leslie’s (n.d.-a) earliest memories was ‘of my mother passing up a basket of butter to my father on horseback, bareback no saddle.’ Family accounts record the prices butter made in the Dunedin markets. While prices could be as high as 1/- per pound, at other times it was only half this.

It was a subsistence economy, with perhaps 12 cows, a flock of hens and a few pigs kept, some of which would be sold to the butcher when large enough, and gardens producing other food for the family; ‘making a living from 50 or 60 acres [20 or 24 ha] was hard enough, but 10 or 12 [4 or 5 ha] NO’ (Leslie n.d.-a). However, in the family accounts for the beginning of 1892, sales of butter ceased and in its place appeared ‘622 Galls [2800 l] Milk’ (Leslie n.d.-a). This marked the opening of the Sandymount creamery on Sandymount Road, perhaps 5 km from the second Leslie homestead.

This creamery was one of several operated by the Taieri and Peninsula Milk Company, where the milk was separated into cream and skim milk. Farmers took a share of skim milk back to the farm to feed pigs, while the cream was taken into a central factory in Dunedin where the milk company produced butter. The daily visit to the creamery must have been a focal point for interaction in the community (Figure 7), as well as taking a large amount of time out of the day, when transport was slow and sometimes difficult.

On my father’s farm on Harbour Cone the milk for the creamery had to be sledged over the shoulder of Harbour Cone from the North East side to the South West [sic], a distance getting on to half a mile [800 m], the horse was then yoked into a spring cart and the milk then taken another 2 to 3 miles [3 to 5 km] to the Sandymount Creamery, suppliers had to wait their turn to unload the milk etc then wait again to get their share of skimmed milk and return home the same way. (Leslie n.d.-a)

In the late nineteenth century four dairy factories were working on the Peninsula, the ‘hey-day … of small farm pastoral activity’ (Knight 1979:96; see also West 2009). When the Sandymount creamery was operating at its peak, there were 30 dairy farms in the area, but by the close of this period only six remained as sheep farming gradually replaced the dairy herds. By 1967 when Leslie (n.d.-a) recorded his memoirs there were ‘at least 13 sites on and around Harbour Cone where there was at one time a house, the house belonging to a farm, today not one left, the land is now grouped into a much larger farm or farms carrying sheep’.

At Sandymount, other remnants of the community infrastructure can be found within a short distance of the concrete foundations of the creamery – the site of the school (opened in 1873), the post office (the site also marking the remains of a large cow byre, stable and homestead), a limestone-crushing plant, remains of three impressive stone lime kilns (the first built in 1865) and an associated tramway (Middleton 2008).

From Highcliff Road, and from the sledge track that runs around the base of Harbour Cone to the second Leslie homestead, a complex network of old roads and stone walls can be seen. One of the roads leads to the site of an old gold mine (beyond the Dunedin City Council’s purchase boundary), a late nineteenth-century venture that brought few returns and was quickly abandoned. Another well-formed,
stone-revetted and walled road leads to a stone enclosure and the stone ruins of another homestead, the home of one of those involved in the early cheese-making venture. Not far from the first Leslie homestead and the site of the cheese factory the most complete stone ruins can be found in a complex of hedgerows, paths, stone walls, a cow byre and a formed stone-lined road leading over a knoll around the northern slopes of Harbour Cone. This was once the home and forge of the local blacksmith, the structures built in the 1870s out of an inferior local stone quarried from a nearby source. Below this house site a bridle path now used as a walking track runs in a direct line downhill to Broad Bay. This path appears on the 1863 survey plan (Figure 4), drawn as a straight line with no consideration for the steep topography. Its continuation can still be seen running across the landscape as a feature, but long incorporated into farmland. The first roads were also drawn up without consideration of the topography they passed through and were subsequently so unsuitable that they were closed and the land transferred to surrounding land owners.

In the valley between Harbour Cone to the north and Peggy’s Hill at the south, the remains of other homesteads can be found, along with solid stone walls marking the 1863 cadastral boundaries. At one of these sites lived the local midwife, ‘Mrs. Arnott,’ whose husband was William Larnach’s stone mason. Twelve-year-old William Leslie was sent to fetch the midwife at 2 am on a morning in July 1900 and two hours later his mother gave birth to twins, only one of whom survived. There were no doctors to attend births – the nearest was across the harbour at Port Chalmers. An old formed track, marked by a single gnarled tōtara post, leads to the homestead site of stone foundations and chimney remains, inside a stand of macrocarpa trees. These trees are common settler homestead site markers.

The two Leslie family farms were humble subsistence economies, with money scarce. Above the site of the Arnott house, on the shoulder of Peggy’s Hill, the ruins of a grander series of farm buildings overlook the sites of the modest homesteads. This farmstead, once accessed through an arched entranceway, consisted of a cow byre, stable, barn, and dairy, and along with the farm manager’s house, formed William Larnach’s model farm (Figure 8). While Larnach’s castle now forms a focal point on the peninsula, his neglected complex of farm steading is of more archaeological interest, once forming the heart of Larnach’s self-sufficient farming operations. Larnach himself constructed some of the standing stone boundary walls (West 2009:330). He also pioneered the use of wire fencing, drilling tōtara posts to run fencing wire through them. Many of the tōtara posts, cut from the tōtara forest that once covered the area, still stand. By the time of his suicide in 1898, Larnach...
had bought up all the small, uneconomic dairy farms and consolidated these into his own large holding of over 1000 acres (404 ha); (West 2009:330). After his death this land remained as one economic unit, converted to sheep farming.

HEREWHEKA – ‘TO BIND OR KILL A WEKA’ (A NATIVE WOOD HEN)

Beneath, or alongside, the most visible archaeological features of the settler landscape, an indigenous palimpsest can be identified on Muapoko. Some of this can be seen in the remnant archaeological features of Pukekura pā, once located on the southern headland at the entrance to Otago Harbour (Hamel 1994). Although vestiges of the original Māori ditch and bank remain, much of this ‘cultural layer’ was overwritten with the construction of the late nineteenth and early twentieth-century European defenses, known as Taiaroa Head after a prominent nineteenth-century Ngāi Tahu chief. Other nearby recorded archaeological sites include umu tī, traditional ovens used to cook the roots of the tī or cordyline tree, and stone ovens or hāngī. Around the inlets beyond Hereweka, large sites relating to prehistoric Māori occupation have been both fossicked and investigated (Samson 2002; Simmons 1967; Skinner 1960). At Papanui Inlet sites I44/42, 47, 86, 89, and I44/90-I44/93 are likely locations of late prehistoric settlement (Figure 1). Papanui Beach site I44/1 (also known as Little Papanui) has evidence of both early and late occupation, while adjacent sites I44/7 and I44/115-117 are likely to relate to occupation in late prehistory. A total of over 6,000 objects from site I44/1 are held in the Otago Museum, at least 400 of these adzes, as well as chisels, gouges, and over 90 ‘ornaments’ (West 2009:116-119). Stone wood-working tools may have been used to build canoes, as there was little evidence of houses; the peninsula was a noted canoe-manufacturing area, with the durable tōtara forests providing an ideal material for this. In the eroding sand dunes on the coast beyond the inlet, early burials are sometimes exposed.

All this archaeological evidence is likely to relate to the Ngāti Mamoe occupation of the area until the final Ngāi Tahu conquest on the peninsula and Ngāti Mamoe retreat to the far southwest, at Preservation Inlet. While no prehistoric archaeological sites have been identified in the immediate Harbour Cone area, such sites are plentiful around the peninsula. Oral history, however, firmly connects Hereweka to the final struggles between Ngāi Tahu and Ngāti Mamoe around the turn of the eighteenth century.

At this point of the Ngāi Tahu conquest, Pukekura pā was under the command of Tarewai, ‘a great fighting chief’ (Anderson 1998:54-56; Tau and Anderson 2008:154). Although Tarewai was of Ngāi Tahu descent, there were also Ngāti Mamoe residents in the pā, while the main Ngāti Mamoe population was based at nearby Papanui Inlet and Little Papanui. Predictably, conflict between the two groups developed, initially over access to fishing grounds. After this dispute died down, the Ngāti Mamoe chief, Whakatakanewa, invited Tarewai and his Ngāi Tahu people to come and assist in the construction of a large house. After work on this, a meal was followed by ‘friendly’ wrestling. Of course, this invitation was simply a ruse and all the Ngāi Tahu men from Pukekura were killed, apart from Tarewai, who was taken captive:

Whakatakanewa, the Ngāti Mamoe chief, having decided that Tarewai’s heart was to be eaten, took a sharp piece of flint and proceeded to cut him open, which entailed a long cut from the throat to the pit of the stomach. He had made the first incision which only cut the skin, and had just pierced the cavity below the breast bone, when the men who were holding Tarewai, deceived by his passivity, relaxed their grasp slightly. Up till then he had not winced or moved at all, but then suddenly broke loose with a yell that quite astonished his enemies, and before they had recovered he was lost in the bush. Ngāti Mamoe’s hot pursuit failed to find him. (Tau and Anderson 2008:154).

Later, Tarewai actually returned to the Ngāti Mamoe camp, where he recovered his favourite whalebone mere (a short flat weapon), before he took off back into the bush. He hid out in the heavy forest on the eastern slopes of Hereweka, in the area where the house that William Leslie later grew up in would be built. Here, Tarewai caught weka (wood hens) and used the fat from the birds to heal the long incision down his chest (Tahu Potiki, pers. comm. 7/11/2010). He occasionally came out of the bush to pick off and kill Ngāti Mamoe people from Papanui as they collected fresh water (Anderson 1998:54). Meanwhile, Ngāti Mamoe besieged Pukekura pā from a fortified position they had constructed on the slope directly opposite. Tarewai, his wounds having healed, decided to return to Pukekura. From a nearby point he signalled to his relatives inside the pā to create a diversion by performing a haka (war dance). While this was happening, Tarewai sprinted across the small beach below Pukekura (Pilot’s Beach, now a tourist spot noted for its penguin population) and, by using the thong of his mere, swung himself up into a tree from where he leapt into the pā. This spot is still known as ‘Tarewai’s Leap’ (Anderson 1998:55; Tau and Anderson 2008:155). To celebrate his return, Ngāi Tahu killed a dog for Tarewai to eat and the next day they prepared for a full attack on the Ngāti Mamoe fortification. They broke open the gate of this pā and killed some of those inside. The survivors fled to Lower Portobello, below Hereweka, where there was more fighting, and from there to the far west, into Fiordland.

In Fiordland, Ngāti Mamoe constructed a pā on an island in Preservation Inlet. Ngāi Tahu pursuers, including Tarewai, arrived in two double-hulled canoes and anchored these near the pā, but in the night warriors from the pā swam out, cut the anchors’ ropes and towed the canoes towards the pā. All the invaders were captured, while Tarewai was killed during his efforts to break free. Tarewai’s nephew returned to Pukekura to enlist more men to fight at Preservation Inlet. On their arrival they lured Ngāti Mamoe occupants out of the pā, which was then stormed and taken. However, other residents of the pā were fishing further up the sound and the survivors fled to Lower Portobello, below Hereweka, where there was more fighting, and from there to the far west, into Fiordland.

By the end of the nineteenth century, Ngāi Tahu Māori were occupying land holdings on the Otago Peninsula, some of only 10 acres (4 ha), too small to support their families. Many were forced by this poverty to move away from Otakou to return to other ancestral places (West 2009:420). Today, however, the iwi still maintain mana whenua over the peninsula and Otago from the marae (a traditional place for religious and social purposes) at the centre of their old reserve at Otakou.

CONCLUSION

This discussion of Hereweka/Harbour Cone describes a case study of the settler transformation of Aotearoa/New Zealand through the clearance of bush and the imposition of a cadastral landscape layer on an indigenous one. It is this historical archaeological landscape that remains the most visible today. Forest clearance brought with it a flood of other unexpected environmental changes, but the imposition of private
ownership was the primary step in the settler dynamic of ‘improvement’ (Tarlow and West 1999: West 2009:27). This ideology of ‘improvement’ imposed a new order associated with the creation of a cadastral landscape and the English ideal of the small yeoman farmer (see also Middleton 2003). The first survey of the peninsula in 1863 cut up an open landscape into the favoured grid system, ‘an ancient feature in Europe’s landscapes, and so generic and ubiquitous in its far-flung colonies’ (Park 2006:36). This system is presented as neutral, when in fact it is highly ideological, presenting productive units of land that have individual and exclusive property rights, often ignoring topography and ecology (West 2009: 17, 28).

Such a system is demonstrated in the relict archaeological landscape at Harbour Cone, in the sites associated with the first European settlement of the Otago Peninsula. These include house sites, dry stone walls marking cadastral boundaries, old road networks, an early post office and lime kilns. Beyond, or beneath, this apparent landscape there is another layer, associated with the successive waves of Māori migration into the south, each tribal migration conquering and incorporating earlier groups. These events are remembered in the oral history associated with the name of Hereweka. This term, meaning ‘to bind or kill a weka’ (a native wood hen), recalls the Ngāi Tahu conquest and absorption of Ngāti Mamoe, as Tarewai caught weka near the summit of Harbour Cone and used the fat of this bird to heal the wound he had received from the Ngāti Mamoe chief, Whakatakanewa.

Ironically, while the less visible, indigenous landscape associated with the story of Tarewai has persisted through Ngāi Tahu oral history, the more visible archaeological, settler landscape appears to have been forgotten, only brought to light again through the Dunedin City Council’s purchase of the land, and subsequent archaeological survey and the unearthing of William Leslie’s memoirs. The Hereweka/Harbour Cone landscape is associated with the memories of this Pākehā individual and with larger indigenous Ngāi Tahu and Ngāti Mamoe identities, connecting this study with similar explorations of identity and landscape around the globe. Overlaid on this is the more recent construction of the Otago Peninsula as a tourist destination for nature or wilderness tours; the small beach where Tarewai once lept into the pā above (‘Tarewai’s Leap’) is now the favoured spot for penguin watching, while the former Pukekura pā is renowned for its albatross colony.

Hereweka/Harbour Cone is one example of a landscape embodying values of identity and memory (Branton 2009; Yoffee 2007) of both Māori and Pākehā. Similar stories echo across Aotearoa/New Zealand (for example, Solomon n.d.) and throughout other indigenous and colonised regions. These dual cultural and archaeological values are entwined in Hereweka/Harbour Cone, demonstrated by the two different names the park is now known by.
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