Implicitly or explicitly, academic studies of the arts of the Pacific have, at least until recently and before the interest in ethnoaesthetics, been exclusively concerned with Western responses to these arts. Most of the explicit literature has focused on the responses of European explorers, missionaries, artefact collectors, scientists, art critics and artists. This article surveys another very particular European response to Māori art that has not previously been considered. Its subject is the response of colonialist/imperialist landholders who, with their landscape artists and gardeners, created what is often colloquially referred to as “the Māori house down in the garden”.

This subject of study is a direct development from my earlier work on the history of Māori carving in the Rotorua area (Neich 2001). I began to notice that many of the carved houses I was studying had ended up in English and New Zealand gardens. I started to wonder how and why this had happened. This led me into an investigation of the history of English picturesque landscape gardens and the garden follies that were often placed in them. I realised that these Māori houses in English gardens had been assimilated into a completely different and ancient English tradition. What I was actually dealing with was the debris of the conjuncture of two great traditions, both extending back over about 300 years at least. One tradition was the construction of carved Māori houses, evidenced in pre-contact times by the carved house excavated at Kohika in the Bay of Plenty and the carved house seen by Cook and Banks at Tolaga Bay. The other is the European, and especially English, picturesque landscape garden tradition, dating back to at least the mid-18th century. This study intends not only to describe the conjuncture of these traditions but also to explicate some of the “structure of this conjuncture” (Sahlins 1981).

This appropriation of Māori houses was a completely different modality of colonial artefact collecting in that it was not undertaken for the sake of national pride and prestige, not for the purpose of displaying converted artefacts representing the success of Christianity, nor as tokens of native industry, and certainly not in the name of science. An aspect of curio and
souvenir collecting was present in some instances, but this was not the main motive. The response involved the physical appropriation of complete or partial carved Māori houses, their insertion and assimilation as follies or fabriques into existing long-standing English traditions of landscape gardening around stately homes, and their consequent use for alien English purposes. The practitioners of this response obtained Māori houses for their own purposes and uses, not just as curios or collection items to be admired.

The seeds of this response can be discerned in both England and New Zealand. As early as 1784, Sir Richard Hill at his Hawkestone estate near Shrewsbury in Shropshire had created a garden grotto representing a scene in “Otaheite” along with several elaborate garden follies (Jones 1974). One hundred years later, in New Zealand, Judge Fenton planned to erect in his Auckland garden the carved Māori storehouse named Te Oha that he had obtained from Rotorua. But he was persuaded that the storehouse could not survive outdoor exposure in Auckland’s weather, so he presented it to Auckland Museum instead.

The actual implementation and development of the idea of a Māori house down in the garden can be traced back to two men, acting independently but with knowledge of each other and at about the same time, in the late 1880s. One was Lord Onslow, an English aristocrat sent as the Governor to the colony of New Zealand. The other was Sir Walter Buller, a colonial trying to be an English gentleman who frequently visited and spent considerable time in England, eventually dying there in 1906. Therefore, this idea developed concurrently in New Zealand and England, and then continued to oscillate frequently between the two. It became part of the colonial relationship between England and New Zealand, while also reaching back to much older European traditions of landscape gardens for the wealthy and the aristocratic, which were still current in both countries. As Bernard Smith (1960:223) has pointed out, the emergence and expression of taste and style in colonial Australian and New Zealand society was closely allied to landscape gardening, the enjoyment of picturesque scenery and landscape painting among amateurs.

Later, as the idea and its practice became democratised both in New Zealand and England, it was continued in small private suburban gardens and was carried over into community parks set up by local authorities and councils. Sometimes a complete house was built, but more often simply a carved house front. As a result of this democratisation in New Zealand, the use of Māori houses in this way became a part of Pākehā New Zealand culture, accepted as a natural part of the scene. Consequently, for a present-day New Zealander, this practice needs to be deconstructed and its unique
strangeness recognised and examined. I know of no other former colony and its colonial metropole where a corresponding practice developed to this extent. One other isolated and later parallel example, again from New Zealand, is the Samoan *fale* erected in 1940 on the grounds of Sir Henry Kelleher’s estate in the Manukau Harbour, to become a garden folly complementing his Spanish mission style stately home (Refiti 2002:212).

From a semiotic perspective, this process can be regarded as a progressive extraction and abstraction of symbolic elements of the Māori carved house form in order to use them as symbols of liberal sentiments, of sophistication and cosmopolitan awareness of other cultures, and of other forms of group identity whether as Māori specifically or as New Zealanders. This same process of metonymical symbolism extracted from a Māori carved house form accounts for the use of *kowhaiwhai* painted scroll patterns on Air New Zealand planes.

“The Māori house in the garden” was very much a period fashion, concentrated between the late 1880s and the 1930s. As such follies started to become unfashionable, some of the houses were removed from their gardens and deposited in museums or returned to Māori ownership. Some of them, even while physically in museums, were subsequently re-appropriated back into the Māori world and re-imbued with a spiritual presence, showing that the Māori response to this use of Māori houses was basically to ignore that episode of the house’s history during which it was in non-Māori hands.

In this study, the major characteristics of English picturesque landscape gardens and their incorporated follies are described to provide a background to the development of this phenomenon in New Zealand. The subsequent use of Māori carved houses and house parts as garden follies in both England and New Zealand is explained as an extension of the established English tradition. All of the known examples of Māori houses used as garden follies are surveyed in order to examine their histories of Māori ownership, how they were obtained for their use in European gardens, and the changing socio-economic backgrounds of their new European owners. This survey of Māori house garden follies then reveals some of the main temporal trends in this phenomenon, especially the democratisation of the tradition, the personal motives involved, and the changing role of Māori art in the New Zealand cultural scene. In private gardens, especially the landscaped gardens of the well-to-do but also in some of the larger suburban gardens, the Māori house was almost always situated “down” in the garden to the rear, never in front, of the main European-style house. This arrangement changed as the Māori house façade or house parts became situated at the entrance to public parks and later moved on to the front gate or front porch of small
European-style suburban dwellings. Finally, noting the present disposition of these former Māori house follies gives an indication of the Māori response to this phenomenon and suggests how elements of this phenomenon may have been assimilated into contemporary Māori material culture.

THE PICTURESQUE LANDSCAPE GARDEN IN EUROPE

The cult of the picturesque landscape garden that began in England in the mid-18th century was part of a wider movement in Europe when the construction of formal pleasure gardens went out of fashion (Mosser and Teyssot 1990, Saudan and Saudan-Skira 1987). A major component of the picturesque landscape garden was a view from high ground across an aquatic middle vision, usually a lake or a river, to a distant object, often a ruin—either real or constructed—or an antique form of building. This pattern had been formulated in the works of artists, such as Claude Lorrain, whose paintings served as models for garden design. Another inspiration for these gardens was the idea of landscape as theatre, where the “scene” was regarded as a metaphor from the theatre. Hence these gardens were composed as a series of unfolding scenes. There were also strong links between literature and this type of garden art, whereby the garden became something of an encyclopædia, serving as an “open-air library” based on literary quotations and standing partway between idea and reality. These gardens were very large expensive creations, within the reach of only a few wealthy landowners. They were very much aristocratic gardens.

As Smith (1960:150) noted, despite many attempts to define the term “picturesque”, the “exotic” was never named as a crucial factor in the creation of picturesque beauty. Yet the exotic certainly helped to nourish picturesque taste. Buildings, landscapes, people, costumes and customs from distant and little-known lands were so frequently called picturesque that the terms became virtually interchangeable. This merging of the exotic and the picturesque would certainly make a Māori house from the other side of the world an obvious candidate for a picturesque garden folly, but the materials did not become available until much later in the 19th century.

Everett (1994) characterised “the picturesque” as a Tory conservative way of appreciating art. The Tory idea of landscape is associated with a romantic sensibility to the ideas of continuity and tradition embodied in certain kinds of English landscape. This view equates a traditional landscape with certain spiritual and moral values, as the Tories dwelt on ethical and aesthetic values without engaging with economic theory. They sought for balance and principles of regulation in tradition, with religion situated in
a higher order of nature. Of course, owning extensive tracts of land and being involved in hierarchical relationships does not determine a single viewpoint and does not necessarily suggest an homogenous ruling class ideology governing all aesthetic and social attitudes. Nevertheless, their mansions and country houses were built to be seen as assertive expressions of private property and control of territory.

From 1720 to mid-century, the most influential designer of these landscape gardens was William Kent who had trained as a painter in Italy from 1711 until 1719, when Lord Burlington brought him back to England. Kent’s most famous gardens were at Chiswick, Stowe, Rousham and Stourhead. After Kent, this picturesque style of landscape garden had its supreme exponent in his former apprentice Lancelot “Capability” Brown (1716-1783). His style was characterised by a standard formula of artificial expanses of water, clumps and belts of trees, providing a heightened display of property and the appropriation of nature to personal use. It certainly expressed a “love of possession” allied with luxury and amusement, making a clear distinction of personal property as separate from the commons and the peasants. Brown’s main successor was Humphrey Repton (1752-1818). Brown’s approach was later criticised as “unlearned forms”, promoting a landscape stripped of allusion and meaning, whereas the earlier picturesque gardens had contained rich classical references. “The picturesque based upon learned parallels that sustained the early landscape movement had surrendered by the last quarter of the 18th century to a concern with visual excitement and texture” (Hunt 1990:235)

Kent’s, Brown’s and Repton’s creation of parkland often involved both a selective valuing and preservation of the past as ruins along with the destruction of unwanted existing ruins, villages and established natural landscapes. Theirs was an appropriation of landscape in the conviction that nature could be both rescued and improved. Even though landowners did not hesitate to demolish ruins that did not fit the desired effect, those lucky enough to have a ruin on their property often used it as part of the garden design, while those without ruins sometimes had an artificial ruin constructed. They recognised “the necessity for ruins” (Jackson 1980:102) as monuments to remind people of their religious and political obligations, and to keep them loyal to tradition. Ruins provide the incentive for restoration and a return to origins, but there has to be an interim of death or rejection before there can be renewal or reform.

Landscape gardening on the scale of Kent, Brown or Repton was beyond the resources of most people. By the 1820s and 1830s the great landscape gardens of England were in decay. This eventually led to the Victorian enthusiasm for the “rustic” expressed in simple cottage gardens and a
summerhouse in rustic style (Cowell 1978:205). The theme of rustic simplicity was already present in the 18th century garden style, but in the 19th century the rise of an urban educated and ambitious middle class led to more interest in smaller and simpler gardens. The cult of ruins had already led to imitation of “primitive monuments”, such as Druid temples, but now more gardens featured “rustic buildings” with decorations such as thatch, moss, unspoken wood, knotholes and stumps, to suggest “cruder” forms of construction and “natural” human structures (Elliott 1986:40). Having been already assimilated as garden follies, the Māori houses were more amenable than many other types of follies for a transition to the “rustic” in the later 19th century. This transition to the rustic helps to account for the continued use of Māori houses as garden huts and summer teahouses.

GARDEN FOLLIES AND FABRIQUES

Most garden follies built in England to supply the desire for picturesque landscape architecture during the 18th and early 19th centuries were created in the form of primitive huts, druidical temples, gothic castles, or Greek, Roman, Chinese, Japanese or Moorish structures. Boathouses and bridges too could be among the follies. Many of these follies were built in gothic revival style, inspired by Romantic painting and literature, serving as light relief to the usually Palladian stately house of the estate (Jones 1974, Mosser 1990). Follies or fabriques were often integrated as triangulation points, guiding visitors on their ritual journeys through the created landscape.

Māori houses used in these created landscapes were clearly appropriated and assimilated within the category of garden follies or fabriques. Their appropriation exhibits all the classical elements identified by Root (1996:70-73) and others, who have shown that cultural appropriation signifies not only the taking up of something and making it one’s own but also the political and financial ability to do so. Appropriation is different from sharing or borrowing because it also involves the commodification of aesthetic, cultural and spiritual forms of a society and tends to displace the local social, ceremonial, and political contexts of the cultural forms being appropriated.

The European owners of these Māori house follies disregarded and contravened Māori norms of house usage. Following their “universalization of Western cosmological notions” (Root 1996:75), which assumes that the Western approach is “the real”, they felt justified in using their Māori houses as summerhouses, as teahouses, as breakfast rooms, as a dance hall, as a private study and probably as sites of play acting for their children. Most owners were probably genuinely ignorant of Māori sensitivities about
the use of the houses. Once a house had been collected and set up in a European owner’s garden, there was usually very little further interaction of the new owner with Māori. Encountering a house like this in a European’s private garden would have made many Māori people quite uneasy and nervous, just as many Māori people were nervous about having any traditional carvings or artefacts in their own homes apart from their own family heirlooms.

Clearly, appropriation and commodification are only possible where there is an asymmetric relationship of economic and political powers. This relative difference in economic and political power determines not only what is available in the market place but also how it is available.

Appropriation has to do with who decides what is interesting enough to commandeer and reproduce, usually someone from the more powerful group who is in a position to select and use whatever happens to catch her eye. When an outsider decides which aspects of a cultural and aesthetic tradition to take up and emphasise and which to ignore, these decisions may have nothing to do with the internal meanings of the dances, art forms and ceremonies within the culture in which they were created (Root 1996:78).

In this regard, it is interesting to note that all of the Māori houses appropriated for this purpose were carved houses, usually acquired from the Rotorua tribes (Neich 2001) who had been “loyal” in the recent New Zealand Wars, and not figuratively painted houses (Neich 1993), which were associated with the tribes that had been regarded as “rebels” during the New Zealand Wars. And of course, the carved houses were superficially more “exotic” and striking than the painted houses, which were more modest in outward appearance. When these fragments of a culture are taken up and manipulated, “[a]ppropriation incorporates the objects and sensibilities into the dominant, Western-based culture, sometimes by domesticating and sometimes by erasing the origins of these objects” (Root 1996:78). However benign it might have been, this phenomenon of domesticating the Māori house down in the garden could only have been possible in a colonialist milieu.

There are also some differences between the Māori houses and the usual English garden follies. Several of the Māori houses were not constructed expressly as follies, but were rather appropriated and reused. This is in contrast to English garden follies that were usually newly built for this purpose. However, there were exceptions to both sides of this contrast. Some of the Māori houses were commissioned by people who probably had their purpose as follies in mind from the beginning. Similarly, in addition to
the incorporation of extant local ruins on site, there was some limited re-use of ancient materials from the classical world, such as columns from Leptis Magna and Italian marble architectural remains. In another more absolute contrast, Māori garden follies were actually used by their owners, whereas other garden follies were intended as visual ornaments to the garden and not as functional buildings (except perhaps for those ruins where the owner employed a “hermit” to occupy them at least when visitors were touring the garden).

THE BEGINNINGS: TE TAKINGA AND HINEMIHI

1. Te Takinga (Te Marama-tae-ahoaho) storehouse/pātaka at Sir Walter Buller’s garden, Papaitonga, Horowhenua, 1891.

Originally erected in the 1840s or 1850s at the Ngāti Pikiao settlement of Taheke on Lake Rotoiti, Rotorua, and named Te Marama-tae-ahoaho, this pātaka had a history as the site of an adultery between the carver and the wife of the local chief Te Pokiha Taranui. In January 1886, the pātaka was sold, apparently by its carver and builder Te Hareti, to Gilbert Mair, magistrate and Land Court official, acting for his collector brother-in-law Walter Buller. When Mair arrived and arranged with Te Hareti to collect the pātaka, a dispute erupted, probably with people representing Te Pokiha, and a further £2 had to be paid to settle the deal. The pātaka was renamed Te Takinga as a safer, neutral, ancestral name encompassing both parties in the adultery that would not remind people of this event (Neich 2001:389).

Buller was born to missionary parents in the very small isolated settlement of Tangiteroria in northern New Zealand and dedicated himself to becoming a landed Englishman (Galbreath 1989, Park 1995, 1999). Having recently gained a knighthood, Buller went to England in late 1886 in charge of New Zealand’s contribution to the Colonial and Empire Exhibition in London. He took his pātaka and other personally owned Māori carvings with him to show as part of the New Zealand display. The Exhibition was an ideological showcase of the spoils of Empire and the tenets of social Darwinism. While on its way back to New Zealand, Te Takinga was displayed at the 1888 International Exhibition in Melbourne, yet another celebration of colonial progress.

Buller was away in England for four years, establishing his credentials as an English gentleman. During that time, he visited and became familiar with England’s great landscaped estates of Stourhead, Stowe, Tring and Rousham. They were filled with imitation Italianate ruins symbolising the lost glories of Rome and other garden follies, set in picturesque scenery created by William Kent, Capability Brown and Humphrey Repton.
In 1891, back in New Zealand and using his influence and acumen as a lawyer and politician, Buller purchased his “country estate” of Lake Papaitonga, north of the capital Wellington, from the local Muaupoko Māori, negotiating the purchase with a measure of subterfuge and misrepresentation. Buller already had his supply of “magnificent statues and ruins” in his collection of Māori curiosities, especially Te Takinga and the canoe memorial named Nga Rangi o Rehua from Putiki at Whanganui. To erect Te Takinga (Fig.1) he employed a local Manawatu Māori carver named Morehu, who fashioned the missing piles with a figure carved on them. Buller wanted to preserve some of New Zealand’s original bush at Papaitonga, but with Te Takinga as the centrepiece overlooking the lake (Fig.2). His “country seat” became a wealthy man’s scenic folly, a late Victorian art form of created “scenery”.

As Park (1999:178-79) has commented, Te Takinga was once filled with food and sacral items by hunters and gardeners who recognised, in its extraordinary carving, their dependence on nature’s nurture and vitality. But in Walter Buller’s hands it had become a Darwinist’s marvellous possession;

Figure 1: Te Takinga storehouse set up at Papaitonga, standing on the piles carved for Sir Walter Buller by Morehu, a local Manawatu carver of Ngāti Raukawa, and surrounded by a typical New Zealand post and wire farm fence. Well-dressed young European ladies pose in the porch of the pātaka along with some of Sir Walter Buller’s collection of Māori carvings.

Photo: Alexander Turnbull Library, Wellington [F65814 ½].
evidence that up against things British in origin and purpose, Māori, their skill and creativity notwithstanding, were losers in the struggle for life. A food-store carved from the forest, a survival facility no less, became a curiosity of history. Te Takinga lent Buller’s landscape theatre all the symbolism that England’s great estates drew from their “Statues and Trophies, Gardens and Groves”.

As a gentleman naturalist, an aesthete and a thorough disciple of Darwin, Buller viewed the Māori race as doomed to extinction. Buller’s social Darwinism explained this demise and assuaged any guilt he might have felt because, by this Darwinist canon, it was predestined and inevitable; it was Nature’s law at work rather than any human tragedy. Although having grown up speaking Māori and long familiar with their company, Buller was very disparaging of Māori customary ways, totally imperialist and with implicit belief in his racial superiority. He did not want local Māori contaminating the scenic purity of Papaitonga with their demands for access. Having promised them continued eeling rights during the negotiations for his purchase of Lake Papaitonga, he then used subterfuge to keep them out by importing feared and tapu tuatara reptiles to create Motu Ngarara ‘Monster Island’ in his lake (Park 1999:179).

In Buller’s scheme, Te Takinga was there for a special purpose, as a symbol of how the Māori were disappearing. As a colonial “Neo-Europe”

Figure 2: Te Takinga in its setting of created scenery of bush and Lake Papaitonga on Sir Walter Buller’s country estate. Photo: G.L. Adkin Collection, Album XII, PA1-q-002, Alexander Turnbull Library, Wellington.
Papaitonga had a “necessity for ruins”. Before there can be a born-again landscape, there must be an interim of death or rejection, and ruins are necessary evidence of this. The picturesque vanishing Māori had a place to part in this. Thus the centrepiece of Buller’s aesthetic fantasy was Te Takinga, together with Nga Rangi o Rehua canoe memorial set up on yet another island in his lake. They stood there as evidence that against British culture; Māori culture must give way.

But his totara timber Māori ruins could not survive the southern New Zealand weather like Italian marble, and they began to rot. Therefore, in 1911, five years after Walter Buller’s death, his sons presented Te Takinga, or rather the carved front, to the National Museum in Wellington. Thomas Heberley, a part-Māori carver of Te Ati Awa tribal affiliation (not Ngāti Pikiao) was employed at the museum to complete Te Takinga as a fully carved pātaka. He reconstructed it, as instructed, with carved rear and sides. The Museum wanted to make it a fine example of a type, a completely carved storehouse on the model of Te Puawai o Te Arawa from Maketū in the Auckland Museum, even although this meant turning it into something that it had never been.

Most recently, as part of the new Museum of New Zealand Te Papa Tongarewa policy of involving the relevant Māori community with their treasures in the Museum, Te Takinga has been completely re-appropriated by Ngāti Pikiao, despite all that has happened to it and been added to it in the interim. The Museum hired the respected carver Lyonel Grant of Ngāti Pikiao to supervise its renovation and its transport (including the Heberley additions) by a huge assembly of Ngāti Pikiao people to its display place in the new Museum building. Thus the iwi of Ngāti Pikiao were given the opportunity to reinterpret their taonga ‘treasure’ and to empower it spiritually again. As Park (1999:182) has pointed out, Te Takinga has made the transition from a tribal storehouse and symbol of chiefly might, to a picturesque colonial curiosity in Victorian London, to a Māori ruin and symbol of white superiority in Buller’s country estate and, finally, to become one of the National Museum’s most spectacular Māori exhibits.

2. Hinemihi at Clandon Park, Surrey, England, 1892

Opened in March 1881, Hinemihi was the meeting house of Aporo Te Wharekaniwha and his Ngāti Hinemihi hapū. Carved by Wero Taroī and Tene Waitere of the Ngāti Tarawhai tribe (Neich 2001:335-36), it stood just back from the road through the village of Te Wairoa where the Ngāti Hinemihi used it to entertain tourists on their way to see the famous Pink and White Terraces. The story of Hinemihi during and since the Tarawera volcanic eruption of 10 June 1886 and its subsequent purchase by Lord
Onslow, has been told many times, most recently and most comprehensively by Gallop (1998) and Hooper-Greenhill (1998). Since that purchase, Hinemihi has stood in the garden of Clandon Park in Surrey, England, the home of the former New Zealand Governor Lord Onslow.

Clandon Park had been home to the Onslow family since its purchase by Sir Richard Onslow in 1641. The present house was completed in 1729 by his great grandson Thomas Onslow in Palladian style by the design of Venetian architect Giacomo Leoni. Two years later, in 1731, the famous landscape gardener Capability Brown designed the large landscape gardens of the estate. The house later fell into ruin and the gardens went wild until 1876 when Lord Onslow, William Hillier and Fourth Earl of Onslow, inherited it. He devoted himself and his family money to its restoration, which was completed in 1880. This Lord Onslow had a distinguished career as a public servant and, in 1889, while still quite young, he was appointed Governor of New Zealand, arriving in April 1889. During his time in office, Onslow travelled all over New Zealand and became very popular, enjoying much contact and involvement with Māori people. His son was born in New Zealand, was given the Māori name of Huia and later was adopted into the Māori tribe of Ngāti Huia. Onslow was a keen photographer and took many photographs of New Zealand and Māori people before returning to England at the completion of his term in 1892.

In 1891 Onslow had started to look for a Māori house to take home and enlisted the help of the New Zealand Government’s Native Office. He considered buying the famous meeting house Te Tokanganui-a-Noho at Te Kuiti, but the local chief declined to sell, saying it belonged to all of his Ngāti Maniapoto tribe. Then the privately European-owned carved house Tiki a Tamamutu at the Spa Hotel in Taupo was considered but the asking price was too expensive for Onslow. Finally, Onslow was told about Hinemihi, standing derelict in the deserted village of Te Wairoa since the Tarawera eruption of 10 June 1886. After some negotiations, Onslow purchased Hinemihi from its Māori owners (via agents) on 21 January 1892 for £50.

Hinemihi arrived in England in April 1892 in the form of 23 disassembled carvings. It was set up as a boathouse beside Clandon Park’s ornamental lake, but without its porch front wall so that rowing boats could be dragged up into it. Some of the discarded frontal carvings were put away in Clandon House and others were probably given away. The carved door surrounds of pare and whakawae disappeared and only just recently resurfaced at a 2002 auction in the United States. (Here and elsewhere see appended diagram of parts of meeting house, p.366)
Some tenuous Māori contact was maintained with Hinemihi over the years. Māori members of the New Zealand Mounted Rifles in England for Queen Victoria’s Jubilee celebrations of 1897 were taken to see the house. A report of their visit published with photographs in *The New Zealand Graphic* magazine of 23 October 1897 made Hinemihi’s garden setting known to a wide range of New Zealanders. In 1902, some Māori people in England for the coronation of King Edward VII visited Clandon Park and were said to have been impressed by Hinemihi. Again in 1903, *The New Zealand Graphic* published a large photograph (Fig.3), supplied by Lord Onslow himself showing Hinemihi in his garden with flowerbeds planted directly in front of it and children in English summer dresses playing around the house. Many New Zealand soldiers wounded in the First World War convalesced in a temporary military hospital set up at Clandon Park. In 1917, some of the Māori soldiers there suggested that they dismantle the house and re-erect it away from the lake. They reconstructed it more like a true Māori meeting house but still minus the missing front carvings. In this form, the Onslow family used Hinemihi as a summerhouse until the whole estate passed to the National Trust in 1956. Subsequently, the people of Ngāti Hinemihi from Rotorua have had extensive contact with Hinemihi.

Figure 3: Hinemihi in the garden at Clandon Park with flower beds directly in front and children in English summer dresses. Photograph supplied by Lord Onslow to the *New Zealand Graphic* magazine in 1903.
again. The extant original front carvings have been reinstalled and at Rotorua replacements for lost sections have been carved by descendants of the original carvers. Ngāti Ranana, the London-based Māori group, now uses Hinemihi regularly for their functions.

Lord Onslow’s interest in Hinemihi was mostly as a souvenir and memory of his time in New Zealand, on which he always looked back with pleasant nostalgia. However, his experience of renovating Capability Brown’s landscape gardens of Clandon Park must have made him aware of the value of Hinemihi as a garden folly within that scheme. Despite or perhaps because of his sympathetic interest in Māori culture, Onslow was not otherwise a collector of Māori artefacts, except for those pieces given to him and his family in New Zealand that were all kept solely as mementoes in the “New Zealand room” of Clandon House.

AN EASTERN EUROPEAN DIVERSION

3. “Māori” Houses of Queen Marie of Romania at Bucharest and Sinaia, Romania, 1900s. (I am indebted to Dr Shona Kallestrup [née Lowe] for bringing these houses to my attention and for providing all the information and illustrations used here.)

These two houses were built in the first few years of the 20th century for Queen Marie of Romania (1875-1938). Marie was the daughter of Prince Alfred, Duke of Edinburgh, from the English Royal Family, who married Grand Duchess Marie Alexandrovna of Russia. In 1893, Marie married Prince Ferdinand of Hohenzollern, heir to the throne of Romania. Therefore, she was a granddaughter of Queen Victoria and a cousin of the English Duke of Cornwall and York whose travels through New Zealand in 1901 she followed with interest. The photographs and gifts of Māori carvings that he brought back and displayed in England seemed to impress Marie, or at least increased her awareness of Māori art.

Marie was interested in various different art and architecture movements and fashions, and was instrumental in bringing many new ideas in these fields to Romania. She had a reputation as a grand lady and was admired and fêted throughout Europe. Her Victorian interest in exotic cultures and her understanding of Art Nouveau and the British Arts and Crafts Movement inspired her to build a series of garden follies that she called her “dream houses”. She even commissioned British Arts and Crafts designer Mackay Hugh Baillie Scott to design her tree house at Sinaia.

It was in the first years of the 20th century that Marie had her picturesque Māori garden “teahouses” built, one in the gardens of the Cotroceni Palace in Bucharest (Fig.4) and one in the gardens of the Pelisor Palace in Sinaia.
(Fig.5). The latter was completed by 1909. Only the Sinaia “Māori” hut still survives in good condition. Shona Kallestrup (pers. comm. 28 January 2003) now believes that the Sinaia house was probably created by the Viennese furniture designer Bernhard Ludwig (1866-1939) in collaboration with the Czech architect Karel Liman (?-1929). The two of them seem to have worked closely on a number of Marie’s more unusual schemes in Cotroceni and Pelisor, and the plans of the Cotroceni hut are annotated in German and Romanian. Local Romanian craftsmen built these two “Māori” houses under Marie’s direction and by copying Māori architecture and carving designs as provided by Queen Marie. Their carvings include fanciful bear and cat faces. These were apparently attempts of European craftsmen to render the Māori carved faces seen in their sources. The huts were “free interpretations of Māori models designed as picturesque garden tea-houses where Marie, then Crown Princess, would take her breakfast or play with her children” (Shona Lowe, pers. comm. 26 May 1999).

Figure 4: Queen Marie of Romania in her Māori-style “dream house” in the gardens of Cotroceni Palace, Bucharest in 1926. Photo: Bucharest State Archives, Fond Regina Maria [III/157/1926].
Lowe’s initial surmise was that the Romanian “Māori” houses were probably inspired by Hinemihi at Clandon Park, which Marie would have known and which also had its porch deconstructed like the Romanian houses. Lowe also pointed out that, as a cousin of the Duke of Cornwall and York, Marie would have been aware of the Māori items he brought back to England from his 1901 visit. She would also have seen the Māori objects brought back to England in 1869 by her father, the Duke of Edinburgh.

However, judging by the actual composition of the Sinaia carvings, it would appear that the carvers had access to other images beyond those of Hinemihi. These could have been photographs or the paintings of Earle and Angas or pictures in books, such as Augustus Hamilton’s Maori Art. As Kallestrup has pointed out, Marie would most likely have known the references to Māori art made by Owen Jones and William Morris. She certainly subscribed to the decorative arts magazine The Studio, that featured Māori wood carving in 1900 (Volume 21, October) and Māori houses in 1901 (Volume 22, February). Exact identification of her sources is difficult because of the artistic license and other influences that the Romanian carvers have introduced into their compositions. Echoes of other Māori
carving styles and figure types that are not represented in Hinemihi can be discerned, but it is difficult to point to actual sources for these. The clearest example of this is the figure called a *marakihau* (a sinuous frontal figure of a mythical sea monster with stylised human upper body, a long tongue and fish tail), which is obviously the inspiration for the carved panel in the sidewall of the Sinaia hut. The *marakihau* does not occur in Hinemihi but there are many other famous examples, especially in the meeting houses of the eastern Bay of Plenty. Another interesting feature in the Sinaia hut is the low relief carved rendering of what is traditionally *kowhaiwhai* scroll painting. The painted pattern the Romanian craftsmen copied into carving is called *puhoro* (a continuous repeating pattern of curled bulbs extending into long straight linking lines, usually painted in white on red) and is especially characteristic of the Arawa tribes from around Rotorua in the central Bay of Plenty.

As Lowe (1999:22) phrased it: Marie’s “fascination with the spiritual otherness embodied in certain forms of architecture” is apparent in these Māori houses. And further:

> While Lord Onslow reduced a genuine Māori meetinghouse to the status of an unusual garden collectable, Marie commissioned her palace architects to create their own imaginative pseudo-Māori structures. Although clearly drawing on Māori models, these huts reveal glaring inconsistencies which betray a fundamental misunderstanding of the spiritual function of the original (Lowe 1999:22).

Consequently, the structure of these houses trivialised the complex symbolism and ceremonial functions of the Māori original. They were foreshortened and fitted with furniture inside, indicating that Marie’s aim was “to suggest a specific atmosphere through free interpretation of native models, rather than recreate a stylistically accurate interior” (Lowe 1999:24). Within the context of the picturesque landscape garden of the Pelisor Palace, the Sinaia “Māori” house is nestled under fir trees facing across a lawn (a *marae*?) toward the side of Pelisor. It is oriented so that Marie could look down and across to it from the balcony of her gilded “Celtic” boudoir (Kallestrup, pers. comm. 28 January 2003).

**FURTHER EXAMPLES**

4. **T.E. Donne’s carved house, Government Gardens, Rotorua, 1906.**

This is a reduced size model house, fully carved inside and out by Tene Waitere of Ngāti Tarawhia (Neich 2001:339). It was commissioned privately by T.E. Donne, General Manager of the Government Tourist Department in
Rotorua, as a house for European use, perhaps intended for his garden. Four of the pou pou depict naturalistic, very literal narrative scenes, designed to be accessible and understandable by outsiders. Donne hired out the house for £25 to the Christchurch International Exhibition of 1906. At the Christchurch Exhibition, the organisers gave it the name of Te Wharepunia-a-Maui. After the house was returned from Christchurch to Rotorua, it was set up in the Government Gardens for a short time. From 1901, when the New Zealand Government Department of Tourist and Health Resorts took over the administration of the gardens, many Māori carved fence posts and ornamental archways with carvings had been added to the garden’s attractions (Neich 2001:222, 352), but Donne’s was the only complete carved Māori house. Here it stood in isolation among introduced and native trees in a public park for unaccompanied tourists to wander into, before being sold to Germany in 1911, where it is now in the Linden Museum, Stuttgart.

5. Nuku Tewhatewha pātaka/storehouse at Brancepeth Farm, Wairarapa, 1912.

This storehouse has been variously described as carved by experts from Ngāti Porou (note by Augustus Hamilton on New Zealand Institute photograph, Museum of New Zealand files, Phillipps 1952:107) or by Te Wharetoroa of Ngāti Pikiao (Phillipps 1952:110) or by Patatai (Horonuku) Te Heuheu and Taringa of Ngāti Tūwharetoa (McEwen 1966:425, Oliver 1993:516). On stylistic and historical grounds, the latter attribution is most likely. When the Māori King Movement was gathering followers from among many tribes, this pātaka was designated one of the so-called Pillars of the Kingitanga, marking the Movement’s southernmost area of tribal supporters.

It was built in 1856 for Wi Tako Ngatata, a chief of the Wellington area Te Ati Awa people and at that time a supporter of the Māori King Movement, and reportedly it cost him £3000. The woman and the baby shown in the central doorway carving represent Te Hamene, Wi Tako’s wife, and their baby daughter Merania. The pātaka stood on lands owned by Wi Tako at present-day Naenae in the Hutt Valley. When the English settler William Beetham R.A. purchased these lands and built his home there at Te Mako, he promised to look after the pātaka. It remained there until 1888 when George Beetham, one of William’s sons, moved it to the garden of his home in Moturoa Street in Wellington City where it was well known to local residents and Māori. George was a prominent alpinist, member of the Royal Geographical Society and Member of Parliament. When George moved to England in 1898, his other brothers took care of the pātaka, setting it up at their family estate of Brancepeth (Fig.6) near Masterton in the Wairarapa in
1912. Here it stood framed by native plants in the large landscaped garden of Brancepeth, one of the largest pastoral homesteads in the area, at one time covering 21,457 hectares.

William Beetham R.A. (1809-1888) was a member of the Royal Academy and travelled widely in Europe as a renowned portrait painter, until immigrating with his wife and family to New Zealand in 1855. After buying the land from Wi Tako and settling at Te Mako, he soon encouraging his four sons to take up land in the Wairarapa, where they created Brancepeth Station. In New Zealand, William continued to paint portraits and is most famous for his group portrait of Dr Isaac Featherston (Superintendent of Wellington Province) with the Māori chiefs Wi Tako and Te Puni. This portrait has recently been interpreted as “political hagiography”, praising Featherston as the “father of Wellington” and friend and mentor of the two most important local Māori chiefs (Easton 1991). To achieve this effect of Featherston as the dominant figure, Beetham had to reverse the real stature of his Māori and Pākehā subjects and depicted Wi Tako as a less imposing character. Despite this, Beetham and Wi Tako were good friends and their mutual regard continued between their descendants, focused on the care of Nuku Tewhatewha.

Figure 6: Nuku Tewhatewha as erected in the garden of Brancepeth Station, Wairarapa. Photo: Alexander Turnbull Library, Wellington [F641 1/1].
With specific reference to the Beethams and other southern Wairarapa runholder families, McIntyre (2002:214) commented how the “powerful and pervasive culture of the English upper classes was admired and imitated by runholder families”. The mannerisms of the aristocracy were adopted and close ties with London society were maintained and valued. This included the creation of family coats-of-arms and the acquisition of country estates as a means of elevating status, such that: “Wealthy landowners became New Zealand’s nearest equivalent to Britain’s landed gentry and aristocracy” McIntyre (2002:214). A carved Māori house in the estate’s landscaped garden, such as Nuku Tewhatewha at Brancepeth, was an obvious component of this colonial recreation of European style.

In 1982, Mr. Hugh Beetham presented Nuku Tewhatewha to the Dowse Museum in Lower Hutt where it is now displayed (Phillipps 1952:107-11, Yerex 1991:63-64).


David Nathan founded the Nathan family merchant’s business at Kororareka (now Russell) in the Bay of Islands in 1840, moving it to Auckland in 1841. His grandson David Lawrence Nathan, the owner of L.D. Nathan and Co. Wholesale Merchants, bought 40 hectares in Hill Road at Manurewa in 1910. The house that he built there was called “The Hill” after Harrow School in England where D.L. Nathan had been sent to

Figure 7: Composite Māori house front of assorted carvings erected in the garden of L.D. Nathan at “The Hill”, Manurewa, Auckland. Photo: Ladies Home Mirror 1(2):15, 1 August 1922.
school. This house was furnished with many treasures of furniture and fine arts, including a Māori carved fireplace and other Māori carvings as ornaments. The property also had a very large garden, with gardeners and other domestic staff employed there (Nathan n.d.).

In a bushy part of the garden was a composite construction of assorted Māori carvings set up to look like a derelict Māori house (Fig.7), and actually forming the front to a fern-house. A lily pond was placed right in front (where the marae ātea would have been) and was overhung by a large old *puriri* tree. These carvings came from various sources, mostly from Rotorua where the Nathans had extensive business interests, including a large tourist hotel. The *maihi* ‘bargeboards’ of the house front structure are actually *poupou* (side wall panels representing tribal ancestors) from the carved house Nuku Te Apiapi (Neich 2001:210-11), built earlier to entertain tourists at the Nathan’s Geyser Hotel in Rotorua. These representations of named ancestor figures intended as *poupou* panels within the genealogical structure of a meeting house have here been reused inappropriately in a configuration that conflicts with their original purpose.

The homestead at “The Hill” burnt down in December 1923, a new house was built there in 1925 and D.L. Nathan died in 1944. Thirty years later in 1974-75, Lawrence David Nathan presented all of the carvings from “The Hill” garden house to the Orakei Marae Trust Board, and the Board placed them on loan for safekeeping in Auckland Museum (AM47175).

7. Carvings in Ebbett Park, Hastings, 1924

George Ebbett presented a collection of 26 carvings to the Hastings City Council in 1924 to decorate a public park donated to the City by Mrs Ebbett. George Ebbett had originally intended to erect them in his own garden but later decided to give them to the City Council for the park. Seven of these carvings can be attributed to Ngāti Tarawhai carvers (Neich 2001:337) and the others are Mataatua style *poupou* and other house carvings. All of these date to the later 19th century, but it is most unlikely that they are all from the one house. Unfortunately, scarcely anything is known about the origin of these carvings. George Ebbett said that he purchased the carvings in Auckland for £200 in about 1917.

George Ebbett himself supervised the erection of these carvings at the park. Some were used to form the usual arrangement of a Māori house porch (Fig.8) and the rest are set up in two open exposed arrangements over the park gateways in the format of the interior front and rear walls of a meeting house. Therefore, while not constituting a complete meeting house, these carvings were certainly erected to suggest an “exploded” meeting house set up in a European garden setting.

This carved house (Fig. 9) was commissioned by Sir Robert Anderson to stand in the grounds of his home in Invercargill, now Anderson Park, and was completed in 1925. It is a small house about 4.5 metres wide with frontal carvings, door and window pare and whakawae, but no porch poupou or rafters and no ridgepole over the porch. Inside there are five pairs of poupou but no carvings at the ends. The central porch post, tokoihi, is very similar to the tokoihi of Nuku Te Apiapi depicting a male and female embracing pair back to back with a pair of back to back lizards above. Both window and door pare are late versions of the Rauru pare: the one over the door shows a wheku (face with angled slanting eyebrows) figure and the window one a ruru (face with round eyes) figure. Overall, the carvings are very standard, classical, late Ngāti Tarawhai style, almost certainly the work of Tene Waitere of Ngāti Tarawhai (Neich 2001:343).

Sir Robert Anderson was born in 1866 in Queenstown and soon moved to Invercargill, starting work as an office boy. He became a successful
businessman, a managing agent for the large Ocean Beach Freezing Company, served on the boards of many other companies and purchased many farms. He also became prominent in local body politics. His Māori house was set in 24 hectares of landscaped gardens, lawns and native bush behind his stately neo-Georgian style home. Lady Anderson suggested that the Māori house should have a sprung floor for dancing and many parties were held in it. In 1932, Sir Robert Anderson’s daughter, Kathleen, had her marriage ceremony in the Māori house and during the reception after the ceremony their gramophone played the latest tunes from London. This Invercargill arrangement of stately home and “Māori house down in the garden” is almost a direct recreation of the arrangement of Hinemihi and Clandon House at Clandon Park in England.

This small house with carved front, 10 metres long and 3.6 metres wide was originally commissioned from the carver Tene Waitere of Ngāti Tarawhai in 1906 by Sir Thomas Mackenzie during his term as Minister in charge of the Tourist Department. Mackenzie first entered Parliament in 1887, becoming Minister of Industries and Commerce in 1909. He held other ministerial
portfolios and was Prime Minister very briefly in 1912. From 1912 to 1920 he was the New Zealand High Commissioner in London. Sir Thomas’s son, Sir Clutha Mackenzie, later explained the origin of the house:

In the early years of the century, Sir Thomas employed what were then reputed to be the last of the old-time Maori carvers at Rotorua to make for him the appropriate carvings for a Maori meetinghouse. His plan was to erect it in our garden at Allan Grange to house his fine collection of Maori weapons, ornaments, feather cloaks, flax and rush garments and domestic utensils, and perhaps to use it as his study. He left it in store with the Government Tourist Department at Rotorua; but many years went by, and with his busy public life and long absences in England, he had no opportunity to make another permanent home. He now gave it to me in 1928, a most generous gift, and chose a site in the garden for its erection (Typescript notes by Sir Clutha Mackenzie, Ethnology Department files, Auckland Museum).

Sir Thomas first had to reclaim his house from the New Zealand Government Tourist Department by proving that he had commissioned it. While in its care, the Tourist Department had already displayed the house at exhibitions in San Francisco and New York, assuming that it belonged to the Department.

Sir Clutha was blinded in the First World War on the beach at Gallipoli and may even have recuperated with other New Zealand soldiers at Clandon Park. At the very least he would probably have heard about Hinemihi at Clandon Park. He underwent rehabilitation at the St Dunstans institution for blind ex-servicemen in London. After returning to New Zealand, he entered Parliament in 1921, and, in 1926 or 1927, he purchased the Findlay house with about 6 hectares at Homai, Manurewa, where he raised his family. In 1928, Sir Thomas gave his Māori house to his son Sir Clutha who erected it at Homai (Fig.10), probably about 1930, and later wrote:

We called our farm ‘Wharematoro’ after this Maori house, a ‘House of Happy Social Gatherings’. We built it on the site my father selected, facing it to the north in accordance with Maori tradition, and I made it my study. The sun shines warmly into its sheltered porch; and we had a rough stone open fireplace for log fires on chilly winter days and evenings; and it is a grand place for jolly parties. A gift of fine old Maori carvings, made to me in 1933 by the Tuhoe tribe of the Urewera Country adds to its attractiveness and interest (Typescript notes by Sir Clutha Mackenzie, Ethnology Department files, Auckland Museum).
Sir Clutha had obtained the Tuhoe carvings in 1933 at Ruatahuna in the remote Urewera when he was visiting the mission school and a blind Māori friend there. The main carving was the remains of a carved gateway that had been erected on a model pā at Ruatahuna built in the late 1890s. The pā was intended as a tourist attraction but the tourists never came. Somewhat inappropriately, Sir Clutha had these carvings and the stone fireplace built into the interior of his Māori house.

Sir Clutha’s family remembered the Māori house fondly, as evidenced in a speech given by Mrs. Christina Doake (daughter of Sir Clutha) at Clendon Park Community House (formerly Sir Clutha’s home where the Māori house stood) on 18 April 1991 about her life there: “It was a lovely building. Dad used to have his office and desk there. In the afternoon it would be lovely and sunny and we always sat there after lunch and somebody would read the paper to him, cover to cover” (Typescript notes, Ethnology Department files, Auckland Museum).

In 1972, the Orakei Marae Trust Board purchased the Mackenzie carved house for £2000 from Sir Clutha Mackenzie’s estate, moving it to Orakei Marae on Bastion Point on 22 September 1972. There it was renamed Te Koha ‘The Gift’ and was used as the meeting house for the Marae until a new large carved house had been built. Te Koha still stands at Orakei Marae.

Figure 10: Sir Clutha Mackenzie and his family at leisure in front of his carved Māori house standing in their garden at Manurewa, Auckland. Photo: Private collection.
10. Memorial gateway, Seddon Square, Waimate, South Canterbury, 1929.

In September 1929, the Waimate Borough Council decided to erect in Seddon Square an “imitation of a Māori meeting house front” to serve as a shelter and resting place for the citizens. In the shelter were to be placed four tablets, commemorating “the arrival of the first European settler Michael Studholme, his peaceful reception by Huruhuru the Māori chief, the names of the Mayor and Council of the first year of the Borough, and of the Jubilee Year” (Letter 19 September 1929, Town Clerk to Messrs Hamilton and Fitch, Solicitors, Courtesy of Waimate District and Historical Society Archives). The carvings were commissioned from the Rotorua School of Māori Arts, and Harold Hamilton, the Director of the School, quoted a cost of £25 for a carved house front consisting of *koruru*, *maihi* and *amo*, with a guaranteed delivery time of 21 days (Letter dated 16 September 1929, H. Hamilton to Town Clerk, Waimate, Courtesy of Waimate District and Historical Society Archives). The Borough Council must have decided that it could afford twice this amount as the final product (Fig. 11), still standing in Waimate, features two carved house fronts as described by Hamilton (in 16 September letter above), erected back to back, with a blank wall between on the street side on which are mounted the plaques. The carvings are important as early examples of the carvings produced by some of the first students at the Rotorua School of Māori Arts. Another gateway in the form of a Māori house front with simplified *koruru*, *maihi* and *amo* with painted *kowhaiwhai* patterns between them was erected at the entrance to Manchester Park in Waimate. These are cast in concrete.

![Figure 11: Memorial gateway, Seddon Square, Waimate, South Canterbury. Photo: R.Neich.](image-url)

Attributed to Tene Waitere, this house stood in the New Zealand section of the Empire Exhibition, Wembley in 1924, along with a small model storehouse, also attributed to Tene Waitere. After the exhibition, most of these carvings were apparently obtained by a Mr. Weston (or Wiston) who had a biscuit factory in New Zealand. They later came into the possession of Dr T.R.F. Raw, a general medical practitioner who had been born in Rotorua, New Zealand. Dr Raw set them up as a summerhouse in his garden in Horley, Surrey, England, also incorporating the carvings of the model pātaka into the same structure (Fig.12). Here the Raw family and their descendants enjoyed the Māori house in their garden as a leisure focal point for many years before they later moved away to Norfolk.

Most of these carvings were purchased by the Museum of New Zealand at Phillips Auctioneers, London, in 1987. The koruru had been given to a colleague of Dr Raw and remained in his hands in England until 1994, when it was given to the Museum of New Zealand.

Figure 12: Dr Raw and family members taking tea in front of a composite mock Māori house front composed of carvings from the Wembley Exhibition of 1924, set up in his garden at Horley, Surrey, England. Photo: Private collection.
12. Hauiti Meeting house carvings, Mr. O’Conner’s garden, Wadestown, Wellington, 1930s.

The meeting house named Hauiti had stood from 1885 at Te Houhou Marae—Rata Huki of the Ngāti Whakatere hapū had built it for the chief Utiku Potaka of the Ngāti Hauiti (Phillipps 1955:62-63). After the house had been abandoned, the carvings were brought to Wellington and erected in a summerhouse configuration in Mr. B.C. O’Conner’s garden at Wadestown.

13. Sir William Goodfellow’s carved house, Maar Road, Manurewa, Auckland.

In the first half of the 20th century, after travelling widely in Europe in 1906, Sir William Goodfellow became the most influential leader in the New Zealand dairy industry, holding important positions in many related companies. He was also briefly involved in New Zealand politics in the 1930s. Goodfellow is said to have had a small Māori house set up in the garden of his home in Manurewa, not far from Sir Clutha Mackenzie’s, but this has not yet been substantiated.


The only available evidence of this pātaka is a set of photographs supplied to the Museum of New Zealand in 1976 showing it in a large private garden. The whole front of the house was elaborately carved and was raised on short piles. Judging from these photographs, the house was carved in Rotorua probably between 1910 and 1920, perhaps by Te Ngaru Ranapia (Neich 2001:91, 377).


Gilwell Park is the headquarters of the Scout movement in the United Kingdom. This archway (Fig. 13), which is still standing there, has the form of the bargeboards and apex figure of a meeting house front, carved in a Rotorua Te Arawa tribal style. It forms the entrance to the large campfire circle used at the Gilwell Reunions and other large gatherings. The arch was presented by the scouts of New Zealand to commemorate their contingent to the 1947 World Jamboree held in France. They travelled by boat and were away from home for five months, camping at Gilwell Park and continuing their school studies before continuing on to France. As a thank you gift, they commissioned a Māori craftsman (who is at present unidentified) to make the ceremonial arch. By one account, the arch was shipped over to Gilwell with them and officially handed over to the Camp Chief John Thurman before they left for the jamboree in France (pers. comm. Patricia Styles, Gilwell Archivist, 20 January 2003). Another account by some of the
participants states that the arch was shipped over to England and presented to Gilwell after the contingent had returned home, probably having been commissioned by the late Sir Joseph Ward who was the leader of the contingent (Owen Rodgers pers. comm., 29 January 2003). Whether presented by the scouts at the time or somewhat later, this is a clear example of the national appropriation of Māori carving as a symbol of their New Zealand identity, even though the majority of the scouts in this party would have been of non-Māori ancestry.

DEMOCRATISATION OF A TRADITION

Erecting Māori houses or parts of them in public parks by civic authorities both in New Zealand and England can be considered a major aspect of the democratisation of the “Māori house in the garden” tradition. Many public parks were modelled on the landscape style of private aristocratic gardens with their follies, which in New Zealand often meant a Māori carved archway. A striking example in a slightly different context was the elaborately carved archway at the Kahutia Bowling club grounds in Gisborne, a gift from Sir James Carroll (photograph in Alexander Turnbull Library Wellington).
Other examples of this democratisation were the practices of ordinary private citizens who placed parts of Māori houses or models of Māori houses in their small backyard gardens. For those who could not afford a complete Māori house and did not have the large landscape garden to accommodate one, this was basically a direct continuation of the tradition from well-to-do aristocratic country estates to the city and suburban gardens of the middle and working classes.

One such house was the small summerhouse consisting of an older Māori tekoteko and koruru figure carving combined with imitation Māori bargeboards made by a European in a Nelson back yard in about 1910. The older carvings are now in Nelson Museum (Daniel McKnight pers. comm., 28 May 2002). In the garden of his suburban home at Silverstream in the Hutt Valley, another Pākehā New Zealander and long-time President of the Polynesian Society, Jock M. McEwen, who was an accomplished and knowledgeable carver in Māori style, erected a model pātaka that he had carved himself.

Another solution to the limited space of a suburban garden was to attach Māori house carvings to the bungalow or villa-style home. This was done in about 1916 on the exterior front of Rose and Harold Hankey’s home in Warrington, Dunedin, using carved bargeboards, amo and tekoteko (Fig.14), commissioned from a Rotorua carver (Christine McCarthy pers. comm., 7 April 1998). At Rotorua, Mr. Douglas Larnach, formerly of the Otago Peninsula, attempted to combine Māori carving decoration with modern bungalow architecture when he framed the front door and windows of his suburban bungalow with carved tekoteko, koruru, maihi, amo and paepae. He christened his house “Te Whare o Te Pa” (T.E. Donne Scrapbook, “The Māori at Home”, Alexander Turnbull Library qMs-0623). Another European carver in the Māori style, Arthur Percy Godber, also of Silverstream, decorated the front porch of his suburban bungalow with his koruru-inspired carving (Fig.15). Some people even took the “Māori house in the garden” tradition to another level of democracy by carving their letterboxes in the form of a miniature carved Māori house.

An examination of the political status and socio-economic standing of the English and Pakeha involved in this “Maori house in the garden” phenomenon demonstrates the colonialist origins and the subsequent democratisation of the practice. In approximate temporal order, they were Fenton (judge), Onslow (English aristocrat, parliamentarian, colonial governor), Buller (lawyer, politician, diplomat, administrator), Queen Marie (royalty), William Beetham (artist, member of the Royal Academy, gentleman farmer), George Beetham (parliamentarian), Nathan (wealthy businessman), Anderson (wealthy businessman, benefactor), Donne (civil
servant, diplomat), Thomas Mackenzie (parliamentarian, diplomat), Clutha Mackenzie (parliamentarian, international administrator), Raw (general medical practitioner), Goodfellow (businessman, entrepreneur), McEwen (public servant) and Godber (tradesman).

These democratisations of the “Māori house in the garden” can also be regarded as part of the movement that began in the late 19th and early 20th centuries when European New Zealanders began to use Māori designs to decorate the interiors of their homes. Sometimes these designs were produced by the European householders themselves; others were commissioned from a very small pool of practicing Māori carvers prepared to do this sort of work. This resulted in Māori-style carved banisters, doorframes, chairs, beds, bookcases and fireplaces (Neich 2001:354, Petersen 1998, 2000). Interest in the “Arts and Crafts Movement” after 1888 also played a role in this reappraisal of Māori art: Owen Jones and William Morris both mentioned Māori art. Yet, this was the same period when Māori carving as a practising art was fast dying out within Māori communities. As Petersen (1998:138) has commented: “This European aestheticisation of Māori art constituted a political act because it presupposed some denial of Māori capacity to continue their own uses and construction

Figure 14: Carvings attached in 1916 on the exterior front of Rose and Harold Hankey’s home in Warrington, Dunedin. Photograph: C. McCarthy, Dunedin.

Figure 15: Albert Percy Godber with his koruru-inspired carving decorating the front porch of his suburban bungalow at Silverstream. Photo: Alexander Turnbull Library, Wellington [APG G776].
of things.” At the same time, there was a trend in early 20th century international exhibitions, including that at Christchurch in 1906, to present native material culture as innocuous and suggestive of a praiseworthy inclination towards craftsmanship and industry (Petersen 1998:139).

HOW COLONIALIST? HOW BENIGN?

Clearly, this phenomenon of the “Māori house down in the garden” could only have developed in a colonial milieu, whether in England or New Zealand. While it is risky to impute motives on such variable evidence, some reasons for indulging in the practice are clear and are not mutually exclusive. For some, the Māori house in their garden might be regarded as a “trophy” or even as a mere memento of past travels, in effect a souvenir or an example of the “exotic”. For those with some sort of attachment to New Zealand, the Māori house in the garden could signify their sympathy with “antipodality” (Clark and Bell 1994). For those with a deeper experience of Māori culture, it could be a memento of past contacts with Māori people and Māori culture. It might have been intended to demonstrate the cultural awareness and liberal views of the owner. For many, it was surely a way of showing their admiration for Māori art as art, and was taken to a new level by those who learned to carve in Māori style. Alternatively, it could be the expression of the owner’s high regard for English culture, valued as a picturesque addition to a gentleman’s garden, or even as a way of showing that the owner was an educated and sophisticated and cultured person who understood and valued the wider traditions of English country estates. Finally, as suggested by the earlier discussion of Sir Walter Buller’s motives, it might have been intended as a symbol of impending Māori extinction and the “natural” superiority of British culture.

Buller’s views on impending Māori extinction and his underhand measures to keep local Māori away from his estate indicate that his motives were not wholly benign. And perhaps more subtly malign motives were operating in this practice, as suggested by Eileen Hooper-Greenhill (1998) when describing the decorations of the 1730 aristocratic baroque stately home of Lord Onslow that stood on the estate where Hinemihi was erected. These decorations include references to slavery in Jamaica, one of the sources of Onslow family wealth. Therefore, while placing Clandon firmly within the cultural frame of European humanism with a decorative scheme intended to demonstrate the cultured sophistication of the Onslow family, they “show all too clearly how European humanism constructed its values through exploitation and exclusion” (Hooper-Greenhill 1998:141).

Certainly, in most of these examples of a “Māori house in the garden”, the gap between the wealth and standard of living of the English house
owners stood in stark contrast to the poverty of their Māori contemporaries. There have also been suggestions that Aporo Te Wharekaniwha signed the sale document for Hinemihi under some duress and without realising that the house was to be taken out of New Zealand. This may account for some of the later desultory attempts by Māori in 1935 and 1988 to have Hinemihi returned to New Zealand.

Nevertheless, this practice of “the Māori house down in the garden” was certainly benign in that no physical injury was ever done to their Māori owners in the process of obtaining these houses. All of them were obtained by gift, purchase or commission, often in very amicable arrangements. However, despite this amicability, the owners of these houses felt free to modify and alter the traditional scheme and structure of a Māori house to suit their own purposes, often simply to suggest the romantic idea of an exotic native house in the bush of their contrived gardens. They fitted these houses into their own English traditions transplanted to New Zealand, looking back to centuries of English garden planning. And unlike other collectors of Pacific art, they actually used these houses, albeit for various alien purposes, as evidenced by their family photographs.

The question arises as to how unique was this practice? Was this practice found within other colonial regimes? All of the evidence indicates that it was special to the Māori colonial situation. Most follies in England were drawn from “recognised civilisations”, usually Western European, Chinese, Japanese or Indian. And, apart from a few rare instances where genuine foreign antiquities, such as Italian marbles and Roman columns, were assimilated as garden follies, virtually all English follies were either local ruins or fanciful constructions that were designed and made locally. Similarly, in other former colonies of British settlement, such as Canada, the United States, Australia, South Africa, and so on, no traditions developed for using the houses of indigenous peoples as garden follies, except in some more recent public parks.

Therefore, this practice seems to indicate a special English attitude and benevolent regard towards Māori art, as compared to other colonials’ attitudes towards other ethnic arts. Beyond an attitude towards their art, it also indicates a special regard for Māori people and their culture, perhaps based upon the then current social evolutionist belief that Māori were more “advanced” and “civilised” than most other indigenous peoples. Following on from this belief, most “Māori houses down in the garden” were set up in the period of the 1890s and early 20th century when a popular concept of New Zealand nationhood was emerging, drawing upon the idea of a “Britain of the south” combined with highly selected and sanitised aspects of Māori culture.
THE MĀORI RESPONSE

There is no historical evidence of Māori opposition to the appropriation of Māori art for European interior house design at the turn of century. On the contrary, some Māori carvers, such as Hori Pukehika at Whanganui, Tene Waitere at Rotorua, Jacob Heberley at Wellington, and Patuaka Tauwehe and Hokowhitu Makarika both in the Manawatu district, welcomed this fashion and joined in, accepting commissions from well-to-do Europeans for fireplaces, door-frames, picture frames and so on. Also, some elite Māori leaders incorporated Māori designs into their own English-style dwellings, for example Sir Maui Pomare’s house at Melling near Wellington, Reweti Kohere’s home at Te Araroa and Sir Apirana Ngata’s house at Waiomatatini, though these remained as very rare instances. Ultimately, the idea that Māori art could form the basis of a distinctive New Zealand style of domestic design did not gain great popularity (Petersen 1998:144).

While occasional Māori contact was maintained with some of these houses in English gardens, notably Hinemihi and Nuku Tewhatewha during their employment as garden follies, for most of them this was a time of separation from their Māori context. In recent years, nearly all of them have been returned to Māori ownership or have been deposited in museums or, as in the case of Hinemihi, have come under the care of cultural and historic trusts. In these new situations, even when now standing in museums, they have been reclaimed and embraced by Māori again. Through renewed

Figure 16: Gateway of Otakou Marae, Dunedin in the form of an expanded carved house doorway flanked by miniature model meeting houses. Photo: R. Neich.
Māori involvement with their latest renovations and relocations, these houses and carvings have been reinvested with new spiritual energy. What is notable is that the Māori people who have embraced these treasures again are generally not very interested in their short life as symbols of other things and other ways of life. The Māori counter-response to the European “Māori house down in the garden” response has mostly been to ignore this period of a house’s biography. This re-appropriation clearly demonstrates the resilience, persistence and power of contemporary modern Māori culture.

Despite this apparent Māori lack of interest or even unease about the “Māori house in the garden” period for most of these examples, I suspect that some influences from this English use of Māori houses may have reappeared in the designs of some modern marae. In particular, the modern practice of planting decorative shrubs around the meeting houses and on the margins of the marae could be seen as an echo of the garden setting given by their European owners to those earlier “Māori houses in the garden”. Similarly, the modern forms of gateway entrance to many marae now reproduce the carved fascia boards of a meeting house. This is a dramatic departure from the traditional form of Māori pā gateways (Neich 2002), but it follows the same pattern as many former meeting house carvings set up in public parks. Several schools, especially those in strongly Māori areas, feature a carved entrance modelled on the front of a carved house. An extreme and intriguing development dating from the 1940s of the “meeting house as gateway” idea may be seen at the entrance to Otakou Marae (Fig.16) on the Dunedin peninsula, where two tiny model carved meeting house fronts are set up on posts at each side of the gateway. The gateway itself is an extension of a meeting house pare and whakawae doorway composition, rendered in cast concrete and said to have been cast from original carvings in the Otago Museum. In this way, the carved house has become a symbol of itself, moving in full circle via the extraction of symbolic parts of a house to a model of a house.

* * *

This examination of the “Māori house down in the garden” phenomenon has illuminated the confluence of several processes of change occurring in Māori art during the later 19th and early 20th centuries. Among these are the use of carved Māori houses, either in whole or in extracted parts, as symbols of various types of identity beyond the original Māori symbolic role of the carved house concept; the increasing deployment of carved houses in many contexts of New Zealand society and culture; the use of Māori designs in Pākehā house interiors and the practice of Pākehā people learning to produce Māori-style carvings for their own use.
Although relatively few Māori houses and carvings were used as garden follies in England and New Zealand, those few had a significant impact on how Māori art was viewed in England and by Pākehā in New Zealand. Their prominent placement and care in the estates of a wealthy and cultured elite helped to develop among many Pākehā a sympathetic attitude toward Māori art as something to be valued, preserved and nurtured. The uniqueness of this practice emphasised the special relationship between Pākehā and Māori in New Zealand that was different from settler/indigenous relationships in other parts of the colonial world.

Parts of Māori meeting house (after Neich 2001:402).
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