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ABSTRACT: The customary practice of tuku, or gift exchange, by Māori chiefs is exemplified in the formal gifts of two mere pounamu (greenstone clubs) by Titore and Patuone to King William IV of the United Kingdom in 1834, in the expectation of a formal return. The formal return was of two sets of plate armour, that for Titore arriving in 1835 and that for Patuone two years later, in 1837. The former is in the Museum of New Zealand Te Papa Tongarewa (Te Papa) but the latter is lost, although a receipt and a detailed description survive, along with good documentation. The two mere pounamu (as far as can be determined) have also been located and are illustrated for the first time; they are still in the Royal Collection, at St James's Palace, London. 'His Highness Titore' was killed at the Bay of Islands in 1837, but a formal salute to him was fired from HMS Rattlesnake on the orders of Captain William Hobson at that time. Patuone dined with Hobson on HMS Herald on 6 February 1840, presenting him with a further mere pounamu for Queen Victoria, as he had for her late uncle. This mere is one of two that were retained in Hobson's family after his death in 1842, and is also in Te Papa, here illustrated. Patuone's gifts to the Queen symbolically confirmed his cession of sovereignty to her.
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Introduction

Two panoplies (complete sets of armour) were sent to Titore and Patuone, chiefs of New Zealand, as diplomatic gifts in exchange for presents sent by them to King William IV of the United Kingdom in 1834. While the remnants of the armour of Titore are in Te Papa, and even the accompanying letter from the Earl of Aberdeen has survived, the panoply of Patuone has vanished, although his receipt for it, with his moko (tattoo), is extant. As for the two mere pounamu given to the King, while provenance data are uncertain, these are likely to be two fine but unattributed mere now in the Royal Collection at St James's Palace, London, and located after much searching in May 2001. These, their history and their likely associations, along with the available documentation, are described and illustrated, as is a further mere pounamu given by Patuone to Lieutenant-Governor William Hobson as a gift for Queen Victoria, confirming the chiefly link to the British Crown, when they dined on HMS Herald on the evening of the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi, 6 February 1840.

The alleged ‘armour of Hongi Hika’

Stories about chiefs and their armour have become confused over the decades, that of Titore (displayed for a long time in the former Dominion Museum at Buckle Street) sometimes being muddled with the ‘armour’ that allegedly belonged to Hongi Hika, which for many years was displayed at the Auckland War Memorial Museum. But Hongi Hika, after meeting King George IV in 1820, received not a suit of armour but rather a shirt of chain mail, later said to have...
been stolen by a servant of the chief, then recovered and buried with Hongi after his death in 1828. The armour at the Auckland War Memorial Museum (breastplate, back plate and helmet) was actually purchased by the Auckland Institute and Museum on 5 September 1936 from Mr F.O. Peat. At the time, the armour was ‘said to have belonged to Hongi. Consists of breast plate, back plate & helmet’ but probably has nothing at all to do with the chief; it is, in fact, early nineteenth-century cavalry armour, probably from the 1st Regiment of Life Guards or 1st or 2nd Dragoon Guards. At some point, the Peat armour and helmet were separated, but they are in fact unrelated items; the latter is now identified as a kind of regimental helmet complete with a Roman-style crest and red horsecollar.

In the time between Hongi’s meeting with George IV in 1820 and the gifting of the panoplies, there was another royal connection with Māori, when, in 1831, 13 chiefs from the Bay of Islands wrote to King William IV asking for his protection against the French. Both Titore and Patuone were among the chiefs who put their moko on the letter (marks numbered as 6 and 3, respectively), which had been prepared for them by the missionary William Yate. It was this letter that resulted in the appointment of James Busby as British Resident in 1833 and initiated the more regular diplomatic connections between the British Crown and the independent chiefs between 1833 and 1840, New Zealand being regarded as a foreign country.

**Titore and Te Toru**

Titore of Kororareka (now Russell) was one of the principal chiefs in the Bay of Islands from 1830 until his death in 1837, and effectively replaced Hongi Hika as the leading chief when he died in 1828. Evidence about Titore, however, is conflicting and requires elucidation, as two quite different but well-attested individuals (Titore and Te Toru) have been persistently confused in the published sources. Titore has usually been misidentified with ‘Tetoro, Chief of New Zealand’, who is the subject of the frontispiece in Cruise (1823), but this chief is actually Te Toru. The variation in the spelling of Māori names before the missionaries settled on a consistent orthography in 1830 accounts for this confusion.

Rogers (1961) calls Titore of Kororareka ‘Titore’, but also includes references to the alternative spellings ‘Tetoro’ and ‘Tetoree’. ‘Titore’ is said by Rogers to have gone with ‘Tuhi’ (correctly Tuai, brother of Korokoro) to England in 1817 (actually 1818), but this is an erroneous reference to another man, Titere, Tuai’s companion; portraits by James Barry of both men are in the Alexander Turnbull Library. Two small silhouette portraits of Tuai and Titore, also made during their brief visit to England, and which came to light at auction in 2002, were acquired by Te Papa in 2006. The statement by Rogers (1961) that ‘Titore’ returned to New Zealand two years later with Samuel Marsden refers to Te Toru, who journeyed home with Marsden and Cruise on H.M.S Dromedary in 1820, and who is the imposing figure depicted in the frontispiece of Cruise’s _Journal of a ten months residence in New Zealand_ (1823). Thus, three distinct people (Titere, 1817–18; Te Toru, 1820, i.e. Cruise’s ‘Tetoro, Chief of New Zealand’; and Titore, c. 1830–37) have been confused. There is a single further reference to Titere by Rogers (1961: 109) as ‘Tetoree’ in error, mentioned on 28 February 1828. Titore is first mentioned by Rogers in a reference to March 1830 at the start of the ‘Girls’ War’ (1961: 58); he is thereafter mentioned frequently until his death, at the hands of Pomare II, in 1837. Titore was married to a sister of Hongi. An authenticated and dated sketich of him by Conrad Martens is in the Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales, Sydney.

It is most unlikely that Cruise knew Titore, but he did know ‘Tetoro’ in 1820 and also knew Hongi Hika, Korokoro and his brother Tuai, as well as Te Uri o Kana of Rangihoua, Te Koki of Paahi, Kiwikiwi and the Whangaroa chief Te Ara and Te Puhi. All these figures are mentioned in Cruise’s account and thus there is little likelihood that he confused them. ‘Tetoro’ (from Waikare at the Bay of Islands) had resided with Marsden and Hongi’s son Rapiro at Pararamatta in New South Wales, where he learned English. Cruise reports that ‘Tetoro’ saw a military pike and asked if he might have it. On being told that it belonged to King George III, ‘he observed that King George, if he were here, would give it to him’. The number of valuable articles ‘Tetoro’ saw in the ship, ‘caused him frequently to express his surprise, “that the white people should be so rich, while his countrymen were so poor”’ (Cruise 1823: 9). Further references to George III occur later in the work (Cruise 1823: 12), and the title ‘King George’ was also adopted as an honorific name for the _Dromedary_ itself, on which the party sailed from Sydney to New Zealand (Cruise 1823: 14).

According to its inscription, the original portrait of ‘Tetoro’ (i.e. Te Toru) on which Cruise’s frontispiece is based was ‘Drawn by R. Read from Life, 1820’ (Fig. 1). This artist can be identified as Richard D. Read Jr (1796–1862), who arrived in New South Wales in November 1819. Read is now
also thought to have drawn the undated portrait of Te Uri o Kana in the Alexander Turnbull Library, which was published as an engraved plate by John William Lewin in 1824 as ‘A Hoodoo O Gunna. Chief of Ranghee Hoo’. In February 1821, Read described himself as a ‘miniature, portrait and historical painter’ and had for sale a ‘most elegant collection of drawings consisting of natives of New Zealand and New South Wales, views, flowers &c.’ (Kerr 1992). It is probable that ‘Tetoro’ was drawn by Read in his Sydney studio in 1820, just before the chief returned to New Zealand on the Dromedary.

The original picture of ‘Tetoro’ (which is now in a private collection) shows the chief holding not a taiaha (long weapon), but what appears to be a Marquesan spear. This...
original was illustrated in the Christie's catalogue when the work was sold by the London auction house on 26 September 2001, and there gives the artist as 'Read the Elder'.” As stated above, however, the artist is now thought to be Richard Read Jr. The very odd-looking taiaha held by ‘Tetoro’ in Cruise’s frontispiece is evidence of artistic licence on the part of the engraver (Edward Finden). Aside from portraits by Cook’s artists, and the unnamed chief shown in the frontispiece to the first volume of Nicholas’s (1817) Narrative of a voyage to New Zealand (which is partly an adaptation of a plate designed by Sydney Parkinson), Read’s is the first published drawing of a Māori in the nineteenth century. The same ‘Tetoro’ image was also adapted to depict another chief in an engraving published in the United Service Journal (Anonymous 1830: 651), but here he is called ‘Enararo, or, the Lizard’ (i.e. Ngārara).

On his return to the Bay of Islands, ‘Tetoro’ lived in the southern arm at Waikare with his elder brother, ‘Wevere’. In his 1822 list of chiefs at the Bay of Islands, the disgraced missionary Thomas Kendall names three chiefs at ‘Waikadìi’ (Waikare): ‘Maki Wiwiia’, ‘Waikakadìi’ and ‘Tetodu’, the last of these being ‘Te T oru’ (Kendall [1827–1832]: 135). The missionary Henry Williams also mentions ‘Te T oru’, in March 1828, as ‘Tetoro one of the head chiefs’ of Waikare, and again in July 1834 as ‘Te Toru … very civil tho hard as flint rock’ (Rogers 1961: 111). Rogers adds the footnote ‘Te Toru, one of the principal chiefs of Waikare. He lost five sons in the fight at Hokiaanga in 1828, in which Pomare’s son and Whareumu were killed’ (Rogers 1961: 379). Henry Williams also mentions Wiwiia on 10 October 1833: ‘very obstinate and would not come near’ (Rogers 1961: 332). These references show that the linguistically competent missionaries distinguished ‘Te Toru’ from Titore. Wiwiia was a signatory to James Busby’s ‘Declaration of Independence’ in October 1835, but his brother was not. The last reference to ‘Te Toru’ is in 1834 (Rogers 1961: 379), and his absence from Busby’s list probably indicates that he had died in that year; Cruise indicated that ‘Te Toru’ had been born about 1778 and was about 45 when his portrait was painted (c. 1820) or when the engraving was published in 1823. Nevertheless, the picture of ‘Te Toru’ at Treaty House, Waitangi, is still misidentified as Titore.

The attributed status of ‘Te Toru’ and ‘Te Uri o Kana’, the two figures drawn by Read in about 1820 and both called ‘King’, as if they were local monarchs in some way comparable to the King of England, was brief. Marsden sought a successor to Ruatara, when that chief was dying in 1815, and determined to establish ‘Te Uri o Kana’ as ‘King’ of the place. Marsden executed a land purchase deed, through which a parcel of 200 acres was bought for 12 axes from ‘Ahoodee o Gunna, King of Ranghee Hoo’ on 24 February (Salmond 1997: 506). But the use of this title was not to last. Thereafter, ‘Te Uri o Kana’ and ‘Te Toru’ would be referred to as ‘sovereign chiefs’ (the term used by the adventurer Charles Philippe Hippolyte de Thierry in his absurd pretensions to the sovereignty of New Zealand in 1835 (FitzRoy 1839: 515)). Marsden soon recognised that his ‘King of Rangihoo’ was not a replacement for Ruatara.

A watercolour copy of Read’s portrait of ‘Tetoro’ in the Wesleyan Historical Society collection, currently on loan to the Auckland Art Gallery, has been identified as another person, ‘Te Puhi’, spelled ‘Tabooha’. This portrait, and another in the collection of ‘George’ ('Te Ara), are illustrated in Salmond (1997: 576). The portrait of ‘Te Puhi’ was inscribed by the Wesleyan missionary Samuel Leigh: ‘The New Zealand King Tabooha at the Wesleyan Missionary Settlement, Wesleydale, Wangaroa, New Zealand. Samuel Leigh 1823’. Salmond (1997) accepted the ascription to Leigh on the basis of the evidence, but in fact the two portraits are not by Leigh, who was merely the collector of the images. Certainly both ‘Te Ara’ and ‘Te Puhi’ were known to Leigh, as he met them at Whangaroa in 1822. Strachan, in his biography of Leigh, calls them ‘Tara [Tärä]’ and ‘Tepui [Te Puhi]’, respectively: ‘Tara, called by the sailors “George” and ‘George and Tepui his brother’ (Strachan 1853: 166, 179). It is uncertain whether Leigh knew ‘Te Toru’. The frontispiece in Cruise (1823) of ‘Tetoro’ (i.e. ‘Te Toru’), engraved by Finden after Read’s original, combines disparate elements (as is often the case with portraits); here, the head of ‘Tetoro’ (i.e. ‘Te Toru’) is the same as the head of ‘Tabooha’, but with the addition of two white feathers. In essence, however, this is not ‘Te Puhi’ (or ‘Tabooha’), but ‘Te Toru’ again, the acceptable face of a ‘typical’ chief, misidentified. Given the scarcity of images of notable Māori from this early period, it is not so surprising that one can readily be passed off as another.

In 1835, however, the Reverend William Yate commented on the Read portrait (as engraved by Finden), stating that it was ‘an excellent specimen of a fully-tattooed face, in the likeness given of Te-Torou. It is admirably done and the features are so strikingly portrayed, that even at this distance of time it is easily recognised by anyone who has seen
the original’ (Yate 1835). Yate knew what Te Toru looked like because Te Toru was still alive in 1834. Yate also distinguished ‘Te-Toru’ from Titore, another chief whom he knew personally (Yate 1835: 244).

A genuine portrait of Titore
The pencil portrait of Titore by Conrad Martens, inscribed ‘Bay of Islands, April 8 1835’, shows somebody quite different from Te-Toru, indicating that the confusion of misspelt names appears to be a more modern phenomenon. Descriptions of the stature of ‘Tetoro’ (i.e. Te Toru) and Titore also serve to distinguish them. Captain Frederick W.R. Sadler (see below) stated in 1835 that Titore stood 5 ft 10 in, but according to Cruise (1823: 6), ‘Tetoro’ was 4 ft 5 years old, 6 ft 2 in in height and ‘perfectly handsome both as to features and figure; though very much tattooed, the benignity and even beauty of his countenance were not destroyed by this frightful operation’. Let us hope that the confusion of names is now ended.

Titore writes to King William IV, 1834

HMS Buffalo came to New Zealand in 1833 on a diplomatic mission to deliver a proposed flag for the chiefs to adopt at the behest of the recently appointed British Resident, James Busby. The flag, however, was rejected because it contained no red, and a new attempt was made in 1834, this time meeting with success. On the second visit the vessel also came for the economic purpose of collecting kauri spars, and that part of the enterprise resulted in the development of connections with Titore and Patuone, who supplied the spars, as described by Campbell (1988). After its first visit to New Zealand, the Buffalo returned to Sydney in April 1834, but in June, on her way home to England, the ship called again at the Bay of Islands. Here she picked up William Yate, who had prepared the 1831 letter to William IV on behalf of the 13 chiefs, and who was now returning to England with some of the mission children and with scriptural translations to be printed there. Titore (using Yate as his amanuensis) now wrote to King William, seeking to advance his own project of obtaining a ship. In his unpublished diary for 1833–1845 (entry dated 26 June 1834, pages 116 and 117), Yate writes:

Putting all to rights in my cabin and preparing for sea. Titore asked me to write down what he said to me and be fingers for him to the King of England. I accordingly at his dictation wrote the following letter which, with the translation was given to Captain Sadler to convey to His Majesty:

Kia Wiramu te Kingi o Engarani
E Kingi Wiramu

Tenei ano a hau te hoa o Kapene Harara. Ka tomo te kaipuke – ka tahi ka rere. Kua rongo a hau he Rangatira Kaipuke koe i mua – mau e titiro inga rakau me he pai ranei – me he kino ranei. Ka wawai korua ko Manoao tenei ano nga rakau mou he rakau mo ou kaipuke wawai.

Ka tahi nei a hau ka wakaro ki te tahi kaipuke moku. He waka maori toku kaipuke – kahore aku mea ke. Ka tahuri te waka maori ma tomo ki nga kapana, nga aha ra nei mo ou.

Ka utaina ke te ‘Puwaro’, te tahi Meri Pounamu me nga kakahu e rua. He oti tonu to te tangata maori mea. Me he mea pai atu ka ho atu e hau ki a Kapene Karara?
He oti toku ki a loe
Te Titore
Ki a Wiremu te Kingi o Engarani
[June 24th 1834 Wangaroa]

King William —

Here am I, the friend of Captain Sadler. The ship is full and is now about to sail. I have heard that you afore time were the Captain of a ship. Do you therefore examine the spars, whether they are good, or whether they are bad. Should you and the French quarrel, here are some trees for your Battle-Ships. I am now beginning to think about a ship for myself. A native canoe is my vessel, and I have nothing else. The native canoes upset, when they are filled with potatoes, and other matters for your people.

I have put on board the Buffalo a meri ponamu and two Garments for you: these are all the things which New Zealanders possess. If I had anything better, I would give it to Captain Sadler for you.

This is all mine to you, mine.

Titore
To William, King of England

The text is printed with minor alterations and the caption ‘Letter XXIII. A New-Zealand Chief to the King of England’ in Yate (1835: 271). Soon after his arrival at Plymouth, on 20 November 1834, Captain Sadler sent ashore the presents from Titore and Patuone to King William, via the Admiralty.

One mere (said to have been presented to Captain Sadler) is in the British Museum, but this would appear to be a personal gift to the captain from Titore, and not the present to the King. Jill Hassell of the Department of Ethnography at the British Museum wrote: ‘The British Museum collections contain four artefacts brought to England by Captain Sadler.'
These were acquired by the British Museum in 1896, purchased from Sadler’s grand-daughter, Miss B.S.M. Sadler. She stated that they were “New Zealand objects presented to my grand-father F.W.R. Sadler, KTS, Commander, by Tetore King of New Zealand about 1833 or 34” (pers. comm. 20 October 2000). The four objects are a nephrite tiki (carved figure), the nephrite mere, a carved bone flute and a bone cloak pin. It is possible that a further message may have been sent via Sadler to King William from Patuone of Hokianga, but if so there is no documentation of it.

The armour of Titore

As was explained by Campbell (1988), on 26 December 1834, Sir Herbert Taylor, Private Secretary to William IV, wrote to Lord Aberdeen, Secretary of State for War and the Colonies, ordering that a suit of armour be sent for Titore. Robert Hay, Permanent Under-Secretary of State for War and the Colonies, then wrote to Sir George Murray on 1 January 1835: ‘You will perhaps be surprised at receiving a requisition from this department to supply a suit of armour. It is for one of the King’s new Allies in New Zealand, and Sir H. Taylor has suggested by H.M.’s Command that the particular present for which application has been made to the Ordnance would be the most acceptable to the Chief’ (Hay to Murray, 1 January 1835, in Campbell 1988: 17).

The order was put into action that day, but officials at the Tower of London raised some practical questions about the fit of the armour (R. Porrett to R. Bryham, 2 January 1835, in Campbell 1988: 18):

The description of armour which I should consider best adapted for this service is the Black Armour of the time of Charles the First which reached only to the knee, and was worn with Boots and Gauntlets of Leather. Bright Armour I should imagine would quickly become rusty and useless in New Zealand where it is not to be expected it could be kept in the best state of repair.

The curator of armour at the Royal Armouries, Thom Richardson, advised:

the only difference between bright cuirassier armours and black ones is basically polish: black ones were originally left in black from the hammer condition, and quite a few survive in that state in the armoury. Bright ones were the same but polished bright. A lot of that polishing happened in the early 19th century, and during the same century a lot of armour was painted black also. (Natasha Roberts, Royal Armouries, pers. comm. 20 October 2011)
Fig. 2 Armour of Titore (Te Papa collection ME 001845).
The Earl of Aberdeen,
One of His Majesty’s Principal
Secretaries of State to His Highness Titore
Friend and Brother

I have received the commands of my Most Gracious
Sovereign King William the Fourth to thank you for your
letter brought to him by the hands of Captain Sadler,
Commander of His Majesty’s Ship the ’Buffalo’, and for
the assistance which you rendered to him in obtaining
the articles for which that ship was expressly sent to Your
Country.

King William will not forget this proof of your Friend-
ship and he trusts that such mutual good offices will
continue to be interchanged between His Majesty’s
Subjects and the Chiefs and People of New Zealand as may
cement the Friendship already so happily existing between
the two countries, and advance the commercial interests
and wealth of Both.

The King, my Master, further commands me to thank
you for your Present, and in return, he desires you will
accept a Suit of Armour, such as was worn in former times
by His Warriors, but which are now only used by His own
Body Guard.

This letter, as well as His Majesty’s Royal Present will be
conveyed to you through James Busby Esquire, His
Majesty’s authorised Resident at the Bay of Islands, whose
Esteem and Friendship you will do well to cultivate, and
who in his turn, will do all in his power to promote your
Welfare and that of your Countrymen.

I am your Friend and Brother

Aberdeen
Colonial Office
London
31 January 1835

Scant information has been found with regards the shipping
of the armours in New Zealand, but Busby reported to the
Colonial Secretary of New South Wales on 30 November
1835 (Campbell 1988: 21) that he had received the armours
from the Reverend Robert Munsell when that missionary
arrived at the Bay of Islands from Sydney on the Active: ‘I
lost no time in apprising Titore of the arrival of His Majesty’s
gift, and I received a visit from him without delay, when I
delivered Lord Aberdeen’s letter, after having explained its
contents; and also the case containing the Armour which was
received with much gratification.’

The official continues:

Mr Tukere te Anga who is on the staff here tells me that a
suit of armour was found on a battlefield at Puketuka on
the Wanganui River after a battle in which the Northern
Tribes were involved. Probably both Hongi [Hika] and
Titore were present at this fight and it is said that Hongi
also had a suit of armour. Titore's was of steel, Hongi's was
of chain armour. About 18 years ago Mr te Anga tells me
the armour was found to be held by the natives at Korinhi
[i.e. Corinth] Wanganui River and it was then placed in the
Wellington Museum.

The recollection garbles the tradition, however, as Hongi
died in 1828 (and had been fitted out with chain mail rather
than plate armour) and Titore did not receive his armour
until 1835.

The painter George French Angas saw this armour in
1844, when it was in the possession of Taonui, a chief of
Mokau. In a further confusion over the tradition of the
‘armour of Hongi’, Angas understood the armour had been
given to Hongi Hika and then passed to Titore and then to
Te Wherowhero, who had been affronted by Titore and
demanded the armour as utu (payment) for the insult. Angas
(1847, vol. 2: 86) said it was now old and rusty, and was of
steel inlaid with brass. It was not worn, but was regarded
‘with a sort of superstitious veneration by the natives, who
look upon it as something extraordinary’.

Some of these accounts are corroborated by Hamilton
(1910), including an illustration of the armour, but others
are incompatible with the evidence, as Hamilton points
out. Today, Titore’s armour (Fig. 2) is in Te Papa, but is no
longer on display.

The armour of Patuone

In 1836, after his return to England, Captain Sadler again
took up the case of the armour for Patuone. According to a
memorandum written by Sadler on 9 July 1836, the Under-
Secretary of State had authorised him in June 1835
to go to the Tower and select a suit of armour for Patuone
(a New Zealand chief in my employ during part of the time
I was selecting Masts in the country). On my late visit to
the Tower to inspect some articles for barter, I found no
further orders respecting the said armour had been given.
On my return home to England I brought home presents
from two chiefs – Titore and Patuone to His Majesty –
stating the New Zealand practice of a return being expected – and I presume by some oversight one suit of armour was ordered instead of two – there is no probability of a ship going to Hookianga [sic] of which place Patuone is a great forest owner. I think it will prove of great service to the present expedition [of the Buffalo] that a present be sent to this man.18

A few days later, on 14 July, Sadler wrote to the Admiralty:

On leaving New Zealand in June 1834 I was requested by two chiefs – Titore [sic] and Patuone – to take charge of and deliver to His Majesty on my arrival in England, as a present from them two Meares punamu [mere pounamu] (stone war clubs considered of great value) and some native garments – mats – which on my arrival in November following I forwarded by their Lordship’s direction to the Admiralty, accompanied by a letter from me explanatory of the motives of these chiefs in sending the presents and the New Zealand custom of a return being made. As these chiefs are men of great influence in the North part of the Island and Patuone a great land proprietor of the Hookianga (the port at which HMS Buffalo will most likely obtain her cargo of spars) I am of opinion the service will be considerably forwarded should their Lordships see fit to send a suit of armour to this chief as an acknowledgement for the present sent to His Majesty in the Buffalo.

Annotations of the documents by James Stephen (dated 11 July) state that the Colonial Office had no record of correspondence on the subject of the armour, except in reference to the armour sent to Titore. According to Sadler’s 9 July memorandum, Lord Glenelg, Secretary of State for War and the Colonies, knew nothing about a present from Patuone, his motive for sending it or whether it had been accepted.19

A memorandum written by William Yate’s friend Sir Edward Parry and dated March 1836 (shortly after Yate left England for Australia) provides further information about contacts between Māori chiefs and the Crown (Parry to Colonial Office, March 1836):

The encouraging success of the Church Missionaries in New Zealand and the increasing importance of that country in a political point of view cannot but render every particular relating to it interesting to our beloved sovereign. I have therefore, with His Majesty’s gracious permission collected a few gratifying facts from the Rev. Wm Yate, a pious and talented clergyman of the Church of England who has been many years resident in New Zealand. […] This gentleman has lately come to England for the purpose of procuring some new schoolmasters for the southern parts of the island and will shortly return to the scene of his labours. […] The cargo of masts lately brought home by His Majesty’s Ship store-ship Buffalo are considered very good. […] the Chiefs of New Zealand are extremely well disposed towards this country. […] As a proof of the entire confidence they feel in the goodwill of the natives, it may be mentioned that Mr Yate is about to take his sister out to New Zealand to assist in the work of instructing them. One of the most influential of the chiefs is Titore, successor to Hongi who was introduced to his late Majesty George the Fourth in England. Titore professes so much power that with a little assistance from England it is more than probable that he would obtain the control of all the Northern District of New Zealand and thus exert an influence over the whole island. Titore wrote a letter to His Majesty by Mr Sadler of the Buffalo of which the following is a copy as translated literally from the original.

Titore’s letter has been quoted in full above and so is not repeated here, but Sir Edward Parry continues: ‘The great object of Titore’s ambition is to obtain from His Majesty a small cutter of 30 or 40 tons which would give him great influence and at the same time secure that influence on behalf of Great Britain. Should His Majesty be graciously pleased to grant his request a small vessel of this kind could be procured from New South Wales.’ It is not recorded whether this wish was granted, but it was probably considered that the armory was sufficient. Yate himself had had a long interview with the King in January, recording in his journal (Yate 1833–1845: 176):

He then enquired whether the natives would quietly submit to having their country colonised and assured me that it was only for information that he enquired and that as long as he had anything to do with it no more colonies should be added to the British Crown for he had now more than he knew what to do with, or that his shoulders would bear.

After the experience with Hongi Hika in 1820, arming Ngā Puhi further was surely considered inadvisable.

In July 1836, Captain Sadler was preparing to resume command of the Buffalo and tasked with taking proposed governor John Hindmarsh to South Australia to establish a new colony there. But at this point Lord Aberdeen was replaced by Lord Glenelg and Hay had been replaced by James Stephen. It was Sadler who then discovered that the matter of the armour for Patuone had still not been attended to. Charles Wood, Secretary to the Admiralty, wrote to Sir George Grey, Under-Secretary of State for War and the Colonies, on 9 July: ‘I have to request that you will move Lord Glenelg to cause steps to be taken with as little delay as possible to procure the suit of armory referred to in the memorandum [by Sadler] for the New Zealand chief Patuone that it may be sent out in the Buffalo now at Portsmouth.20
The Colonial Office took notice of Sadler’s letters, ensuring that the armour for Patuone was indeed on board the Buffalo, but on 15 July 1836 Sadler was replaced as commander of the ship by James Wood. Hindmarsh wrote from Spithead on 3 August 1836 that he was at last underway, and on 27 December he reached Holdfast Bay, in South Australia (Campbell 1988). He remained there with the Buffalo until 14 June 1837, by which time there was war in the Bay of Islands and Titore had been killed by Pomare II. By a curious coincidence, William IV had died just two days earlier. Governor Bourke advised Lord Glenelg on 19 September 1837 that the Buffalo was cleared to resume the spar trade to Hokianga (Campbell 1988: 24). This was the day the Buffalo reached Kororareka with Patuone’s armour, but by then the chief had left the Bay of Islands.

Six weeks later, the log of the Buffalo records: ‘31 October 1837: Sent 2nd cutter to the Thames with Mr Chegwyn (Senior 2nd Master), six men and a months provisions, and a Suit of Armour for Patuone a New Zealand chief, a present from His Majesty’ (Campbell 1988). Two days after the news of the accession of Queen Victoria was confirmed on 27 November 1837, a belated royal salute was fired. Chegwyn had returned to the Buffalo by 1 December but there is no indication of the occasion of the delivery of the late King William’s gift. However, a delivery note to accompany the armour was sent to Sir Frederick Maitland at Portsmouth (Fig. 4A), and this shows that it was a suit of bright armour consisting of a helmet and visor, breast plate and back plate, gorget (a covering for the throat), pauldrons (coverings for the shoulder areas), rerebraces (protection for the upper arms) and vambraces (protection for the forearms), cuisses (armour for the thighs) and genouilleres (kneecap plates).

The accompanying suit of clothes consisted of a green jacket, breeches, cap, worsted stockings, gauntlets and a pair of fisherman’s boots. The receipt bearing Patuone’s mark was made out on 4 November 1836 at Maraetai, the station occupied by the Fairburn family and Robert Maunsell. The original documents, formerly in the Library of the Royal Commonwealth Society as MSS 89, are now in the Royal Commonwealth Society collection at Cambridge University Library (Fig. 4). They were also described in an article (Anonymous 1966), and were exhibited at the National Book League Commonwealth Book Exhibition, New Zealand House, London, in 1966.

The fate and current location of Patuone’s armour is unknown but an anecdote records what happened after its delivery. An undated newspaper clipping in the Fildes collection at Victoria University of Wellington reveals that:

A daughter of Mr Fairburn, the missionary, who interpreted for the naval officer who brought the suit of armour from King William IV to Patuone adds some interesting reminiscences to the story recently told by Mr E. Fairburn of Parnell. She says that when Patuone had managed to get into the armour, which was several sizes too small for him, he asked what it was for. ‘To prevent your enemies wounding you,’ answered the officer. ‘If I wear it,’ retorted Patuone, ‘they kill me for sure. I am not able to run away.’ Finally, Patuone handed the armour over to Mr Fairburn to keep for him, and strode away in the red baize suit with which it was lined, and which greatly pleased him.22
The story ‘recently told by Mr E. Fairburn’ refers to the reminiscences of Edwin Fairburn (1827–1911) and his sister Esther Hickson (1829–1913) in the manuscript ‘Maharatanga’, some of which may have been published in the *New Zealand Herald*. In his manuscript, which from internal dates appears to have been written between 1908 and 1910, there is a comment dated 3 December 1908:

‘There was a warship at Maraetai about June 1837 which brought a suit of plate armour for Patuone from King William, and while that suit was being unpacked in our verandah on a rainy day a boat from a sailing craft just arrived from the Bay brought news of King William’s death.’

A further note corrects the date to 1838, identifies the ship as the *Buffalo* and adds: ‘It was then Lieutt Cheguin brought the armour from the *Buffalo* which came for spars from the RN at Mercury Bay & was wrecked there.’ The discrepancy over the colour of the baize coat (red or green) is probably not significant, the events having occurred almost 80 years before. However, the matter of the armour of Patuone is mentioned by neither Davis (1876) nor Webster (1966).

**The mere pounamu, gifts from Titore and Patuone to King William IV**

In November 2000, I decided to see if there was any trace of the gifts sent by Patuone and Titore (mere and mats) to William IV in the Royal Collection. It was easily established that members of Britain’s royal family who had visited New Zealand had received objects such as feather...
cloaks as presentations, as they had been photographed with them on formal occasions, and such gifts were likely to have been stored safely. In the case of mere, which are relatively indestructible and made of a precious substance (nephrite), there was a good possibility that at least some of those presented to members of the royal family would have survived, especially if they were accompanied by historical documentation, such as registers. The case for the Titore mere was particularly interesting to me as the circumstances of its presentation and the clear evidence that it had been received was beyond question. What then, might have become of it?

Two mere were reportedly found in the estate of the late Duchess of Windsor, relict of Edward VIII. They were then allegedly acquired by Mohamed Al-Fayed, and subsequently sold to a private New Zealand collector, but this appears quite speculative. After some months of searching, a research assistant at the Royal Collection Trust advised me (M. Winterbottom, pers. comm. 14 May 2001) that no specific mere known to be associated with Titore and Patuone could be identified, although there were as many as five mere in the collection about which we know very little due to the paucity of contemporary records or inventories. It is very likely that there two mere that you are particularly interested in are among those presented to William IV are numbers 62810 and 62811 – the older looking, more ‘battered’ examples, which have obviously been used. According to an old inventory number 62167 was ‘taken in the first Maori war’ although no further details are given.24

High-quality black and white images of items 62810 and 62811 were supplied in a further letter of 6 November, and the images (Fig. 5) were then discussed with various curators at Te Papa and at the Auckland War Memorial Museum. These discussions revealed nothing authoritative as to the source of the stone used, the likely date of manufacture or the carving and abrading style.

What is, at least, clear is that these two mere are excellent examples of their type. One of them is provided with a leather carrying strap made from a belt, with eye holes. It is not possible to tell whether these two mere are actually those presented by Titore and Patuone, let alone which is which, but they do fit the bill as valid candidates. It is clear, moreover, that such taonga (treasured objects) were rare by 1840. Many of those produced in later decades were possibly not even made using traditional methods in New Zealand, as modern manufacturing techniques for drilling and polishing stone enabled the production of fakes in Europe. Other mere in the Royal Collection are RCIN 62167, RCIN 61972 and RCIB 69759 (the last being on long-term loan to another institution).

The mere pounamu intended for Queen Victoria

In a letter to his wife on 7 February, Felton Mathew noted that after the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi on 6 February 1840, the chief Patuone (newly baptised as Edward Marsh,
or Eruera Maihi) had joined the party invited to dine with
the officers of the *Herald* (he could understand English but
did not speak it). The old chief now presented a further mere
pounamu for Queen Victoria as a token of submission to her
authority. Mathew wrote:

One of the most powerful of them [the chiefs] named
Patuwooni, who in years past has been distinguished as a
friend of the English then advanced to the Governor &
presented him with one of their splendid Green Talc
Hatchets, or 'mare' as a present for the Queen. This is the
most valuable offering he could have made for they are
now so scarce it is impossible to procure them — not one
of the chiefs present but himself had one.25

This mere was one of two returned to New Zealand in
1937 by William Hobson's grandson Arthur Rendel (son of
Hobson's daughter Eliza) (Fig. 6). Rendel told the then New
Zealand High Commissioner, 'There is a legend in the
family that the axes were intended for Queen Victoria, but
that my great grand-mother never passed them on.' There
is no conclusive proof which of these two mere was that
belonging to Patuone. Today, one of them is displayed in Te

---

**Fig. 6** Two mere pounamu (greenstone clubs) originally in the possession of Captain William Hobson. One of these was presented by Patuone on 6 February 1840 and intended for Queen Victoria. A, 'mere pounamu with three grooves on butt, pre-European drilled hole. Pale green, 15 inches, greatest width 3.5 inches' (Te Papa ME 010819); B, '19th century, dark green with paler flecks, with a fairly thin blade and a slight chip on the top edge, the butt without ridges and a bi-conical perforation' (Waitangi National Trust WNT1961/1/1; reproduced with permission).
Papa (Fig. 6A) and the other is at the Treaty House at Waitangi (Fig. 6B). The latter was formally presented to the Waitangi National Trust by the Secretary for Internal Affairs on 6 February 1961, but was in the custody of the Auckland Institute and Museum until it was returned to Waitangi on 19 June 1967.

Conclusion

The Māori custom of tuku (ceremonial gift exchange) to cement alliances was employed in most of the contacts between chiefs and the Crown in the years preceding the formal colonisation of New Zealand from 1840. Hongi Hika received gifts from George IV in 1820, William IV gifts from Titore and Patuone, and Victoria from Patuone again in 1840. That the presentation of gifts required a reciprocation is clear from the documentation described in this article, and was well understood at the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi in 1840. The gifts to Māori were sometimes physical taonga such as oddly impractical suits of armour, and sometimes more practical ones useful in the long run, such as literacy and technology – for example, printing presses like the one gifted in 1859 by the Emperor of Austria. Sometimes they were more abstract gifts such as systems of laws and government, including protection from foreign occupation, which the chiefs recognised as new kinds of taonga, to be employed in a roughly conceived sort of partnership to take effect in the near future. This was part of the reason that the chiefs accepted the advantages of a treaty. The physical objects discussed here, while of little value in themselves, held the mana (prestige) of the donors and the recipients, and laid the ground for the more useful benefits expected to come from international associations.
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Notes

1 Auckland War Memorial Museum accession no. 252/36.
2 Information supplied by Liz Denton (Royal Armouries, HM Tower of London) and Rose Young (History Curator, Auckland War Memorial Museum) (see MS-Papers-9215-074, Alexander Turnbull Library, Wellington).
3 The original letter is in the National Archives at Kew, London, CO 211/221, ff. 384–388.
4 James Barry, Teetere, a New Zealand Chief, October 1818, G-626, Alexander Turnbull Library, Wellington; and Tooi, a New Zealand Chief, October 1818, G-618, Alexander Turnbull Library, Wellington. ‘Titeri’ is now the accepted form of the name ‘Teetere’ and ‘Tua’ the accepted form of his companion ‘Tooi’.
5 Reg. 2006-00114/11 and 2006-00114/12, Te Papa, Wellington.
6 Conrad Martens, Tetore, Bay of Islands, April 8 1835, Sketchbook 1834–1836, p. 43, PX C294, Mitchell Library, Sydney.
10 ‘King’ had earlier been the term used by Marsden, in reporting in 1813 that, on Ruatara’s return to Rangihoua, the chief had been saluted as ‘King’ after the death of Te Pahi and of Ruatara’s elder ‘brother’ (Salmond 1997: 424). In his letter to Ruatara in March 1814, Marsden addresses him as ‘Duaterra King’ (Salmond 1997: 433), and a similar letter to Tara addresses him as ‘King Terra’ (Salmond 1997: 436).
11 Martens, Tetore, Bay of Islands, April 8 1835. The illustration is most conveniently depicted in plates following p. 240 in Crosby (1999).
12 British Museum catalogue numbers: tiki, 96-925; nephrite mere, 96-929; carved bone flute, 96-930; bone cloak pin, 96-931. The tiki is illustrated in Starzecka (1998: fig. 116).
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