The Rev. Thomas Samuel Grace (1815-79), who temporarily headed the Turanga Mission Station at Poverty Bay between 1850 and 1853, was the first to comment on the exceptional church the local people, with the aid of some of their nearby neighbours, were then erecting at Manutuke, the site near Gisborne where the Rev. William Williams (1800-1878) in 1840 established the headquarters for this Anglican mission to the East Coast Māori. Several months after the building’s main framework had been raised, Grace was moved to write in his 1851 year-end report to the Church Missionary Society (CMS) this prediction concerning the structure then taking shape: “This Church will be, if finished according to Māori architecture, the greatest monument of national art that New Zealand contains, and which the present race is likely ever to execute” (Brittan et al. n.d.: 16). In a letter written shortly after the building’s inauguration in 1863, the Rev. Williams expressed similar sentiments, though devoid of the racist undertone of Grace’s remark: “Within it is elaborately carved, & presents a specimen of native art which is nowhere else to be seen” (Letter dated 7 May 1863, quoted in Porter 1974: 589). Six years later, even when Manutuke had fallen into disrepair, Lt.-Col. J.H.H. St John (1873: 181-82) was still able to discern “its glory” despite the “broken windows, a ripped-up floor, and holes in the roof”.

Because only a handful of Manutuke’s carved and painted panels survive, and the wood engraving of this church published in the 1852 issue of the Church Missionary Intelligencer (CMI) is of dubious accuracy on key points (Fig. 1), what the Rongowhakaata achieved in the realm of both architecture and sculpture has not been fully appreciated. As a result, this monument has not secured the place it deserves in the history of Māori art. This is particularly unfortunate since the church’s main carvers were among the foremost artists of the 19th century, including the greatest and most influential of all, Raharuhi Rukupo (c.1800-1873). He was the person chiefly responsible for the erection at Manutuke of Te Hau-ki-Turanga (c.1842), a monument that is not only universally recognised as one of the greatest masterpieces of Māori art of any age (Fig. 2), but also is the earliest surviving meeting house. It is displayed at the Museum of New Zealand/Te Papa Tongarewa (commonly referred to as Te Papa), in Wellington.
Figure 1. Manutuke IIB as it would appear when completed. Wood engraving, published in 1852 as frontispiece to *CMI* 3 (2) and subsequently in 1884 in the *CMG*. For detail see Fig. 15.

Source: ATL-TPM, ref. no. PUBL-0006-1884-110.
By examining the primary written documents, the seven extant carved panels and the many more known through photographs taken before their destruction in 1910, it is possible to present a more accurate picture of the now-vanished second Manutuke church than the way it is depicted in the illustration in Figure 1. This second edifice was built as a replacement for the Turanga Mission’s first house of prayer, which had been smashed to the ground by a windstorm in 1842 before being completed. The reconstruction of Manutuke II that I am proposing argues for a decorative programme that was sculpturally richer and iconographically more complex than the *CMI* engraving shows.

The aim of reconstructing Manutuke’s ornamental scheme and its architectural setting is to recover this “greatest monument” which, through the vicissitudes of time, has lost its rightful place within the history of Māori art and architecture. This is not to say that scholars have not recognised the importance and originality of the church’s panels, but rather that the carved

Figure 2. Te Hau-ki-Turanga meeting house erected c.1842, originally at Orakaiapu Pā (in Manutuke) and presently in the Museum of New Zealand/Te Papa Tongarewa, Wellington. Photographed in 1988 by Mark Strange. Source: MONZ-TPT neg. no. B.18358.
composition as a totality and what it means have never been addressed, in part because so much has been lost, and what has been preserved photographically is difficult to retrieve and interpret.

The only other Māori church rivalling Manutuke in missionary eyes was the lofty and steeply proportioned church of Rangiātea erected at Otaki (Fig. 3), on the Kapiti Coast, between 1848 and 1851. Williams (1989: 352) was speaking for many when he declared that “the building which now stands at Otaki never fails to excite the admiration of the passing traveller”. Manutuke differed from Rangiātea and dozens of other Māori churches based on the plan and structure of the traditional Māori whare ‘house’ by possessing a fully carved architectural framework similar to that of Te Hau-ki-Turanga. At Otaki and other whare-style churches of the period, carved embellishment was studiously avoided by the indigenous builders in order to conform to the Anglican clergy’s Protestant bias against human imagery, the inclusion of which missionaries like Williams (TJ 1 July 1848: 497) deemed “hardly suitable for a place of worship”. It was the locals’ insistence on employing sculptural decoration that makes this church so significant for the history of Māori art. Only after considerable controversy between Williams and the Māori community was a compromise eventually reached on a suitable ornamental scheme; this decisive step then allowed construction to move forward. In conceding to missionary objections by choosing to carve a type of motif—the manaia—that Williams deemed to be a simple decorative “device” devoid of human characteristics, Rukupo and his group of carvers considerably expanded the scope of Māori art by handling the manaia in new ways. The identity and nature of this creature has been variously interpreted to represent, among the most frequently voiced theories, either a birdman or a human being, usually in profile.

CULTURAL INTERFERENCE AT MANUTUKE AND ITS CONSEQUENCES

Ironically, the circumstances that engendered the creation of Manutuke’s unusual design are the very ones that have impeded the full understanding and appreciation of this monument. Most scholars and critics have remarked that Manutuke’s construction was not only dilatory, but also when it opened in 1863 the edifice was still incomplete. What remained unfinished is not always specified; when it is, it runs the gamut from the planned tower not having been raised, to a patently false claim that none of the carved decoration was ever executed. A middle ground posits that a few of the building’s 60 constituent wall panels did not receive carved ornamentation, as originally intended, but were finished off instead with painted decoration. This alleged state of incompleteness—however extensive or little—has been widely viewed as evidence that the people of Manutuke had lost interest in bringing the idea
Figure 3. Rangiātea Church, Otaki, erected 1848-1851 and burned down 7 October 1995. Photographed in April 1995 by Graeme Simpson. Source: Courtesy of Te Rōpū Whakahaere o Rangiātea.
of a fully carved church to fruition. Most scholars have accepted Frances Porter’s (1974: 548, n.44) contention that Williams’ objection to the initial decorative scheme, with human figures, and the planned move of the Turanga station to Waerenga-a-hika (realised in 1857) had so “dampened” enthusiasm for the church that in end the local Rongowhakaata community failed to complete this project.

The perception of Manutuke IIB as an unfinished structure, its subsequent dismantling, and then the loss of its manaia panels re-installed in a Western-style church have effectively removed this monument from the forefront of artistic developments in Aotearoa New Zealand during the 19th century. To a considerable extent, this dislocation has been fostered because the actual edifice does not survive and there is no reliable illustration of what was built, and because of the perception that the outcome was something less than what Māori had originally intended. A few historians have signalled the importance and innovative nature of the carved and painted panels (Neich 1994: 85-86, Ria 1987: 85), but their discussion focuses on individual extant pieces and not upon the pieces assembled as a whole, and how, in their original location, they related to each other compositionally and iconographically. In light of these several circumstances, it has been difficult for critics, particularly non-art historians, to determine what Māori architects and carvers had undertaken and actually achieved at Manutuke in the course of the late 1840s and early 1860s.

When all the scattered evidence is gathered together and carefully analysed, there can be no doubt than in several important respects the Turanga Mission Church ranked among the most remarkable buildings erected by Māori during the 19th century. It was the largest and most capacious whare-style edifice of “superior” construction (whether to serve as a church or a meeting house); the first and only Māori structure where the carved embellishment was based exclusively on the profile manaia motif; and one of the first buildings employing manaia conceived in monumental scale. Also of considerable significance is the team of artists responsible for Manutuke that included the most eminent sculptor of the period, Raharuhi Rukupo, and other master carvers; chief among them were Te Waaka Perohuka and Te Waka Kurei, both active in the 1840s and early 1850s.

**RECONSTRUCTING THE VANISHED MONUMENT AND EVALUATING ITS SIGNIFICANCE**

Since several scholars have analysed the few pieces of carved and painted work that still survive, there is no need for an in-depth exploration of the more purely artistic and formal aspects of Manutuke’s ornamentation. My aim is rather to engage with the problems that have thus far eluded scrutiny, namely those relating to the planning, scope and execution of the sculptural programme.
A reconstruction of the church’s appearance serves as the necessary prelude to an evaluation of the artistic and architectural achievements that Manutuke represents. In the sections that follow I analyse the panels in detail and then draw from this information arguments demonstrating that for its time (and long thereafter) Manutuke was unprecedented in the scale and amount of carved ornamentation, that everything planned for it within the whare tradition was executed, and that the carved and painted work was highly original both in form and conception. There can be little doubt that the second Manutuke church represents a remarkable display of Māori co-operation, industry, productivity, innovation and accomplishment.

Research on destroyed structures is always demanding and challenging; Manutuke is no exception. It presents a full array of impediments: physical remains are few, fragmentary and scattered over three known locations; the major photographic documentation is held in two different museums; and the unpublished archival material is even more widely dispersed, with some key pieces held in foreign collections. Quite naturally, these circumstances conspire against bringing the vanished edifice back to life, but it can be done. It would be unrealistic to think that any scholar, whether Māori or non-Māori, like myself, could ever offer a completely accurate reconstruction of a lost building. At the very least, the picture that emerges from my reconstruction vividly confirms the high praise that Manutuke received from Turanga’s resident missionaries, the Rev. Williams, and his temporary replacement, the Rev. Grace.

MANUTUKE’S FOUR SUCCESSIVE CHURCHES

My introduction has already made reference to more than one Māori church at Manutuke. The present study is concerned with both the first and second versions of the second edifice (Manutuke IIA and IIB), and more particularly with IIB. In order to understand Manutuke IIB’s prehistory, history, and afterlife as recycled materials, it is useful to list, briefly describe and date the four Anglican churches erected at Manutuke during the 19th and early 20th centuries.

MANUTUKE I (1840-1842) was situated at or contiguous to the now-vanished Umukapua pā ‘stockaded village’ on what is presently the south bank of the Te Arai River. This whare-styled edifice was destroyed in a windstorm before completion. Manutuke I was often referred to as “Kaupapa”, which was the name of the grounds of the Turanga Mission Station (church, mission residence, etc.). This should not be confused with a site in Manutuke during the 19th century having the same name (Hall 24 April 1989: 1-2, 31 May 1989: 1-3; Ria 1987: 82-83; Sundt 1999: 13-20).
MANUTUKE II (1849-1881) was located in the area known as Whakato, just west of the site of the present eponymous marae ‘ceremonial ground and associated buildings’. This edifice, also whare in form, was the product of two building campaigns, the first of which was aborted early on (Neich 1994: 82-86, Ria 1987: 83-85).

IIA, 1849: Several panels were carved featuring frontal human images. This type of decoration was rejected by the resident missionary; hence, this campaign was abandoned and no further figurative carvings were made.

IIB, 1849-63: Panels with carved manaia images won the missionary’s approval, allowing the carving and construction of the church to proceed. The entire framework was erected in 1851; outer walls and roofing were completed in 1863. In 1881 IIB was dismantled and many of its carved timbers were eventually installed in the subsequent church (PBH 25 February 1887, H. Williams 1913).

MANUTUKE III (1888-1910) was located next to the present-day Manutuke marae, about 300m north of the Whakato marae and about the same distance west of Whakato Road. This third edifice, also of timber but Western in plan and structure, incorporated a great many of the panels carved for Manutuke IIB. This structure was built between 1888 and 1889 and was utterly destroyed by fire in 1910, only two decades after its inauguration in 1890 (GT 29 January 1910; Hall 20 June 1989; PBH 21 and 25 February 1887; F.W. Williams 1939: 322).

MANUTUKE IV (1912-present) occupies either the same location as Manutuke III, or is located just a few metres east of it. The fourth and present church, Tokotoru Tapu ‘Holy Trinity’, is decorated with carved panels specially commissioned for it and inspired by those of Manutuke IIB. In plan and structure this edifice resembles the third church, but its walls are of fire-resistant masonry construction. It still stands (Hall 24 April 1989: 3-4, Hanson and Mahuika 1979: 206-7, Tūpara 2000: 5-7).

ANALYSIS OF THE CARVED PANELS FOR MANUTUKE IIA & IIB

Extant Works and Lost Works known through Photographic Documentation

Since only seven of the 60 panels said to have been carved for Manutuke II are extant (Pipiwharauroa 1913: 9) (see Figures 4a, b; 9a, b, c; 13), it is necessary to examine these in conjunction with photographs of the lost panels in order to create a reasonably large inventory of works upon which a reconstruction of the church’s interior can be posited. It is also important to examine old photographs of the extant panels because these images reveal how the carved timbers changed over time, either because they were deliberately cut and/or because edges just cracked and fell off owing to age
Figure 4. Three carved surviving panels employing the *manaia* motif from Manutuke IIB, presently displayed in Maungarongo Hall at Te Kuri Marae, Muriwai. (a) Panel A. Photographed by M.D. King, 1975. Source: TM file no. 016.3 (13), courtesy of Victoria University of Wellington and Tairāwhiti Museum, Gisborne. (b) Panel B. Photographed by M.D. King, 1975. Source: TM file no. 016.3 (11), courtesy of Victoria University of Wellington and Tairāwhiti Museum, Gisborne. (c) Panel C. Photographed by Dudley Meadows, 2005. Source: Image ref. no. DSC 0023, courtesy of photographer and Tairāwhiti Museum, Gisborne.
or deterioration. Comparison of works then and now is a vitally important task; it is the best means of obtaining reasonably accurate measurements for various types of panels. This data is also crucial for determining the possible locations for slabs belonging to church’s sidewalls and endwalls and how these related to each other.

The problems attending the use of photographic documentation are manifold and challenging. The first difficulty is that even collectively the various photographs of the Manutuke carvings do not show all the relief work that once graced the church. The second is that none of the images show the panels in their original setting. In particular, the various photographs taken by William F. Crawford between 1889 and 1891 (Figs 5-7) provide views of how the vast majority of these carved pieces appeared after they were dismantled from the second church (IIB) and re-installed in the third following an entirely different layout, one that required shortening all the original slabs from as little as 3’ to as much as 13’.

Following the 1910 fire at Manutuke III, only
Crawford’s photographs remain as a record of their existence. Since a little under half of IIB’s carved ensemble was never installed in the third church, mainly because of its smaller scale (approximately 43% less in square area than IIB), the unused works escaped destruction, but unfortunately only a handful survive today.

The earliest photograph of some of the surviving panels is housed in the image collection of Te Papa, in Wellington, and as far as I am aware, it has not been published before (Fig. 8). The photographer was Augustus Hamilton (1853-1913), at the time Registrar at the University of Otago, Dunedin, and later (1903 to 1913) Director of Wellington’s Dominion Museum (now Te Papa), during his passage through Poverty Bay in February 1895 (see O’Rourke 2005). His travelling companion was Thomas M. Hocken (1836-1910), a prominent Dunedin medical doctor and an avid collector with wide-ranging interests in history and ethnology. In his diary entry for February 5th, Hocken recorded (O’Rourke 2005: 38) that they visited Muriwai and then
Manutuke where he and Hamilton viewed its recently completed third church (Manutuke III). On this same day they were also in Gisborne, where they visited the Williams family at their home, Te Rau Kahikatea, built by William Leonard Williams, the Rev. William Williams’ son, in 1876 (F. Williams 1989: 303). Hocken wrote of finding on the house grounds an unspecified number of panels from the second Manutuke church (O’Rourke 2005: 38), but did not indicate exactly when these were transferred to Gisborne. However, since they included some of the manaia panels like those employed in Manutuke III, but apparently rejected for re-use because they were marred by fissures, it is reasonable to assume that all the carvings in Hamilton’s photograph were removed to Leonard’s property soon after the completion of Manutuke III in 1889. Hocken wrote that the panels “lying for years undisturbed on the ground” were collected and “hoisted up by us and photographed by Hamilton” (O’Rourke 2005: 38). This collection was leaned up against the side porch of Leonard’s house, which is visible in the upper left-hand corner of the picture.
Figure 8. Group of six carved panels from Manutuke IIA and IIB photographed at Te Rau Kahikatea, Gisborne, by Augustus Hamilton 5 February 1895. Author’s identification codes overlaid on the various panels. Source: MONZ-TPT, neg. no. MA B.021333 B.021333.
Figure 9. Three extant figurative panels for Manutuke IIA, carved July-August 1849. (a) Panels L (left) and E (right). Photographed at Te Rau Kahikatea, Gisborne, by Augustus Hamilton 5 February 1895. Presently they form part of the portal of the Kahutia Bowling Club, Gisborne. Source: MONZ-TPT, neg. no. MA B.000687. (b) Panel D. Same as A, but is presently in Maungarongo Hall, Te Kuri Marae, Muriwai. Source: MONZ-TPT, neg. no. MA B.000686.
Hocken reported that after photographing all the panels together, and some as pairs and singles, they panels were then “well washed and will now be housed safely in the Maori Theological College presided over by Herb. W.”. Hocken was referring here to Herbert Williams (1860-1937), who at that time was principal of the College, also known as Te Rau.

The carvings in Hamilton’s photograph were not ideally positioned for close examination because two major panels overlap quite considerably. For the sake of reference I have assigned a letter to each of these slabs. The planks differ conspicuously in width and length; at least three—A, H and Ri2, and possibly all, of the six are fragments of much larger pieces. As Hocken noted, the carvings fall in two categories: Panels A, B and Ri2 are ornamented with the manaia pattern that Williams had approved for Manutuke IIB, while E, H, and L (hardly visible) display the frontal human imagery that he found unacceptable for inclusion in a Christian house of worship. Thus, I infer that the last-named group was carved for Manutuke IIA, which came to naught, and the first-named was created for Manutuke IIB.

Fortunately, at least two of the carved panels visible in the group photograph, E and L, were isolated and photographed as a pair and can be fully viewed (Fig. 9a). Panel D, which would be grouped with E and L, was photographed separately (Fig. 9b). Why it was not included in the group picture is not explained. Apparently, none of the other panels were photographed either singly or as pairs, probably because the composite in Figure 8 shows panels A, B, H and Ri2 in their full length and width.

In 1920 Te Rau College closed, and it was then or shortly thereafter that the seven panels which had earlier been placed under Herbert Williams’ guardianship were dispersed, either donated or sold to other collectors. Capt. Greacon J. Black (1850-1932), a Gisborne resident who also owned property near Muriwai (8km south of Manutuke), acquired panels A, B and D in the early 1920s. These and several others appear in a photograph (by an anonymous photographer, Fig. 10) published in a 1930 issue of the Journal of the Polynesian Society (vol. 39, opp. p.199). The Captain stands to the right of a panel assemblage planted in the garden of his Gisborne home on Graham Road at Kaiti. Black’s collection included five additional panels; Ia, Ib, J and K are probably not from the Manutuke church, but C is and clearly relates to A and B in the handling and proportions of the manaia. When, how, and from whom Black acquired C is not known. If it was among the cache of panels Hamilton and Hocken found in the Williams’ residence, it was not photographed or reported.

An editorial note, number 445, in the same issue (JPS 1930a: 199) accompanies the photograph in question and states that the “plate shews [sic] carvings from the first Māori church erected at Turanga (Gisborne District) in 1840, and blown down in 1842. The outer slabs are of especial interest.
Carvings from the first Maori church erected at Turanga (Gisborne District).

Figure 10. Group of eight panels displayed in the garden of Capt. G.J. Black’s Gisbourne residence. Capt. Black stands on the right. Photographed by unknown photographer in mid-1920s. Photograph published in 1930 in *JPS* 39(2), opposite p.199. Author’s identification codes overlaid on the panels.
The photo was kindly supplied by Captain G.J. Black, of Gisborne, who appears in the picture”.

The error of this statement was quickly caught, and in the next issue (JPS 1930b: 292) the editor set the record straight in note number 447.

His Lordship the Bishop of Waiapu [Herbert Williams] points out that the slabs illustrated were not in the church built in 1840, but were carved in about 1851 for a later building erected at Manutuke; this, however, was never completed, and in the late ‘eighties was taken down and the slabs ultimately placed in a church built in 1890, and destroyed by fire in 1910. The slabs shewn [sic] were not included in the building, as they were damaged.

The Bishop is correct in stating that the carvings were made not for the first but the second Manutuke church, but unfortunately failed to distinguish what had been carved for IIA and IIB. He was, however, misleading regarding the church’s completion and contradicts the earlier dating he gave for the building’s dismantling (see H.W. Williams 1913). These issues will be dealt with later in this study.

Sometime shortly after the Captain’s death in 1932, his son Richard gave the four panels associated with Manutuke—A, B, C and D—to the Te Kuri marae at Muriwai. This was a logical venue for these works given that the Black family owned property at Pakowhai, about 2km northwest of Muriwai. For nearly five decades the four panels were exhibited outside, with both the location and manner of display changing from time to time. None of this served the panels well. In 1981 they were cleaned and moved inside Maungarongo, the memorial hall and whare kai ‘dining hall’ of the marae. All of the slabs are still displayed in Maungarongo, most of them placed upright on the elevated stage that runs along the hall’s rear wall. Just before their installation in 1981, some repairs were made and all the carvings were given their present coat of red paint, which softens the crispness of the forms (see TM File No. 016.3 [9n]).

While the second JPS note corrects some fundamental errors in the first, it offers no explanation for the two different motifs that characterise the four Manutuke panels now in Muriwai. The wording of this first note (1930a: 199) inadvertently leads the reader to believe—and some have assumed this—that slabs A, B, C and D were all made for Manutuke IIB, but this is incorrect for D (see Fig. 9b for its earlier state), with its front-facing human imagery, could not have formed part of IIB’s decorative scheme, which called for manaia only. On this Hocken’s journal provides confirmation (O’Rourke 2005: 38). He wrote that the figurative panels E and L (in the Hamilton photos) (Figs 8, 9a), which are the companions of D (Fig. 9b), were for the aborted IIA campaign and never even suggested that they were later used along with manaia panels in Manutuke IIB.
Until recently the fate of panels E and L was not generally known to the Manutuke community at large, nor to most scholars, except those connected with the New Zealand Historic Places Trust Pouhere Taonga, who were cognisant of both the existence and historical importance of these works. In 1991 Dean Whiting authored a report for the Trust on the panels’ state of conservation, but this document was then promptly forgotten and nothing further was done to preserve the panels until 2007 when the Rongowhakaata sought action on the matter (GH 12 May 2007: 1-2, Whiting 2007). Renewed awareness of the two figurative carvings arose in 2003 when I was attempting

Figure 11. Portal of the Kahutia Bowling Club, Gisborne. Western face, photographed in 2005, overlaid with 1895 photograph of panels L and E (see Fig. 9A) marked to show how they were cut to fit the supporting blocks. The portal’s western face is based on the bottom of L and E (but transposed left and right). Photograph courtesy of D. Meadows, Tairāwhiti Museum, Gisborne.
to determine if they still existed, and if so where. When I showed the Hamilton photograph of E and L (Fig. 9a) to a small assembly of parishioners at Tokotoru Tapu Church (Manutuke IV) and asked if anyone knew their location, a couple of people suggested checking the Kahutia Bowling Club gateway in Gisborne. They believed it contained some “old carvings”, but did not know if these corresponded to the ones depicted in the photograph. On August 28th I visited this free-standing portal and did indeed find that “old carvings” had been incorporated into its structure, and that they corresponded to E and L. Both had been sawn in half to form two panels to line the front and back sides of the left and right arch supports (Fig. 11). These two figurative slabs became available, like the others in the Hamilton photograph (Fig. 8), when Te Rau ceased operations in 1920. Shortly thereafter Fred Goodman acquired E and L in order to raise a gateway for the club in honour of Sir and Lady Carroll (as recorded in an inscription on the gate’s base). The entry portal was erected in 1924, with new relief work commissioned for the triangular arch and the inner faces of the supporting blocks (for further details, see Whiting 2007: 2–4).

Unfortunately, the two smaller slabs (H, Ri2) in the Hamilton group photograph remain unaccounted for at present. As for the figurative panel H, whose whereabouts remain unknown, one can only presume a Manutuke origin (for IIA). Ri2 is likewise “lost”, but its connection to Manutuke is certain. In one of Crawford’s photographs (Fig. 5), a long sliver of a side of a manaia panel (a bottle perched just above it) is plainly visible among the carved remnants still littering the floor of the just-completed church (November 1889), and this fragment corresponds exactly with Ri2 in the Hamilton photograph. Clearly someone salvaged this discarded timber, but its subsequent fate remains a mystery. Perhaps the other larger bits of sawn-off carving were collected and saved as well, but they have not yet surfaced, if they indeed still exist. In the same Crawford photograph, the large manaia panels installed along the walls of Manutuke III are visible in all their magnificence and exuberance, but none of these carved timbers, most of which belonged to the same series as Muriwai panels A, B and C, survived the conflagration of 1910.

In one of the photographs of Manutuke III’s exterior (Fig. 12), three substantial carved fragments share the foreground with a top-hatted gentleman. The one standing vertically, which I have designated Re10, entered the Auckland Museum (Registration No. 2476) in 1928 as an object purchased at auction (Fig. 13). This piece remained unidentified until 1991 when Roger Neich (1991: verso) recognised it as belonging to Manutuke IIB based on his comparison of the carving with the one pictured in the aforementioned photograph, which Sheila Robinson included in her 1990 publication on Crawford’s photographic œuvre. Between 1889 and 1891
Figure 12. Manutuke III, oblique view of the exterior, western and southern sides, with unidentified person (Crawford?) standing next to three carved panel remnants (left to right: Re10, Re11; behind Re12). Photographed by William Crawford in 1891. Source: TM, Crawford Coll. ref. no. A292. (Note: Figures are often sequenced for ease of comparing similar subjects, rather than in the order they are introduced in the text.)
Figure 13. Panel Re10 (as in Fig. 12, left). A remnant of a single-stemmed manaia panel originally in Manutuke IIB (showing further losses). Acquired in 1928 by the Auckland Museum (reg. no. 2476). Source: Image ref. no. DSCN 1585, courtesy of Jody Wyllie, Tairāwhiti Museum, Gisborne.
Figure 14. Panel Re10 (as in Figs. 12 and 13) reconstructed to the original width, based on measurements taken directly by the author from the surviving remnant (Fig. 13) and in comparison with the fragment’s 1891 state as it appears in Fig. 12. Drawing by the author with the assistance of Christine L. Sundt.
Figure 15. Manutuke IIB, wood engraving, detail of the *poutuarongo* with single-stem *manaia* panelling. Published in 1852 CMI 3(2): 48, corresponding to the interior view in the frontispiece (Fig. 1). Source: Author’s photograph.
Crawford documented the construction and completion of Manutuke III. This body of work, consisting of 13 images, preserves for us the only visual record of this now-vanished monument.

At some point between 1891 when the photograph with Re10 was taken (Fig. 12) and 1928 when this carving was acquired by the Auckland Museum (Fig. 13), the piece lost about one third of its right side and a sliver of the left edge. In the 1891 photograph, a large crack is visible at the point where the larger break finally occurred. Auckland Re10 is unlike the other manaia panels shown in this exterior shot and those depicted in both the JPS' and Hamilton photographs. On its left side a stem runs from top to bottom.

A close examination of the interior photographs of Manutuke III shows that the Auckland piece belongs to a select number of manaia panels that differed from the rest not only by their greater breadth, but also by having the stem centrally placed and running through their entire height (see, e.g., Fig. 6, left side). Careful examination of the CMI illustration (Fig. 1), which portrays how the church was intended to appear when finished, shows the location of manaia panels with and without stems: the uprights (poupou) of the long sides and the taller uprights of the endwalls (epa) all carry simple manaia patterns, whereas the centremost endwall-upright (poutuarongo), and presumably also the poutāhuhu on the opposite end, are embellished by a stem bisecting their entire length, with manaia positioned on either flank of the vertical band. (A glossary of Māori terms relating primarily to art and architecture is included at the end of this article.) The same 1852 CMI issue also contains a close-up illustration (on p. 48, see Fig. 15) of the uppermost section of the poutuarongo, and in this detail the centrally-coursing band is clearly discernible. It is notable that in the CMI image none of the other endwall panels exhibit the stem motif among the manaia. This observation is central to the problems surrounding the reconstruction of Manutuke IIB’s decorative scheme which I develop below.

Panels D, E, L and H in the Hamilton photographs are all decorated with front-facing human figures (Figs 8 and 9). These were among those that had been started in July 1849 for the first version of the second Manutuke church (IIA) by Rukupo, Te Waaka Perohuka and Te Waka Kurei, the three Māori carvers named by the Rev. Williams in his journal entries for this period. The missionary’s rejection of these figurative panels upon his return to Manutuke in late August 1849, after a five-week pastoral visitation to the upper East Coast (TJ 24 August: 535), set in motion a search for a compromise solution that, after much heated controversy between missionary and Māori (TJ 3 and 5 September: 537), eventually resulted in the adoption of the manaia pattern on 10 September 1849 (TJ: 537-38). The panels A, B, C and Re10 correspond to the new design approved by Williams on that date (Figs 4a, b, c, 13). They are the only ones to survive from the 60 manaia panels (simple and stemmed)
carved to decorate the definitive version of the Turanga Mission’s second church, i.e., IIB (not IIA, the initial but aborted attempt to employ the human figure motif). The entire IIB ensemble of manaia wall panels was executed between September 1849 (see TJ 16 October 1849: 548) and either late 1850 or sometime in 1851. In his year-end report to the CMS dated 31 December 1851, the Rev. Grace mentions that the church’s framework (wall panels, ridgepole and rafters) had by then been erected, the edifice then only lacking closure of the interstices in the wall and roofing.8

“TO OUTDO THE CHURCH AT OTAKI”?

The impetus for creating a carved church, whether with figural decoration originally (despite Williams’ well-known objections to such imagery) or manaia eventually, appears to have proceeded principally from a local cultural situation, rather than from a spirit of competitiveness between distant tribes. This latter explanation was enunciated by the Rev. Williams in 1849 and has remained canonical in Māori art historical literature ever since. In one of his letters, Williams speculated that “a spirit of emulation, a desire I believe in great measure to outdo the church at Otaki, suggested the idea of carving all the posts” (TJ 16 Oct 1849: 547). That rivalry existed among tribes and chiefs is well known9 and, as the Rev. Richard Taylor (1805-73) observed in 1843, this is what probably prompted Te Rauparaha at Otaki to build in his pā “a much finer” church (Fig. 3) than the one that had just been erected in neighbouring Waikanae.10 It is not that Māori in Turanganui-a-Kiwa (Poverty Bay) would have been unaware and unmoved by developments on the opposite side of Te Ika a Māui (the North Island), but when the Manutuke community began contemplating the building of a carved church, sometime before July 1848 (see TJ 1 July: 497), work on Rangiātea had not progressed beyond the erection of the principal parts of the framework.11 Too little would have been accomplished there to have made this edifice an incentive for competition, particularly when, in size, it was by no means among the largest of the monumental whare-style churches. Slightly earlier ones, such as Matamata and Otawhao were in fact larger in area, although probably not as tall as Rangiātea. Thus Otaki was easy to surpass without bringing sculpture into the equation.

Williams’ invocation of competitiveness, even if partially true, has tended to focus attention away from his interesting assessment concerning the state of Māori art in the late 1840s. His remark hints at the real motivation behind building a carved church at Manutuke. Carving at that time, Williams declared, was “an art in which the Turanga natives alone, of all the tribes in New Zealand, excel” (TJ 16 Oct 1849: 547-48). This may have been an exaggeration, but the Rongowhakaata artists active in Poverty Bay during the middle of the century constituted, together with Māori in the upper East
Coast and the Bay of Plenty (especially in Rotorua), the only enclaves in New Zealand where indigenous art still flourished (Barrow 1965: 15-17; Kernot 1984: 151; Simmons 1984: 106-7). Elsewhere in the country, art production had disappeared entirely or was sliding into decline as Māori society adapted to changes brought about by contact with European settlers (for a region-by-region chronology of decline and loss, see Simmons 1984: 107). If this correctly represents the arts scene in Aotearoa New Zealand generally, and the East Coast in particular, then at the most fundamental level, the reason for undertaking a vast sculptural programme at Manutuke was to display and celebrate the skill of Rongowhakaata carvers in what would be one of the area’s most public and conspicuous buildings. This, rather more so than rivalry with Otaki, underlies Te Waka Kurei’s refusal to honour Williams’ call to abandon carved figural decoration. The clergyman recounts his conversation with him as follows:

Te Waaka Kurei, another leading chief, came before breakfast to tell me that he cannot give up the carving for that the fame of their carving had been carried north and south and that if they now gave it up, they would be jeered at by all who had heard of it. (TJ 6 September 1849: 537)

Given Te Waka Kurei’s insistence and rationale for forging ahead with the carving, it is difficult to see how Williams could have later interpreted the position of the Manutuke Māori primarily, if not exclusively, as a game of one-upmanship with Otaki, rather than as an attempt to uphold their cultural traditions and identity.

**THE CARVED PANELS FOR MANUTUKE IIB, WITH THE MANAIA MOTIF**

Williams’ determined stance against the first set of planks ultimately forced the carvers to change the decorative programme to the *manaia* motif. Although this versatile creature was well known to Māori, Williams was apparently unaware of it. He himself never used the term *manaia*; he simply referred to it as something that was “quite non descript exhibiting neither man[,] beast or creeping thing but giving a very good specimen of native carving” (TJ 16 October 1849: 548). Whatever its name or appearance, to the missionary’s eye it was sufficiently abstract to be read as an innocuous decorative “device” and thus acceptable for ecclesiastical ornamentation (TJ 10 September 1849: 537-38).

When Manutuke IIB was dismantled in 1881, well over half of its *manaia* panels were used to decorate the interior walls of the community’s third, Western-style church, which opened in 1890. As a result of its loss to fire two decades later, the whole of its carved inventory, i.e., all that was taken
from IIB, is known only through Crawford’s extensive photography of the late 19th-century edifice. Since interior pictures of Manutuke III were taken from various angles, the vast majority of the panels are visible (Figs 5-7). Shadows render a few difficult to discern, and others are impossible to see owing either to their corner positions or being engulfed in near total darkness. Using digital techniques (zooming in, lightening, etc.) it has been possible to penetrate some of these troublesome spots.

When building the Western-style third church, the first *manaia* panels to be rejected for re-installation were those in poor condition; how many is difficult to determine. Equally difficult to know is how many good ones were discarded simply because Manutuke III was not large enough to absorb the full complement of carved panels made for the second church. Of the four surviving planks, B represents the greater portion (minus c.3’) of a full-sized side panel or *poupou*. It is impossible to know if A and C are remnants of carved planks, the larger portions of which were incorporated into the third church, or parts never used because their other (and larger) sections were in poor state of conservation and eventually sawn off, resulting in truncated slabs A and C. Since Re10 appears in Crawford’s photograph of Manutuke III’s exterior, I assume this carving is but a small segment of a larger panel, the greater portion of which was used in the third church, and must therefore not be counted as yet another panel, save for this small piece. All the other cast-offs visible in Crawford’s photographs of both the interior and exterior remain unaccounted for and may be lost.

In Panels A, B and C the *manaia* motif is composed and handled in essentially the same way (Fig. 4a, b, c). The design of Panel Re10 (Fig. 13) differs from the other three by the inclusion of a single vertical stem motif along one of its flanks (in its present condition), but which originally ran through the plank’s centre. Among this quartet of panels, B is the best preserved and closest to its original size. Presently, it is 28" (2’ 4") wide at the base, 11' 8½" high, and has a maximum depth of 2¼". The earliest known photograph (taken by Hamilton in 1895) reveals that it was longer on both extremities (Fig. 8). By the time it reached Capt. Black in the 1920s, the roughly adzed base had been sawn off, and about 7 to 8 percent of the top part had either snapped off or been cut as well (Fig. 10, with B set upside down relative to its position in Fig. 8). If B’s upper portion is included, the panel in its 1895 condition (not counting the uncarved footing) was around 12' 7" tall (Fig. 4b). If lateral breakage is taken into consideration, this might add about one inch to the width, bringing it to about 29" (2' 5"). This breadth dimension is somewhat greater than the one W. Leonard Williams (1932: 20) reported as the average for Manutuke IIB’s *poupou*: 24" in width (and a height of over 15’). His use of the word “average” for breadth indicates
that the vertical posts were not of uniform size, which is normal in Māori
construction. Panel B’s somewhat larger than average width could argue for
it being an *epa* ‘endwall panel with slanted upper edge’, but it would not
exclude its use as a post on the long sides (*poupou*). Already in the earliest
photograph of this slab it had a deep fissure running through most of its
length. This is probably why it was rejected for use in Manutuke III, and
paradoxically why it survived with its two ends eventually cut to produce
cleaner edges for purposes of installation and display.

Panel A is shaped like an *epa* (Fig. 4a), but while it is possible that it could
have served as an endwall panel, the oblique cut is obviously not the original
since it shears off part of the mouth and head of the topmost *manaia*. This slab
is also cracked and some portions of the upper and lower edges have split off,
or may have been deliberately trimmed to make it narrower, probably by an
inch. Possibly one of the narrower *poupou* or *epa* of Manutuke IIB was cut
to A’s present shape and size to fit into the gable compositions of the third
church, the inner façades of either the transepts or the west entrance (Fig.
7), but was later rejected, perhaps because of the cracks. In its current state,
the uppermost section measures 1’ 8¼" in width and the bottom part 1’ 8½".
The highest side is 8’ 7½" long. Given that the sidewalls in IIB rose to an
average of 15½’, panel A has lost some 7’ of its original length. Owing to its
narrow width (originally about 21") panel A was probably a *poupou*. An *epa*
cannot be discounted if it was located at a corner or outer position in one of
the endwalls (in which case it would not be higher than 14’ 4½" or 172½"
[see Fig. 19]). Corner *epa* are frequently considerably narrower than other
terminal wall uprights and even than some *poupou*.

Panel C is but a small version of its former self and for some time has
existed as two pieces, the split being nearly through the middle (Fig. 4c).
Before it was painted red in 1981, parts that had cracked and fallen off at
the upper centre of the panel and along the right edge were repaired. A
photograph of this piece taken at Muriwai in the 1930s (or at least before
1941), next to the carver Ratoura Wirihana, shows it before the repairs. The
fracture is plainly evident, although at that time the two parts may still not
have completely separated from each other (see photograph in Hair 1985:
29). In its current condition the width varies from 1’ 9¼" to 1’ 11½" and the
maximum depth is 3½". However, it was originally wider since the edges of
all the *manaia* on both the left and right sides have been shaved off, or have
simply cracked and fallen away. When peripheral damage is considered,
panel C was originally some 25" wide and in all likelihood a *poupou*. It is
not possible to determine if C’s missing vertical extension, which would have
been the larger segment of the entire plank, was employed in Manutuke III,
and thus destroyed by fire, or if C’s entire length was never used, perhaps

---
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because it was greatly deteriorated. In any case, most of it disappeared, leaving the present fragment—the result of someone’s decision to saw off the more fissured portions in order to salvage something for posterity.

The stemmed *manaia* panels, visible in Crawford’s interior photographs of the third church, line the central section of the nave on either side, the eastern flanks of the transept arms and the two straight walls of the sanctuary (Figs 5-7 and 20 with stemmed panels designated “s” and “ss”). Whatever their position, panels like Re10 (Fig. 13) are conspicuous, standing out from the rest by virtue of their generous breadth and the prominence of the stem motif around which the *manaia* are organised. Re10’s straighter (lower) horizontal edge measures 13¾” across, and the more serrated one at the top is 16½” in width. Its maximum height, on the stem side, is 3’ 7¾”, and its maximum depth is 5½”. Comparing the piece as it exists today with its appearance in the 1891 Crawford photograph (Fig. 12), I estimate the plank’s total width at that time to be around 37” (Fig. 14). However, close examination of the panel in Crawford’s photograph reveals that some edges of the *manaia* were already missing in 1891, in which case Re10 could have originally measured around 37½”. These dimensions would be comparable to the base measurements of the central end slabs of Otaki’s Rangiātea Church, whose *poutāhuhu* ‘central upright of the front endwall’ was 39¾” (1.010m) wide and almost 8” (.202m) thick and its *poutuarongo* ‘central upright of the rear endwall’ 37” (.940m) wide and 7¾” (.200m) deep (Cochran and Gumbley 1995: 2, 6; their measures are all metric, which I have converted to feet and inches for consistency in comparison). The extraordinary breadth of Re10 suggests a similar location in one of Manutuke IIB’s terminal walls, and the presence of the stemmed motif further reinforces this placement (as discussed below in my reconstruction of the church’s decorative scheme).

Panels A, C and Re10 are not fixed to walls, which allows inspection of their reverse sides. All three exhibit rough and lengthwise striated surfaces indicating that they were carved from planks formed by splitting tree trunks into lengths, rather than cutting by pitsaws or by milling. Presumably slab B and all the other *poupou* and *epa* were produced in similar fashion.

**THE ARTISTS, COMPOSITIONAL SCHEMES AND STYLE OF THE SIMPLE AND STEMMED MANAIA PANELS**

The anonymous Māori author, writing in Māori about the history of Manutuke’s churches on the occasion of the dedication of the fourth edifice in 1913, stated that “60 slabs and three ridge-pole supports were adzed by Paratene Turangi and others” (*Pipiwharauroa* 1913: 9; see translation in Phillipps 1944: 90). This account is ambiguous on several points, particularly
on Paratene Turangi’s role in fashioning Manutuke’s principal framing elements. It could conceivably be interpreted to mean that he and his companions were primarily involved in shaping the raw timbers into planks and posts, and that most of the carving was then done by a different cohort of individuals, perhaps with Paratene later contributing to the carving (see Neich 1994: 82). This would be a logical way of organising labour for so massive an enterprise. Although no contemporary sources name the artists responsible for carving the manaia-ornamented panels, I assume, as does Neich, that the three mentioned by Williams in connection with the creation of the rejected panels also worked on the new planks, particularly since these were the individuals who had formulated the manaia pattern that had garnered Williams’ approval (see TJ 5 and 6 September 1849: 537, 16 October 1849: 548). The principal masters would have been Raharuhi Rukupo, Te Waaka Perohuka, and Te Waka Kurei. Neich (1994: 56, 82, 86) proposes, based on indirect evidence, that three other names can be placed in the carving workshop: Natanaheira Toromata, one Rukupo’s assistants in Te Hau-ki-Turanga; Paratene Turangi; and with somewhat less certainty Natanaheira Te Keteiwi, a painter of kōwhaiwhai ‘painted designs’, also thought to have been one of the carvers of Te Poho-o-Rawiri, at Kaiti, Gisborne, erected around 1849. These tohunga ‘experts’ are said to have been aided by “about twenty assistants all skilled in the work” (GT 29 January 1910).

Prior to sculpting the panels with the missionary-approved “non-descript” manaia designs, Māori had normally handled this enigmatic creature formally and compositionally in two basic ways. The most interesting and iconographically complex treatment is found in pare ‘lintels’ over the entrances and/or windows of Māori houses. The early 19th-century Rongowhakaata lintel in the British Museum and another belonging to Ngāti Kahungunu in the Auckland Museum (Simmons 1994: 42, figs 33-34) are particularly instructive and appropriate to cite since they are both works from adjoining regions of the North Island’s eastern seaboard. In these and many other lintels, as well as in baseboards of pātaka ‘storehouses’, manaia play a subordinate role within the decorative field. Normally they occupy the edges of the composition, while the centre is taken up by a frontal-facing figure, ostensibly the principal subject. Although relegated to the margins, the manaia retain a strong visual presence by virtue of being nearly as large as the central motif itself, and with their entire body displayed, the image is immediately understandable to the eye. Their peripheral locations notwithstanding, Michael Jackson (1972: 41-47; see also Simmons 1994: 43-47) argues that manaia are iconographically integral to the meaning of the composition’s subject matter, particularly when it concerns themes of creation and dissolution.
Manaia decoration also accompanies major sculptural reliefs inside buildings. At Te Hau-ki-Turanga (Fig. 2), the ancestor figures on the vertical posts are framed by manaia rendered in small scale and in highly abstracted form, in some cases not entire manaia but only parts thereof. In this whare rūnanga ‘meeting house’, manaia are employed in similar fashion in the central panels of the endwalls, where the main figures are stacked one above the other on several levels. On all these posts, manaia probably functioned to enhance the mana, ihi and wehi of the ancestors they framed, and in some cases they might also be regarded as guardian spirits. This is the contemporary Māori understanding of the manaia’s role (see Tūpara 2000: 7). There is no reason to think that this is not the older understanding as well, although it might have been only one among several meanings manaia had for earlier generations of Māori (see Neich 1996: 88). Whatever their meaning and function in the social or religious realms, and regardless of whether manaia were necessary iconographic additions to the ancestor images, from an artistic point of view, these creatures served to fill space between the figures and around the outer edge of the panels. Because of their subordinate role and small scale, manaia in these contexts lack the visual prominence they enjoy on lintel and pātaka boards.

In the lower edge of Te Hau-ki-Turanga’s heketipi ‘angled wall plate resting on āpa’ the manaia figures are small and highly abstracted, not too unlike those framing the ancestor figures on the poupou. But the handling of these beings in the heketipi is distinctly different. Here the manaia are the subject of the decoration, the sole element of the composition, and these are arranged as multiple repeating forms strung along the heketipi’s entire lower length. In Manutuke IIB, Rukupo and his associates treated the manaia in similar fashion, but now dramatically increasing their size. In Panel B (Fig. 4b), which is typical, the manaia are about 37” high and 29” broad. Before the erection of this church, only one work is known to have featured such large manaia, but it is unlikely that Manutuke’s Rongowhakaata carvers would have known this piece since it formed part of a building not in their region and, in any case, this structure had been buried in the early 19th century to hide it from destruction by Ngāpuhi raiders. The building in question is the pātaka from Te Kaha in the Bay of Plenty, which after its unearthing was eventually shipped to and erected in the Auckland Museum (Archey 1977: 54, fig. 103a, b). Its magnificent maihi ‘barge boards’ contain representations of manaia that are some 29” high. Manaia normally were much more modest in scale, those in lintels being fairly typical until Rukupo and his associates changed things. For example, in the aforementioned British Museum lintel fashioned by Rongowhakaata carvers in the early 19th century, each of the two symmetrically disposed manaia are approximately 14¾" tall and 6½" wide.
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(see Simmons 1994: 42, fig. 33). In other pre-Manutuke works, including Te Hau-ki-Turanga, manaia are sometimes wider and longer than in the London lintel, but they never attain the scale of those carved for the IIB church.

The orientation of the manaia in the church was handled in a manner that was vastly different from that at Te Hau-ki-Turanga. The principal or larger manaia were made to stand upright and face alternately right and left as they ascended the panels (Fig. 4 a-c). Somewhat smaller manaia (or parts thereof) were situated between the bigger ones. This scheme contrasts sharply with the heketipi in Rukupo’s meeting house where the figures all face one direction, downward (or inward), i.e., away from the roof and towards the interior space. This arrangement makes sense for angled beams, but would have been tricky to manage satisfactorily for vertical panels disposed along four walls, as in the church. The carvers were wise in creating a decorative scheme for Manutuke IIB that was visually effective and suitable for tall and separate vertical planks, regardless of location.

Manutuke’s panels also exhibit a fresh approach to the presentation of manaia, an approach that capitalised on the ambiguous and complex nature of these amazingly elastic beings. Panels of the type like A, B and C (Fig. 4), which simply feature repeated representations of manaia and constitute the majority of the slabs produced for the church, exerted considerable influence on later Māori art, not only in the greater emphasis given to manaia than before, but also in the adoption of compositional schemes that adhere closely to A, B and C panels.15 In contrast to these, Re10 (Fig. 13), with heraldically placed manaia on each side of the stem, enjoyed only limited application, perhaps because it carried meanings and/or a form that could not easily be transferred to meeting houses. The stemmed manaia panels worked well in Manutuke IIB where, placed at the endwall in combination with non-stemmed manaia slabs and the four-part fenestration system, they served to draw the congregation’s attention to the altar in the building’s eastern end (as I will detail later in my proposed reconstruction). They played a similar role on the opposite side where the focus of interest would have been the baptismal font, assuming that its traditional western location was respected.

As a form, the stemmed manaia panel impresses itself on the viewer in a far more significant way than one would presume from just the mere addition of an ornamented band (Figs 15, 16). Indeed, there is more to the stem than meets the eye, an aphorism that applies particularly well in this case. The stemmed panel can best be conceived as two simple manaia slabs placed in mirror-image fashion on either side of a vertical band running through the panel’s entire height. As a result of these appositions, at certain points the stem becomes enmeshed in the beak-like mouths of two manaia that face one another from each side. The two mouths, which individually are profile forms (if one accepts the argument that Manutuke’s manaia represent
Figure 16. Panel 38Gm (left) with simple *manaia* decoration and Panel 39Gws (right) with single-stemmed *manaia* decoration, east wall of north transept, Manutuke III (see coded plan in Fig. 20). Detail from Crawford photograph (Fig. 6), digitally lightened by Christine L. Sundt.
human figures in profile) link horizontally across the stem to form a whole front-facing eight-figured mouth similar to that of the ancestor images on *poupou*, and with a protruding tongue as well. Directly above the figure-eight mouth, two eyes appear on each side of the stem; these eyes would seem to belong to the slightly smaller *manaia* (partial or whole bodies?), those set sideways between the larger upright *manaia*. The placement of the two eyes in relation to the stem and the eight-figured mouth below is such that these varied elements coalesce in the spectator’s eye to suggest a frontal face with mouth and eyes hovering about the stem (the facial effect is greatly enhanced in cases where the eyes still retain their shell inlays). This arrangement, which has the character of an apparition of sorts, then invites speculation of the stem as a spiritualised human or deity. The spiritualisation is achieved by reducing the body and persona to their essence, not unlike that which the 20th-century Swiss sculptor Alberto Giacometti achieved with his exaggerated reduction and elongation of the human figure. When one considers the composition of the stemmed *manaia* panel, it is evident that the frontal facial imagery is the result of the carvers’ decision to handle the *manaia* forms as a series of large, alternating right- and left-facing figures, each separated by a smaller *manaia* (or parts thereof) set sideways. The question is whether the appearance of a face-like form was actually intended or the fruit of unforeseen consequences arising from the chosen compositional scheme and the peculiar shapes that *manaia* can assume, such as eyes emerging from the forearms in the small, sideways-positioned *manaia*.

In order to appreciate how the *manaia* could imbue the stemmed panels with human-like visages, and as a consequence, perhaps impart to the stem a significance beyond mere decoration, it is necessary to consider what *manaia* represent (Fig. 17). To say that no other Māori motif has elicited as much controversy and debate as this creature is no exaggeration. The origin of the term *manaia* is unclear and as a word it does not appear in the first two editions of the Rev. Williams’ *Dictionary of the New Zealand [i.e., Māori] Language* (1844 and 1852a). Among scholars, opinions have varied regarding the nature and character of this particular being. One camp (e.g., L. Barrow 1998: 346-51, T. Barrow 1965: 19-22, Pitt-Rivers 1924: 63, Skinner 1924: 235-36) has interpreted *manaia* as an avianised form of a humanoid creature, or “birdman” figure, while another camp (e.g., Archey 1933: 171-90, 1936: 49-51, 1977: 40; Buck 1950: 312-13) has argued that it represents a human figure in profile. That *manaia* have claw-like hands is itself not a convincing argument in favour of the “birdman” motif since carved human ancestors in *poupou* are themselves routinely depicted with appendages of this type (with the number of fingers varying from figure to figure), yet these ancestor images are not called *manaia* by even the most ardent proponents...
of the “birdman” theory. Certainly, on the surface at least, the treatment of the mouth would appear to validate the concept of avianised human beings. However, countering this view is the observation that the beak-like mouth is the result of showing in profile the front-facing Māori mouth as it is usually and very distinctly handled, often taking a figure-eight form.

The high degree of abstraction with which manaia in the Manutuke panels are characteristically portrayed makes it difficult, even for a trained eye, to dissect the various body parts regardless of whether the motif was meant to represent a human being or a hybrid creature (Fig. 4). However one chooses to read and interpret manaia, one can appreciate why Williams would have had trouble seeing in the Manutuke carvings anything but innocuous
“patterns” that to him looked like “neither man [,] beast or creeping thing” (TJ 16 October 1849: 548). He certainly would not have cared to spend time deciphering a Māori image that was not even slightly obvious as to what it was intended to represent, if anything all. Frances Porter, who edited Williams’ writings and has a good sense of the man, remarked that “apart from his knowledge of the language he showed little interest in Māori culture and disapproved of most Māori social customs” (Porter 2007: n.p.). In this respect he was very different from his colleague, the Rev. Richard Taylor, who headed the Mission Station in the Wanganui. In his books and journals Taylor demonstrates ample curiosity about all aspects of Māori culture (see especially, Taylor 1870). He not only relished the “gorgeously” ornamented churches that Māori were erecting in various parts of his district in the early 1850s (Taylor 1833-73, VII, 5 September 1851: 228; 1868: 26), but also went as far as to include Māori art in the veranda of his residence at the Putiki Mission Station. An old photo and various drawings show the veranda posts in the form of superimposed figures carved in the indigenous style. One of these survives and is currently displayed in the Wanganui Museum (see Phillipps 1955: 74-78, especially p. 76 and fig. 31).

Considerable light was shed on the form underlying the manaia by J.M. McEwen in his encyclopaedia essay on Māori art (1966: 410-11 and accompanying diagrams). When one first gazes at a manaia, the treatment of the mouth suggests a bird-like creature rather than a human one, or some other mammalian animal. But McEwen’s systematic analysis of manaia through a series of illustrations indicates in a very convincing fashion that the mouth’s beak-like treatment is simply the result of representing the frontal human figure, such as the ancestors on poupo, in profile with the mouth characteristically open and tongue protruding. When two manaia are placed facing and adjoining each other, the result is a single frontal face and head (Fig. 17b, left and right). This reading of the manaia has enjoyed support among major scholars of Māori art, most notably by Hirini Moko Mead (1986: 171, 241). However, Terence Barrow (1969: 20), a strong proponent of the “birdman” interpretation, found McEwen’s conclusions “untenable”. Based on his own chosen set of examples, Barrow persisted in arguing that manaia are essentially avianised humans occasionally admixed with “additional animal features derived from reptiles and sea creatures”.17 Neich’s survey of both older and more recent literature on manaia offers a balanced assessment of the problems surrounding the evolution and meaning of this form. He notes that there is “a high level of ambiguity between animal and human forms” and consequently “it may not be feasible or valid to force an exclusively animal or human evolutionary interpretation on apparently anthropomorphic forms” (Neich 1996: 88). This leads him to conclude that the “interpretation
of the symbolic significance of *manaia* needs to take account of the role of birds as guardian spirits in Māori thought, the significance of the lizard as a sign of *tapu* and the bringer of life and death, and the interaction between spirit beings and the ancestors*. In trying to read and understand the *manaia* at Manutuke, it is important to recognise the manifold ways a *manaia* can change and how this affects or determines how it connects to other *manaia* on a relief plane.

The *manaia* is a most versatile creature [and as such it is] of the greatest use to carvers, as it can be distorted or mutilated, almost at will, to fit any space which needs to be filled. It may simply be any eye and a mouth, with or without a nose, tongue, or teeth; it may be a head and one arm, with or without hand; it may have two arms and no body, one arm, one leg, and a body, or the full complement of body and extremities…. It is common for a part of one *manaia* to form part of another one; for instance, the curved arm of one may also be the mouth of an adjacent *manaia*. (McEwen 1966: 411)

McEwen’s analysis captures very well some of the ways *manaia* operate on the Manutuke panels. That a God-fearing Englishman with little interest in Maori ways could not see the possible imagery of *manaia* is hardly surprising. That the church’s carvings so closely resemble Rukupo’s style is no coincidence. As one of the most renowned carvers in the East Coast, his influence on fellow artists in Manutuke and in the Poverty Bay region was extensive and deep. In addition, as the apparent leader of the carvers working on the church, he was in a position to exercise leadership in determining the general character of the *manaia* designs and developing compositional schemes, in each case drawing inspiration from his previous work at Te Hau-ki-Turanga and on the *waka* ‘canoe’ Te Toki-a-Tapiri (in the Auckland Museum) (Fig. 18), upon which he also worked with Te Waaka Perohuka and others in or about 1850 (Neich 1994: 86, for an earlier dating see Simmons 1994: 27; see also Hall 27 October 1988: 1-2, Oliver 2007). With respect to this vessel, the resemblance of the two “ribs” in its *taurapa* ‘stern’ (a motif that recurs in the stern of other vessels as well, see Duff and Biltcliffe 1950: 368-75) is remarkably similar to the ornamented band in Manutuke’s stemmed *manaia* panels (Fig. 16). As relief work, the church carvings exhibit much of the same vigour and plasticity of form that characterise Te Hau-ki-Turanga’s wall panels. In like manner, most if not all the surface patterns favoured by Rukupo and his assistants in the meeting house, as well as in the canoe, appear in the church panels, but are adapted there to the shapes of the *manaia*. The density of the carved surface, the deep undercutting and the three dimensionality of the *manaia*’s body parts are all hallmarks of Rukupo’s style and those working alongside him.
Figure 18. Detail showing the “ribs” dominating the sternpost of Te Toki-a-Tapiri canoe, built in the second quarter of the 19th century and currently displayed in the Auckland Museum.
Source: Photograph by the author.
RETRIEVING LOST PANELS: GROUNDWORK FOR RECONSTRUCTING THE CARVED DECORATIVE SCHEME

APPROACHES TO RECONSTRUCTING MANUTUKE IIB

As a first step towards reconstituting Manutuke IIB’s appearance, the analysis of panels in the previous section dealt primarily with the surviving carvings. In this section and the one following analysis will focus almost exclusively on the lost panels. The first order of business requires establishing the groundwork for determining the total number of slabs from Manutuke IIB that were employed in Manutuke III, their types, and their dimensions. This is a challenging and complex agenda requiring several lines of inquiry.

At the outset, one of the difficulties in attempting to draw an accurate picture of Manutuke IIB is that primary sources give two sets of dimensions for this monument. Those listed by William Leonard Williams (1932: 20), who was 20-years-old when the church was begun and knew it well, are the ones always cited in the modern literature. The set reported by his father, William Williams (1852b: 48), the person who arranged for its construction and oversaw its completion, differs considerably on the matter of breadth. Historians apparently have not been aware of these discrepancies. The most immediate task then is determining which set of dimensions is correct, or at the very least the most reliable. The next stage involves verifying the 1913 Pipiwharauroa account (p. 9) claiming that 60 panels were carved for the church. Both steps in the investigative process necessitate a careful and detailed examination of the lost panels, i.e., those known through Crawford’s photographs of Manutuke III (in addition to the few extant ones). Needless to say, the dimensional data on the wall posts that can be extracted from photographic sources is bound to be imperfect since the camera lens introduces a certain amount of distortion, not only in straight shots but also, and more so, when a photograph is taken at an angle. Inevitably too, in some panels it is difficult to discern details not only in deeply shadowed areas but also when they are positioned too obliquely relative to the picture’s frontal plane. Despite these impediments, it is possible to obtain approximate dimensions for most panels, particularly those at ground level where dimensions can be more directly calculated.

For reasons of logistics and organisational strategy, and as a way of streamlining the narrative and facilitating argumentation, a certain amount of data and figures needed to begin the reconstruction process will be presented to the reader as facts. The evidence proving their accuracy and reliability as sources for reconstruction will emerge gradually as all the pieces of the puzzle are introduced, analysed and connected. (For the sake of simplicity and ease of comparison, dimensions in this study are generally listed in feet (’)) and

Richard A. Sundt
VERIFICATION OF CONFLICTING PRIMARY SOURCES

William Leonard Williams (1829-1916) provides the most detailed information regarding the church’s dimensions and decoration. In his *East Coast Historical Records* (completed c.1900 and published in 1932), he writes (p. 20) that the church (IIB) measured 45' in width and 90' in length. The *poupou* stood over 15' tall and had an average width of 2'. Their inner-facing surfaces were elaborately carved. Two carved posts rose to a height of 28' to support each end of the *tāhuhu* ‘ridgepole’. Here Leonard is referring to the *poutāhuwhu*, the central upright at the entrance end, and its companion, the *poutuarongo*, at the opposite terminus where the sanctuary was located. William Williams, who observed the Ngātīmaru drag one of these pieces from the river to the church site, states that it measured 40' in length and was over 3' in width (*TJ* 20 Dec 1849: 551). This would mean that some 12' of this upright would have been planted into the ground if its height above-ground was 28' as Leonard reported.

While father and son agree on the church’s length, the father places its width at 36' (Williams 1852b: 48). Perhaps the elder Williams was simply quoting the dimensions as originally planned for the church, unaware that the building’s breadth might have been increased as work progressed. In the course of sorting out the conflicting dimensional data, I will introduce evidence that supports Leonard’s larger width. In addition, comparison of Manutuke IIB with Rangiātea Church at Otaki (Fig. 3) suggests that in a 36' span, like Rangiātea’s (with seven endwall panels), it would have been difficult to accommodate comfortably Manutuke’s endwall system of nine carved panels and four windows, as shown in the *CMI* illustration (Fig. 1).19

Verifying Leonard’s dimensions and the Māori claim of 60 carved uprights for the walls go to some extent hand-in-hand. The claim is made in the *Pipihwariaua* article, “*Nga hanganga whare karakia ki Manutuke*”. Unfortunately, the English translation (in Phillipps 1944: 90-91) omits a few words and passages, and ignores Māori architectural terminology. Consequently, it is unclear in the English version whether the number of wall slabs was 60 or 62, the confusion arising in part because the word “slab” is used indiscriminately to refer to all vertical uprights regardless of function and location. This ambiguity in the slab population—made all the more acute by using “about” in reference to the number of panels—is clarified by turning to the Māori text itself. In the original version, the ridgepole supports are

inches (") since 19th-century sources give all measurements for Mantuke IIB according to the Imperial system. More significantly, IIB's panels were resized for installation in III using feet and inches.)
termed *poutokomanawa* ‘free-standing uprights placed along a *whare*’s central longitudinal axis’, leaving no doubt that the reference in this instance is to independently standing posts, which are not to be counted among the wall slabs. The original Māori also removes the ambiguity of “about” with respect to the number of wall posts. “Te nga 60 pou” can be read with the definite article to say “the 60 slabs”. Still, what—other than the author’s own words—provides evidence of a church with this number of wall posts? There is no direct evidence to answer this question, but when Leonard’s measurements are considered in conjunction with those provided by the surviving panels, there can be little doubt of the Māori account’s accuracy. If the average *poupou* had a width of around 2’, as Leonard states, the long sidewalls, at 90’ length (all sources agree on this measurement), could have been easily supplied with 21 *poupou*, leaving around 2' 4” between them for the intervening *tukutuku* ‘latticework panels’, or perhaps the simpler *kakaho*. The ratio between *poupou* and fibrework (or spaces in between, which could be windows) would fall at Manutuke to around 1:1.14. This would have been similar to Otaki’s 1:1.18, based on the average width of its *poupou*, around .815m according to Cochran (1995: 5) (Fig. 3). Similar proportional relationships occur in many other *whare*-style buildings, which strongly supports assigning 42 slabs to Manutuke’s long walls, that is, 21 *poupou* for each flank. But this remains pure speculation without data to confirm Leonard’s average two-foot width for the *poupou*. Fortunately, there is evidence, although it is based, admittedly, on a very small sample and just chance. The three extant *manaia* panels A, B and C (Fig. 4), which are probably the remains of *poupou*, average (based on restored widths, see above) 25”, just one inch off Leonard’s estimate. The lack of breadth uniformity among the slabs (A = 21”, B = 29”, C = 25”) is absolutely typical, no different from other *whare* structures, such as Otaki, where similar variation occurs, or later meeting houses, like Hotunui (in the Auckland Museum) where the differences are particularly conspicuous. Based on the widths that can be obtained for the simple *manaia* panels in the Crawford photographs, using methods still to be described and which can only provide approximate results, these also come to around the two-foot average. This provides further confirmation of the reliability of Leonard’s measurements.

If 42 of the 60 panels were used for the flanking walls, this leaves 18 uprights that must be accounted for. This corresponds to the total number of panels forming Manutuke IIB’s two endwalls, each with nine, as shown in the *CMI* illustration (Fig. 1). Although this image is not correct on many points, there is no reason to question the nine-part configuration; there are precedents for this many members. While Otaki, which was begun a little earlier than Manutuke IIB, possessed only seven slabs at each end, the nine-
part arrangement was employed at Te Hau-ki-Turanga (Fig. 2), erected at Manutuke around 1842, and was used frequently in later meeting houses, such as Te Mana-o-Turanga, also in Manutuke (Fowler 1974: Pl. 4), and Mātaatua near Whakatane (Phillipps and Wadmore 1956: 19, fig. 14).

Unfortunately, when it comes to verifying the height of the *poupou*, which Leonard put at “over 15 ft”, the surviving *manaia* panels are of little help. It has already been noted that Panels A and C are but small fragments of larger carved timbers and that only B is of substantial size. When its broken and now lost sections are factored in, B’s length is around 12' 7½" (see Figs 4b and 8). This is remarkably close to the height of the *manaia* panels in Crawford’s photographs of Manutuke III’s nave and transept (below it will be argued that the panels in these areas rose c.12½’ above their bases, see Plan 3). These lengths suggest that Panel B was probably intended for installation in the third church, but was eventually rejected as too damaged for reuse, or because it cracked while handling and was discarded.

In order to prepare the original *poupou* for display in their new, Europeanised setting where they were totally detached both from floor and ceiling (see especially Fig. 5 right side), it was necessary to trim their roughly adzed footing, the part that had been planted in the ground. The Hamilton photo which includes Panel B shows this slab before its basal flange was eliminated (Fig. 8). This procedure was not only meant to remove the uncarved foot for aesthetic reasons, but was also part of the re-sizing the bottom of each slab to fit Manutuke III’s decorative scheme. The trimming of the crown was also required to remove the notched and sloped edge that served to attach the panel to its corresponding *heke* ‘rafter’. Given the operations required to transform an architectural member of a wall (a *poupou* in *whare* construction) into a purely decorative relief encased within a frame in the Western manner, as in Manutuke III (Figs 16), all *poupou* had to be sheared off at each end and in some instances along the sides as well. It is difficult to be precise about how much, but sawing off all of the flanged base, some 1½’ of carved work above the flange mark and another 1½’ from the top would be within the realm of possibility. These observations, drawn primarily from Panel B, provide considerable support for Leonard’s estimated length of the original *poupou* at over 15’. For purposes of reconstruction this dimension will be assumed to be 15½’.

There is one last measurement requiring verification. According to Leonard Williams (1932: 20) each of the central end posts (*poutuarongo* and *poutāhuhu*) used to support the ridge pole rose to a height of 28’ and were “elaborately carved from top to bottom” (Figs 1, 15). Since endwall panels (except for corner ones) were of necessity much taller than the posts of the long sidewalls (see Figs 1 and 19), the terminal slabs, particularly the central one, endwall upright 5 (*poutuarongo, poutāhuhu*), and the two
adjoining *epa* (4 and 6), had to be cut down much more than the *poupou* in order to fit Manutuke III’s decorative scheme (see Figs 5-7, 22, 23) where all the ground floor slabs were of nearly uniform height (for slight variations in the church’s floor level from west to east, to be discussed later, see Plan 3). Consequently, it is impossible to confirm the 28’ height of IIB’s *poutuarongo* and *poutāhuhu* by estimating the length of the panels visible in the Crawford photographs. However, since all the other measurements given by Leonard appear to be accurate when placed under scrutiny, there is every reason to believe that at its apex, under the ridgepole, Manutuke IIB’s central endwall uprights were as tall as he indicated. Again, while the *CMI* image of Manutuke IIB (Fig. 1) is not trustworthy in certain respects and cannot be assumed to be an exact rendering of what was to be built, it should not be dismissed. In this illustration, the angle of the roof measures about 30-31 degrees, and this corresponds very closely to the slope of Manutuke IIB's roof when the summit is figured at a height of 28’, the eaves or sides at 15½’ above ground and the distance across at 45’ (see Fig. 19). This correspondence, which can be easily worked out on paper with rule and protractor, clearly supports Leonard’s dimensions; they also provide the best evidence against the 36’ width that his father had given for Manutuke IIB. Therefore, there is every reason to believe that this edifice was as wide and long as Leonard indicated, that its side walls rose to a height of about 15½’ and central endwall posts to 28’ and that its *poupou* averaged 2’ in width (although my estimates point to something closer to a 25” average).²³ The breadth dimension of over 3’ given for one of the central endwall panels (position 5) by William Williams (*TJ* 20 Dec 1849:551), but not by Leonard, is confirmed by Auckland panel Re10 (37½”, reconstructed dimension, see Fig. 14), which was in all likelihood part of a *poutuarongo* or *poutāhuhu*.

**INVENTORYING LOST PANELS FROM PHOTOGRAPHIC DOCUMENTATION:**
**Methodology and Organisation**

Because Crawford took photographs of Manutuke III from a variety of angles, it is possible to see mounted on its walls nearly all the carved panels from the second church that were selected for installation in its successor (about 56 percent of the total *œuvre*). Within this later edifice, only a handful of panels are not at all visible and a like number difficult to discern for reasons noted previously. Fortunately, in certain instances, details can be drawn out and made visually comprehensible by enlisting the technology of digital photography (see, for example, a digitally enlarged and lightened detail of Figure 5, left side, and a detail in Figure 21), and even by simply photocopying a print using a very light setting.
Figure 19. Manutuke IIB schematic end-wall cross-section, marked with the upper and lower heights of its nine carved panels and their respective position number. Based on large-scale drawing (1 to 12) re-drawn by Frederick Leff.
To facilitate reference to and discussion of the decorative ensemble I have inventoried and coded the various carved pieces within the third church as photographed by Crawford in 1889, when the building was nearing completion (Fig. 5), and then in 1891, in its completed state and with all the furnishings in place (Figs 6, 7). The key to the coding system used in identifying all the wall pieces on the basis of their ground and aerial positions, and the rationale underlying certain aspects of the coding protocol, are given below. Inventory numbers are inscribed next to the panels displayed on a schematic and unscaled plan of the third church (Fig. 20) that was about the size of the present building, around 2300 sq. ft and with the apse also facing east. This third edifice was some 43 percent smaller in area than Manutuke IIB (4050 sq. ft); naturally, the original complement of panels could not be accommodated.

**INVENTORY KEY**

*Location and Position Codes.* The location of the panels are signalled by numbers, beginning with one (on the north side of the sanctuary’s chancel) and running clockwise around the building. The panels occupy two distinct positions on the walls: those placed on bases set directly on the floor are assigned the letter G (for ground); those placed higher up, over doorways and windows, are marked with the letter H (for high). Panels on levels G and H have their own numbering sequence, each starting with number one.

*Size Code.* It is evident from casual inspection that panels G and H differ in length. Not immediately obvious, however, is that G slabs vary in length among themselves. Those of the nave and transept are of uniform height, but because the chancel is one step higher (visible in Fig. 5), and the sanctuary a further step, chancel panels are around 6" shorter than those in the nave and transept, and the apsidal ones are shorter by around another 6" in relation to their preceding ones in the chancel. Fortunately, it is possible to estimate the lengths of all the G-series planks with considerable accuracy through a method of architectural analysis explained below. Because of their location and low visibility, length dimensions can only be roughly estimated for most of the H-series panels.

It is likewise evident from direct observation that panels vary in breadth. This is not unusual in whare construction, even within a category such as poupou where uniformity might be expected. Epa tend to vary as well, normally becoming wider, always taller, as they march towards the axial centre of the endwall (see Fig. 19). Estimating widths of the panels in Manutuke III is somewhat trickier than lengths, but it is possible to do the former within certain limits and in circumstances where the slabs in the photographs appear nearly straight on, thereby exhibiting a minimum of oblique foreshortening (see especially Fig. 5, east wall of the south transept, and Fig. 7, western end). In
Figure 20. Manutuke III, unscaled plan showing approximate locations of the panels sourced from Manutuke IIB, each identified by inventory code number. Drawn by Frederick Leff.
such cases, approximate breadth measurements are obtainable by determining height-to-width ratios. Each panel is assigned a width designation corresponding to whether it is wide (w), medium (m) or narrow (n) (Fig. 20).

That substantial differences in breadth existed among manaia-decorated panels (i.e., those without the stem motif—stemmed ones to be discussed below) is proven by the extant panels A, B and C, as noted earlier in this article. The above categorisation of panel breadth is admittedly imprecise, but it is the only way of conveying basic width differences for inventory purposes when better measuring methods are unavailable. Inevitably, situations arise when it is hard to decide between two adjoining width categories. Since most breadth measurements are estimates to begin with, I have refrained from adding compound categories, such as “mw” medium-wide, or “mn” medium-narrow. The reader will appreciate in due course why an effort to capture nuances in width, however roughly, has a place in the process of determining the relationship and position of panels in the original church.

**Type Code.** Like the handful of surviving panels, the lost ones also fall into types. In the vast majority of cases, the carving consists of manaia figures only (referred to as “manaia” or “simple manaia” panels (as in Fig. 16, left side). In a select few, as previously noted, the manaia designs are accompanied by a stem motif running up the slab’s entire height (referred to as “stemmed manaia” or “stemmed panels”) (as in Fig. 16, right side). These more complex carvings carry an additional code: a minuscule single “s” if they have one stem, “ss” if two stems (Fig. 21, left).

Most of the simple manaia panels were poupou, and a handful probably epa. It is not possible to determine which was which, except to say that the wider ones probably corresponded to epa, despite cases in whare architecture where corner endwall members are narrower than poupou.

Most of the stemmed manaia panels, all of which were very wide, were in all likelihood endwall panels (inner epa, poutāhu and poutuarongo). Among the endwall panels, regardless of whether of the stemmed or simple type, all but the corner ones would have been taller than the poupou along the flanks (see Figs 1 and 19). The endwall posts closest to the centre position would have been far taller than the corner and outer epa. Whatever their height in Manutuke IIb, all uprights (those belonging to the sides and the ends) had to be reduced in length in order to fit the decorative scheme of Manutuke III, with panels serving as poupou less so than panels on the endwalls. The amount of trimming involved with respect to the endwall panels differed since they were of different heights in order to conform to the slope of the heketipi they supported. This complexity of the endwall system and its implications have to be taken into consideration when attempting a reconstruction of Manutuke IIb’s two terminal walls.
Reconstruction of a Carved Māori Church

Orientation. Manutuke III, like IV, was oriented so the sanctuary faced east. Orientation does not figure in the panel coding, but awareness of the church’s layout is useful when certain panels are discussed.

Visibility factor. Some sections of the north and south transepts were not captured in the photographs owing to the camera angle, or are filled with such deep shadows that nothing within them can be discerned. The presence and

Figure 21. The lower portions of Panel 27Gwss double-stemmed manaia (left) and Panel 28Gws single-stemmed manaia (right) (see coded plan, Fig. 20). Detail from Crawford photograph (Fig. 5 left side). Digitally lightened by Christine L. Sundt.
number of panels in these areas are presumed to be the same as those found on the corresponding (opposite) side of the building. Panels whose existence is conjectural are 7Gn-12Gm, 35Gm, 36Gn, 2Hn-5Hn, 13Hm and 14Hn.

Crucial to reconstructing Manutuke IIB’s decorative scheme is obtaining at least approximate heights (and to a lesser extent, the widths) of the various panels as they appear in the Crawford photographs. This data will provide guidance in deciding when there is a one-to-one correspondence between the panels in Manutuke IIB and Manutuke III (i.e., one full-length IIB panel = one shorter III panel + discarded excess) and when there is no such correspondence, thus avoiding “double counting” (i.e., one full-length IIB panel = one short III panel + another short III panel + in some cases a small discarded excess, and in some cases no excess). The lack of one-to-one correspondence is obvious with respect to the shorter manaia panels (Fig. 4a, c), but not necessarily with some of the longer ones, particularly the stemmed manaia panels whose particularities of form and width, and their original locations in Manutuke IIB, will require separate consideration in order to determine how they were radically refashioned for incorporation into Manutuke III’s decorative scheme.

Reasonably approximate height dimensions can be obtained for all G-series panels and, depending on their location and visibility, their widths as well, although with less accuracy. As noted above, their height is determined by the different levels on which their bases stand. For most of the vertical members of the H-series, it is also possible to estimate their heights and widths, but the angled posture of the slabs in the gabled portions of the west front and transepts are tricky to measure (Fig. 7); their dimensions should be regarded as very approximate, but still useful towards reconstruction.

Key to establishing panel heights are the weatherboards on the church’s exterior (Fig. 12), each one plainly visible in Crawford’s exterior photograph. By counting the height of the nave windows (Fig. 5, see especially the right half) in weatherboard widths and then comparing the fenestration to roof and base lines outside and to panel bases and string courses inside, it is possible to calculate the height of the panels themselves using the weatherboard widths as a unit of measure. By this method, the panels in the nave and transept are 20 weatherboards high. Since the width of these boards for the late 19th century was .20cm (approximately 77/8"), this gives for the nave and transept panels a height of about 4m, or c.13' 1½". This reading has to be adjusted to account for the overlapping of weatherboards when installed, a procedure that reduces the visible width of each board. Based on direct measurement of the weatherboards in Leonard Williams’ house at Gisborne built in 1876, the width of each member is .19m or 7½" (measurement taken in situ by me on 28 August 2003). This brings the panel height in the nave and transept down
slightly (about 8"), to c.12' 55/8" (3.80m). For purposes of convenience, I am rounding this dimension to 12' 6" or 12½' I must note that using the longer dimension (13' 1½") instead would not greatly alter my reconstruction.

INVENTORYING THE CARVED LOST AND EXTANT PANELS

TYPOLOGY, DIMENSIONS, LOCATION AND METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS

The methodology and nomenclature set forth in the previous section for classifying and analysing the carvings in the Crawford photographs can now be employed to inventory the panels, the principal aim being to ascertain where these might have been situated in their original home, Manutuke IIB. This inventory of works also serves to give an account of the approximate number of panels from the second church that were re-employed in the third one, and how much carved work was lost in the process. Before proceeding further, it is neccessary to establish the approximate length and width dimensions of the various types of slabs in Manutuke III, the nature of their manaia ornamentation (with or without the stem motif), and their location within the edifice (see plan with classification codes, Fig. 20).

G-Series Panels: Types and Dimensions.

The G-series panels in Manutuke III are of two types: 28 are decorated with simple manaia, and in 11 the manaia are accompanied by the addition of one or two stem motifs. In all but one of this latter panel type, a single stem runs up the middle (Fig. 16, right), with manaia relegated to either side of this vertical band. The one other panel, 27Gwss (Fig. 21, left), has each of the long edges lined by a stem, with the manaia set in between.

In a previous section I showed that the G panels in the nave stood around 12' 6" tall. With this data in hand, it is possible to determine the approximate breadth of these slabs by invoking width-to-length ratios. This works reasonably well in the case of those panels with and without stems that appear straight on, or nearly so, in the photographs (e.g., Figs 5, 7). The single-stemmed manaia panels on the eastern walls of the north and south transepts, 39Gws (Fig. 16, right) and 5Gws (Fig. 5, right) measure c.37½" in width. That this breadth, determined by ratios is correct, is confirmed by the lone surviving single-stemmed manaia panel, Re10 in Auckland, which can be reconstructed to the same width as above. In the north transept, west wall, the simple manaia slabs 30Gm and 31Gm are approximately 29½" wide (Fig. 7, right of nave) and those on the west front, on either side of the door, 21Gm and 22Gm, are probably about 28½" in breadth. It is important to stress the approximate nature of these measurements (even when given to the half inch). Obviously such dimensional subtleties between panels,
particularly when distant from each other, cannot be easily extracted from photographic images. Despite the difficulties inherent in this methodology, the exercise does reinforce what the eye discerns in the photographs, namely that each of the easily visible simple manaia panels share the same general width measurement (taking distances between them into consideration) and basically fall in the medium (m) width category. The case is the same with the two aforementioned single-stemmed manaia panels; here the eye clearly recognises that they belong to the wide (w) category. At 29½”, the simple manaia panels cited above are substantial enough so as to begin approaching the wide category. It is therefore conceivable that these and some other wider “m” panels of the simple manaia type could have been epa in positions 2, 3, 7 and/or 8 (Plan 1, Fig. 22), rather than poupou or side posts, which was the function of most simple manaia panels. This is of course supported by the CMI illustration. By virtue not only of their great breadth (35-38”), but also by the addition of the stem motif, the two wide single-stemmed manaia panels in the transepts (5Gws, 39Gws) and the other eight like them elsewhere in the building were all probably endwall panels in Manutuke IIB (1Gws-4Gws, 15Gws, 16Gws, 26Gws, 28Gws). The unpaired double-stemmed manaia slab (27Gwss) probably served as a specialised poupou in the second church and will, therefore, require separate consideration below.

Sidewall and Endwall Organisation.

When faced with the task of reconstructing Manutuke IIB’s decorative system, reconstituting the appearance of the two endwalls presents the greatest challenge. Unlike poupou, which were of uniform length (15½’) and were primarily of medium breadth, terminal wall panels (epa, pouuurongo and pouuahuhu) varied considerably in both height and width (see Fig. 19). This particularity determined how much they had to be shortened in order to render them into usable lengths for installation in Manutuke III.

Because in a whare structure the central endwall panels (pouuurongo and pouuahuhu, position 5) are the highest uprights of each end and are therefore charged with providing principal support for the ridgepole, they are also the widest (see Fig. 2). As the cross section in Fig. 19 shows, in a nine-endwall system like Manutuke IIB’s, the epa (positions 1-4 and 6-9) on either side of the central panel descend progressively in height as they move toward the flanks. In some whare, the epa also tend to become narrower as they proceed away from the centre, with those at the ends sometimes narrower than one would expect in such a position. Owing to their variation in height, the available lengths of endwall panelling for reuse in Manutuke III differed among the epa, a situation that complicates attempts to reconstruct the second church, especially its two ends.
Simple Manaia Panels and the One-to-One Relationships between Manutuke IIB and III.

There can be little doubt that most of the simple manaia panels in the G series were originally poupou and stood in a one-to-one relationship with Manutuke IIB (as explained above). By this I simply mean that the full length of a given panel in the third church, particularly those of medium and narrow width, corresponded to just one poupou or side panel in the earlier church, the only difference being that in order to bring the IIB poupou, with a height of 15½', to the uniform 12½' height required for installation in Manutuke III’s nave or transept, the original piece would need about 3' trimmed off, roughly 1½' from each end. If this supposition is correct, it would represent a highly economical reuse of materials with respect to IIB’s poupou since it produced relatively short leftovers.

It is conceivable, as noted above, that a few of the wider, simple manaia panels in the G series were originally epa, and if so, they most likely belonged to the three outer left and right uprights of Manutuke IIB’s endwalls (epa in positions 1, 2, 3 and 7, 8, 9) (Fig. 22). It is conceivable as well that these particular G planks related to those of Manutuke IIB on a one-to-one basis, a situation which in total resulted in a modest to fair amount of lost carved work, as the following discussion will demonstrate, and as Plan 1 (below) and Fig. 22 also illustrate.

By virtue of their corner locations, epa in positions 1 and 9 were almost, but not quite as tall on their outward sides as their adjoining poupou (see Figs 1, 3, 19). This seems counter intuitive, but it is owing to the peculiarities of whare construction whereby epa, unlike poupou, carry an intervening member, the heketipi, between themselves and the rest of the ceiling. Because their crowns are cut obliquely in order to conform to the gabled roof line, the critical measurement of all epa relative to their redeployment as squared slabs is the lower edge of the slant, not the upper one (see Fig. 19). Since epa 1 and epa 9 in Manutuke IIB rose along their inner (higher) edges to around 15' 6¾" (186¾") (cf. Figs 19 and 22), they required a trim of around 3' (36¾") (measured from the upper height, as noted in the plan) in order to fit into the new décor (where nave and transept panels were 12½' high). Considerably more discarding of carved work was required of the inner-lying uprights since they gained progressively in altitude (and occasionally in width as well) in their procession towards the centre. Epa in positions 2 and 8 would necessitate shearing off some 6' 3" (75"), and epa 3 and 7 almost an additional 3', for a total of about 9' 5½" (113½"). This latter case represents a considerable loss of relief work, unless, of course, the 9-foot plus segments removed from these end posts were saved and used elsewhere in Manutuke III, but there is no evidence for this. The loss of a goodly amount of sculpted decoration had
Plan 1: Configuration of the simple *manaia* panels in Manutuke IIB, with amounts used in Manutuke III and amounts discarded based on a one-to-one relationship between IIB and III (amounts measured from upper heights). Plan corresponds to both sanctuary and entrance ends, and is illustrated visually in Figure 22.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Epa 1</th>
<th>Epa 2</th>
<th>Epa 3</th>
<th>Epa 4</th>
<th>Poutuarongo Poutahulu 5</th>
<th>Epa 6</th>
<th>Epa 7</th>
<th>Epa 8</th>
<th>Epa 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>upp. ht 15' 6¼&quot; (186¾&quot;)</td>
<td>upp. ht 18' 9&quot; (225&quot;)</td>
<td>upp. ht 21'11¼&quot; (263¾&quot;)</td>
<td>upp. ht 25' 7&quot; (307&quot;)</td>
<td>straight ht 28' (336&quot;)</td>
<td>upp. ht 25' 7&quot; (307&quot;)</td>
<td>upp. ht 21'11¼&quot; (263¾&quot;)</td>
<td>upp. ht 18' 9&quot; (225&quot;)</td>
<td>upp. ht 15' 6¼&quot; (186¾&quot;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>used in III 12' 6&quot; (150&quot;)</td>
<td>used in III 12' 6&quot; (150&quot;)</td>
<td>used in III 12' 6&quot; (150&quot;)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>used in III 12' 6&quot; (150&quot;)</td>
<td>used in III 12' 6&quot; (150&quot;)</td>
<td>used in III 12' 6&quot; (150&quot;)</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>discard 3' ¾&quot; (36¾&quot;)</td>
<td>discard 6' 3&quot; (75&quot;)</td>
<td>discard 9' 5¼&quot; (150&quot;)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>discard 9' 5¼&quot; (150&quot;)</td>
<td>discard 6' 3&quot; (75&quot;)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>discard 3' ¾&quot; (36¾&quot;)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

to be tolerated as the inevitable result of downsizing the original décor to fit a smaller venue. On these grounds, one simple *manaia* panel in Manutuke III, and its discarded portion (ranging from a little over 3' to nearly 10'), corresponded to the full length of one simple *manaia* *epa* in Manutuke IIB (at least in positions 1-3 and 7-9, as shown above in Plan 1, and in Fig. 22).

*Series-H Panels and Limited One-to-One Relationship with Manutuke IIB.*

The relationship between the Series-H panels in Manutuke III and the original simple *manaia* slabs in IIB is more complex than that described for the G series. Two H-series panels are of sufficient length to allow reading these on a one-to-one basis relative to their IIB source, but such is not the case for the rest owing to their short lengths. All of this upper group of simple *manaia* slabs range in width from narrow to the lower range of medium, which indicates they were originally *poupou* and/or corner *epa*, which were narrow and close to *poupou* in height. A casual glance of the Crawford photographs quickly reveals that all the H panels (even the two longer of these) are obviously much shorter than any of the G-series planks (see esp. Fig. 7, gabled wall, and Fig. 20). To assume that every H slab from the third church corresponded to a single full *poupou* in Manutuke IIB would be double counting, unless one were willing to assume that in re-sizing the original panels for installation in Manutuke III substantial segments were discarded and not used for yet another area in this third church.
Figure 22. Manutuke IIB endwall cross-section showing *epa* (with simple *manaia*) in positions 1-3 and 7-9 as possible sources for shorter panels employed in Manutuke III, and the amount of discarded work. Corresponds to Plan 1 in text. Drawn by Frederick Leff.
If the measurements obtained for the H-series panels are essentially correct, they argue for a concerted attempt by Manutuke III’s designer to make, whenever possible, efficient use of the original decorated planks. Fortunately, one of Crawford’s interior photographs of the west end was taken straight on, thus minimising the distortion of the sloping panels framing the edges of the façade’s triangular portion (Fig. 7). Since the other panels are vertical, they can be measured directly, as explained earlier, by counting their height in weatherboards, the number of which can be determined by reference to Crawford’s photograph of the building’s exterior (Fig. 12). For the angled panels (7Hn and 10Hn), it is not possible to count the number of weatherboards through which they cross diagonally to obtain a credible measurement. This difficulty can be circumvented to some extent by using the height of the rose window’s glazed portion, which consists of nine weatherboards, as a measuring rod. When this method is applied to these clearly narrow panels 7Hn and 10Hn, they turn out to be roughly 10’ 4” long and 19” wide. These pieces were sufficiently long that they cannot be regarded as being half of an original poupou (which rose to 15½’ in height). This provides grounds for positing for each a one-to-one relationship with Manutuke II poupou, a situation that would result in cutting off from the original panels a moderately large discard of just over 5’ 2” (62”).25 However, with some real confidence, in part because waste is negligible, a direct connection can be conceded for the two vertical panels in the western façade that support the upper ends of the angled slabs 8Hm and 9Hm. Measured to their fullest extent they were about 7’ 7” high and 26-27” wide. Since the two segments’ total linear dimension is around 15’ 2”, there is good reason to believe that these two panels represent one poupou (the same one cut in two, or each half from a corresponding poupou), so the two should simply be counted as one. To assume otherwise would run the danger of over counting. Therefore, in this case the relationship was not one-to-one, but two-to-one, or two Manutuke III panels sourced from a single IIB poupou. The west façade situation, but with small variations, also obtains for all the framing members of the upper transeptal façades26 (Fig. 7, far right) and above the sacristy and entrance doorways (Figs 5, 7) (see below Chart I: Inventory I). The estimated measurements for the transepts are less reliable because the only photograph that includes the interior of a transverse arm (Fig. 7) shows it heavily shadowed in a very oblique angle. Nonetheless, it can be lightened sufficiently by digital means to see details and roughly estimate dimensions.
The inventory of simple *manaia* panels, both the few that survive and the ones known only through photographic documentation, involves not only counting but also measuring extant panels and estimating the dimensions of lost ones. This inventory and account of sculpted work, when combined with the results of the second inventory, permits a reconstruction of the church’s overall appearance, and more particularly the decorative scheme of its endwalls. The evidence demonstrates that stemmed *manaia* panels were arranged to create a visual display of Māori carving that was far more complex and richer than is portrayed in the 19th-century depictions of this monument.

The dimensions given above for the extant panels were taken directly from the works themselves and are therefore exact. In some cases their length and width are “restored” and consequently are estimates. This restoration seeks to provide the dimensions of the panels as they appeared in the first known photographs, before their deterioration, and, in the case of some of these slabs, to calculate what was lost before they were photographed. For all the panels identified from photographic sources the measurements are naturally approximate (the inclusion of fractions should not be taken as exact, but as reflecting my preference for giving precise dimensions as they result from taking averages or measuring by indirect means, and my general tendency not to round off numbers).

The *simple manaia* panels are inventoried below. The stemmed *manaia* panels are tabulated in the following section. The results of the two are then combined and briefly analysed regarding the information they yield for the reconstruction project. In Inventory I (Chart 1, below, and likewise with Inventory II, Chart 2), all the known pieces (surviving or known through photographs) are identified and listed. The intention is to establish the number of *whole* panels from Manutuke IIB that went into creating the carved décor of the third church, a scheme that quite obviously required sawing every original slab selected for reuse in the new church into a shorter length.

Chart 1. (Key below and chart opposite)
Inventory I: Simple *Manaia* Panels, Lost and Extant Works

---

**Key to locations:**
- G = ground level
- H = high, above doors and gabled areas

**Key to widths:**
- n (narrow) = 20-25”
- m (medium) = 26-30”
- w (wide) = 35-38”
A. LOST WORKS KNOWN FROM PHOTOGRAPHIC SOURCES

Total pieces in Manuteke III (various heights and widths), unadjusted: 42
Below are charts adjusting the shorter Manuteke III panels to correspond to the longer ones in IIB (prior to sawing off sections for installation in the third church). Dimensions of panels are only approximate.

Panels, G series in Manuteke III: total of 28 panels equal 28 Full-Length panels (15½") in Manuteke IIB (no adjustment necessary due to 1:1 relationship):
6Gm, 7Gm, 8Gm, 9Gm, 10Gn, 11Gn, 12Gm, 13Gm, 14Gm, 17Gm, 18Gm, 19Gn, 20Gn, 21Gm, 22Gm, 23Gn, 24Gn, 25Gm, 29Gm, 30Gm, 31Gm, 32Gn, 33Gn, 34Gm, 35Gm, 36Gn, 37Gm, 38Gm: discarded for each 3'

Panels, H series in Manuteke III: 14 panels adjusted to 7 Near Full-Length* and/or Full-Length** panels (poupou) in Manuteke IIB, as follows:

Western End:
7Hn = 1 Near Full-Length: 10' 4", discarded 62"
10Hm = 1 Near Full-Length: 10' 4", discarded 62"
8Hm+9Hm = 1 Full-Length: 7' 7" + 7' 7" = 15' 2", discarded 4"

Northern Transept End:
11Hn+14Hn = 1 Near Full-Length: 6' 10" + 6' 10" = 13' 8", discarded 22"

Southern Transept End:
2Hn+5Hn = 1 Near Full-Length: 6' 10" + 6' 10" = 13' 8", discarded 22"

Northern and Southern Transept Ends:
3Hm+4Hm+12Hm+13Hm = 1 Near Full-Length: 41" x 4 = 13' 8", discarded 22"

Eastern Transept Wall and Western Entrance Wall:
1Hn+6Hn = 1 Near Full-Length: 8' + 5' 3" = 13' 3", discarded 27"

* Near Full-Length: Panels that are not of full poupou length (15½"), and thus not long enough to extract additional, good-sized fragments for further use in Manuteke III.

** Full-Length: Panels that are almost the full length of a poupou, with no or negligible discard.

Panel, on the grounds, outside of Manuteke III: total of 1?
Re11 = 4' 4", partial length of whole piece, with remainder (c.11") lost and uncounted, or already counted among those listed above in G or H series?

B. EXTANT WORKS

Total Surviving Panels: 3 panels adjusted to 1 Full-Length (certain) and 2 Near Full-Length (probable):
Panel B = 1 Full-Length, 12' 8": discarded 34"
Panel A = 2/3 of Full-Length, 8' 7½": part of another one (82½" long) already used and counted among the above?
Panel C = 1/3 of Full-Length, 4' 10¼": part of another one (127¼" long) already used and counted among the above?

C. ACCOUNTING FOR THE TOTAL OF SIMPLE MANAIA PANELS: A plus B

43 simple manaia panels in and outside Manuteke III adjusted to Near- and/or Full-Length panels in Manuteke IIB as follows:
A (28+7) plus B (1) = 36 CERTAIN
A (28+7+1?) plus B (1+2?) = 39 PROBABLE
ACCOUNTING FOR THE NUMBER AND LOCATION OF THE STEMMED MANAIA PANELS

It now remains to inventory the stemmed _manaia_ panels and determine if these stood, like all G-series simple _manaia_ panels, on a one-to-one relationship with Manutuke IIB, or, if like most series H-panels, they represent only partial correspondence with their source, the second church. The answer to this question is important because it significantly affects the reconstruction of the original decorative system, particularly the composition of simple _manaia_ and stemmed _manaia_ panels in the church’s eastern and western endwalls, the former corresponding to the sanctuary and the latter to the entrance.

As I noted earlier, the _CMI_ engraving of Manutuke IIB shows in the sanctuary end a single-stemmed _manaia_ panel, the _poutuarongo_ at the centre of the endwall (Figs 1 and 15), and flanking it on either side _epa_ with simple _manaia_ decoration, like the _poupou_ along the sidewalls. By virtue of its central location, the _poutuarongo_ is taller than the accompanying _epa_, and because of this it is also wider since it alone rises to meet and support the end of the ridgepole.\(^27\) In several respects, the _CMI_ image of the church’s eastern endwall, long considered as authoritative, does not accord with the evidence visible in the Crawford photographs of Manutuke III.

Since the _poutuarongo_, at the sanctuary end, and the _poutāhuhu_, at the entrance end, were each 28' high, a decorative system like Manutuke IIB’s, as shown in the _CMI_ engraving, would produce 56 linear feet (two times 28') of single-stemmed _manaia_ planking, and no more. But, as analysis of the Crawford photographs in the next section (corresponding to Inventory II) demonstrates, Manutuke III contained approximately 122' of such carved planking (Table 1). Also in the third church, there was one double-stemmed _manaia_ panel (27Gwss, detail in Fig. 21, left) measuring 12½' in height, bringing the total of all stemmed _manaia_ panelling to 134½'. This unique panel is discussed below.

The question then is how was the extra 66 feet of single-stemmed _manaia_ panelling in Manutuke III—the amount beyond the 56 feet sourced directly from IIB’s _poutuarongo_ and _poutāhuhu_—used in the rest of Manutuke IIB—as _poupou_, _epa_ or a combination of both? If one assumes a one-to-one panel relationship between the second and third churches, this would mean, as noted previously, that five of the single-stemmed _manaia_ panels in Manutuke III were sourced from among IIB’s five endwall panels (positions 3–7) in the sanctuary end; the other five single-stemmed slabs in the third church were sourced from the five corresponding panels of IIB’s other endwall (Plan 2 below and Figs 23a, b overleaf). Together these ten slabs would total 122 linear feet of single-stemmed _manaia_ carving.
The problem with this one-to-one scheme is that large sections of carved work would have to be sawn off to fit the panels in their new setting (see Plan 2 and Fig. 23 following). For the eastern endwall the discard amount would be 739", and for the western endwall 751" or slightly more, on account of the shorter slabs sourced from *epa* 3 and 7 (for the reasons in height variation see Plan 3, below). The amount of carved single-stemmed *manaia* work discarded from both ends together (counting endwall panels 3 to 7) would thus total 1490" or 124' 2" (amounts of lost work are based on upper heights of endwall panels). The amount of discarded carving, as indicated previously, is great enough so as to cast doubt on the validity of reconstructing Manutuke IIB’s decorative scheme around a one-to-one relationship between the panels of the two churches.

A more economical use of carved relief work would result if one were to reconstruct Manutuke IIB not on the one-to-one principle (as is Fig. 23 a-b), but rather with a suite of three single-stemmed *manaia* panels at each terminus. Careful attention to the placement and distribution of the single-stemmed *manaia* panels within Manutuke III provide clues as to how it was

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MANUTUKE IIB</th>
<th>MANUTUKE III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Single-stemmed <em>manaia</em> panels (2)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Single-stemmed <em>manaia</em> panels (10)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>poutuarongo</em>, pos. 5</td>
<td>11½' (apse, 2Gws)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>poutahuhu</em>, pos. 5</td>
<td>11½' (apse, 3Gws)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56' total (17.07m)</td>
<td>12' (chancel, 1Gws)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12' (chancel, 4Gws)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12½' (transept, 5Gws)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12½' (transept, 39Gws)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12½' (nave, 15Gws)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12½' (nave, 16Gws)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12½' (nave, 26Gws)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12½' (nave, 28Gws)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>122' total* (37.19m)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* There is also one double-stemmed *manaia* panel (27Gwss, nave) at 12½', bringing the total of all stemmed-*manaia* panelling to 134½' (41m).
possible to take six panels (three from each endwall) of the second church (Plan 4, Fig. 24a, b) and with only small adjustments, fashion from them ten pieces for the third edifice. The attractiveness and plausibility of this proposal lies in the way materials were maximised, substantially reducing the loss of carved panelling.

Plan 2: Configuration of single-stemmed manaia panels in Manutuke IIB as sources for Manutuke III panels, based on one-to-one relationship. Manutuke III panel locations can be assigned arbitrarily and are interchangeable. For epa, upper height is at the top of the angled cut. Plan 2 corresponds to Fig. 23a-b. (Epa 1, 2, 8 and 9 have simple manaia panels.)

### MANUTUKE IIB: SANCTUARY END

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Epa 1</th>
<th>Epa 2</th>
<th>Epa 3</th>
<th>Epa 4</th>
<th>Poutuarongo 5</th>
<th>Epa 6</th>
<th>Epa 7</th>
<th>Epa 8</th>
<th>Epa 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>upper ht 21'11½&quot; (263½&quot;)</td>
<td>upper ht 25' 7&quot; (307&quot;)</td>
<td>straight ht 28' (336&quot;)</td>
<td>upper ht 25' 7&quot; (307&quot;)</td>
<td>upper ht 21'11½&quot; (263½&quot;)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1Gws in chancel</td>
<td>26Gws in nave</td>
<td>39Gws in transept</td>
<td>28Gws in nave</td>
<td>4Gws in chancel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>used in III 12'</td>
<td>used in III 12½'</td>
<td>used in III 12½'</td>
<td>used in III 12'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119½&quot; discard</td>
<td>157&quot; discard</td>
<td>186&quot; discard</td>
<td>157&quot; discard</td>
<td>119½&quot; discard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### MANUTUKE IIB: ENTRANCE END

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Epa 1</th>
<th>Epa 2</th>
<th>Epa 3</th>
<th>Epa 4</th>
<th>Poutahuhu 5</th>
<th>Epa 6</th>
<th>Epa 7</th>
<th>Epa 8</th>
<th>Epa 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>upper ht 21'11½&quot; (263½&quot;)</td>
<td>upper ht 25' 7&quot; (307&quot;)</td>
<td>straight ht 28' (336&quot;)</td>
<td>upper ht 25' 7&quot; (307&quot;)</td>
<td>upper ht 21'11½&quot; (263½&quot;)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Gws in apse</td>
<td>15Gws in nave</td>
<td>5Gws in transept</td>
<td>16Gws in nave</td>
<td>3Gws in apse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>used in III 11½'</td>
<td>used in III 12½'</td>
<td>used in III 12½'</td>
<td>used in III 11½'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125½&quot; discard</td>
<td>157&quot; discard</td>
<td>186&quot; discard</td>
<td>157&quot; discard</td>
<td>125½&quot; discard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Close examination of the Crawford photographs of Manutuke III’s interior reveals the presence of eleven stemmed *manaia* panels (Fig. 20): ten with a single stem motif and one with two stems. Five stood in the nave (15Gws, 16Gws, 26Gws, 27Gwss [the double-stemmed], 28Gws), two in the transept arms (5Gws and 39Gws) and four in the sanctuary (1Gws, 2Gws, 3Gws, 4Gws). Except for these last four, all the stemmed slabs were as tall as the simple *manaia* panels, that is, approximately 12' 6" (3.81m). While the crowns of the slabs in the sanctuary were at the same level as all the G-series panels in the rest of the church (see Figs 5-7), the sanctuary members were in fact shorter owing to differential floor levels, as Plan 3 below demonstrates. This resulted in chancel panels 1Gws and 4Gws rising to only 12', and the apsidal ones, 2Gws and 3Gws, by 6" less, to only 11½'.

Plan 3: Panel height variation in Manutuke III in response to floor level rises.

![Plan 3: Panel height variation in Manutuke III in response to floor level rises.](image)

Only two single-stem *manaia* panels are easy to see in Crawford’s photographs (5Gws in Fig. 5 and 39Gws in Fig. 6) and so positioned to allow a creditable determination of their approximate breadth (37½"), an amount that receives confirmation from the surviving Auckland fragment Re1028 discussed above. The other eight single-stem *manaia* planks in interior photos of Manutuke III are very difficult to read. However, inspection of these panels with the aid of digital technology (see Figs 5 and 21) reveals that they are without doubt stemmed and very wide. Based on uniformity of type and dimensions, these characteristics suggest that the ten single-stemmed *manaia* panels in Manutuke III were all members of a coherent group originally forming the central set of panels in IIB’s endwall system. My assignment of these panels to terminal wall positions is based on the CMI illustration (Fig. 1), which depicts just the *poutuarongo* as a single-stemmed *manaia* panel. But since the linear length of this type of carved panelling is far greater than the combined total of the *poutuarongo* and the *poutāhuhu* (56'), the
Figure 23a. Reconstruction of Manutuke IIB with a configuration of five single-stemmed manaia panels, sanctuary (eastern) end, as source for panels in Manutuke III, and amount of discarded carving. Corresponds to Plan 2 in text, and Fig. 29a. Drawn by Frederick Leff.
Figure 23b. Same as a, but showing the entrance (western) end and corresponding difference in panel heights.
Figure 24a. Reconstruction of Manutuke II B with a configuration of three single-stemmed manaia panels, sanctuary (eastern) end, as source for panels in Manutuke III, and amount of discarded carving. Corresponds to Plan 4 and Fig. 30b. Drawn by Frederick Leff.
Figure 24b. Same as a, but showing the entrance (western) end and corresponding differences in panel heights.

Richard A. Sundt
remaining balance of 66' of single-stemmed manaia carving must be placed somewhere (see Table 1 above). One very attractive possibility would be to have just one single-stemmed manaia epa flanking either side of the central endwall upright. This would result in less lost carved work than the five-part endwall system discussed earlier (Fig. 23a, b), which represents a one-to-one relationship of parts between IIB and III.

This possibility then invites a search for a different configuration of panels in Manutuke IIB that would supply the ten single-stemmed manaia slabs for the third church in a manner that minimised the amount of carved relief work that had to be removed so the panel could be installed in Manutuke III. There are a number of different arrangements that would result in a more economical use of materials. Although not the most economical of these, the scheme just mentioned above appears especially attractive when all positive and negative factors are considered (see Plan 4 below). At the sanctuary end, the poutuarongo would be flanked by epa 4 and 6, all three endwall panels having the single-stemmed manaia design (Fig. 24a). The remaining epa, 1-3 and 7-9 (as in Plan 1, Fig. 22), would have only the simple manaia design, like the poupou of the sidewalls, but on the wider side of medium width, save for epa 1 and 9, which could possibly be narrower. The entrance end to the west (Fig. 24b) would have been configured in the same way (but circumstances would result in more discarded material, as Plan 4 indicates). This reconstruction essentially proposes a more elaborate decorative scheme for the endwalls than the one depicted in the CMI illustration. Three factors recommend this tri-partite configuration: (i) it accounts for the full 134½' of stemmed manaia panelling; (ii) unlike the five-part scheme, the three-panel configuration generates only a very moderate amount of discarded carved work (36' 4" vs. 124' 2"); and (iii) this three-part scheme, consisting of a total of six full endwall panels of single-stemmed manaia panels, is the only way by which Manutuke III could have been supplied with ten such slabs. The one factor that makes this feasible—and what inspires confidence in the reconstruction as proposed— involves the difference in Manutuke III’s floor levels and the resulting three different panel heights (see Plan 3). It is this coincidence that speaks in favour of a triple single-stemmed formula for each of IIB’s terminal walls (Plan 4, Fig. 24). If the sanctuary in Manutuke III had called for panels of the same height as those of the nave and transept (12½'), six Manutuke IIB endwall pieces would not have been sufficient to supply all the single-stemmed manaia carving this decorative scheme would have required. The simple reason is that, unlike the poutuarongo and poutâhu, not even the two tallest epa, numbers 4 and 6, would have been tall enough to extract from each of them two 12½' square-headed panels (the balance needed to realise the tripartite endwall system) because the usable
height of these *epa* is limited to 23' 8" (see Fig. 19), i.e., to the *lower* angle cut, but the amount needed would be 25'. Following the intricacies of the reconstruction proposed here is rather daunting, but careful examination of Plan 4 and of the cross-sections in Fig. 24a and b should assist in clarifying the dimensional limitations imposed by angled endwall pieces, and how the six single-stemmed *manaia* panels from Manutuke IIB were re-sized into ten panels for installation in III. (For detailed explanations of the process, see Notes on Sourcing and Plan 4.)

**NOTES ON SOURCING AND USAGE TO ACCOMPANY PLAN 4:**

How six single-stemmed panels from Manutuke IIB could have been re-sized into ten panels for installation in III is explained in detail in the following three notes.

(1) **Handling of the central endwall uprights east and west.** The *poutuarongo* (28') and *poutähuhu* (28') were more than sufficient to obtain from each two lengths of 12' 6" for installation in Manutuke III’s nave and/or transept. Thus, the upper section of the *poutuarongo* corresponds to panel 5Gws (12' 6") in Manutuke III, and in like manner its lower segment corresponds to panel 39Gws (12' 6"), this leaving a discard of only 3' (36") total. At the opposite end, the *poutähuhu* was treated in the same way, using panels 15Gws and 16Gws, also 12' 6" high, and likewise resulting in a 3' discard (the Manutuke III panels assigned to locations in IIB’s endwalls are in most cases interchangeable with others; specific assignments are made for purposes of tracking panels and accounting for the numbers used).

(2) **Handling of the *epa* in the eastern end:** *Epa* 4 and 6 (each 25' 7" high at the upper end and 23' 8" at the lower end, the latter being the only usable height for extracting square-headed panels for III) were about 4' 4" shorter than the *poutuarongo* but just long enough to obtain from each *epa* two panels of slightly different heights for two panels in Manutuke III. The top section of *epa* 4 (but it could just as well be the bottom) was cut to a length of 11' 6" to generate a panel, 2Gws, for the north side of Manutuke III’s apse; the remainder of *epa* 4 was cut another 12' to fashion 1Gws for the chancel, this then leaving only a small amount as a discard, a wedge of around 2' 1" (25"), measured at its highest point. *Epa* 6 was sectioned off in the same way in order to form Manutuke III’s sanctuary panels on the south side with 3Gws for the apse, and 4Gws for the chancel.

(3) **Handling of the *epa* in the western end:** *Epa* 4 was cut to form just one length of 12' 6" to create panel 26Gws (or any other of the Gws series in the nave and/or transept). Thus there remained a large segment of this
Plan 4: A proposed reconstruction of Manutuke IIB’s endwall system. A conjectural model of sourcing for Manutuke III, with explanatory notes. Building width = 45', height at centre = 28', side wall (*poupou*) height = 15½'. Roof at a 31 degree angle. This plan corresponds to Fig. 24 a-b.

**MANUTUKE IIB: SANCTUARY END (EAST)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Epa 1</th>
<th>Epa 2</th>
<th>Epa 3</th>
<th>Epa 4</th>
<th>Poutuarongo 5</th>
<th>Epa 6</th>
<th>Epa 7</th>
<th>Epa 8</th>
<th>Epa 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>upper ht 25' 7&quot; (307&quot;)&lt;br&gt;lower ht 23' 8&quot; (284&quot;)&lt;br&gt;total used in III 23½'&lt;br&gt;2' 1&quot; (25&quot;) upper discard&lt;br&gt;2&quot; (0.051m) lower discard</td>
<td>straight ht 28' (336&quot;)&lt;br&gt;total used in III 25'&lt;br&gt;3' (36&quot;) discard</td>
<td>upper ht 25' 7&quot; (307&quot;)&lt;br&gt;lower ht 23' 8&quot; (284&quot;)&lt;br&gt;total used in III 23½'&lt;br&gt;2' 1&quot; (25&quot;) upper discard&lt;br&gt;2&quot; (0.051m) lower discard</td>
<td>2Gws/11½' in apse&lt;br&gt;1Gws/12' in chancel</td>
<td>5Gws/12½' in transept&lt;br&gt;39Gws/12½' in transept</td>
<td>3Gws/11½' in apse&lt;br&gt;4Gws/12' in chancel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MANUTUKE IIB: ENTRANCE END (WEST)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Epa 1</th>
<th>Epa 2</th>
<th>Epa 3</th>
<th>Epa 4</th>
<th>Poutahuhu 5</th>
<th>Epa 6</th>
<th>Epa 7</th>
<th>Epa 8</th>
<th>Epa 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>upper ht 25' 7&quot; (307&quot;)&lt;br&gt;lower ht 23' 8&quot; (284&quot;)&lt;br&gt;total used in III 12½'&lt;br&gt;13' 1&quot; (157&quot;) upper discard&lt;br&gt;11' 2&quot; (134&quot;) lower discard</td>
<td>straight ht 28' (336&quot;)&lt;br&gt;total used in III 25'&lt;br&gt;3' (36&quot;) discard</td>
<td>upper ht 25' 7&quot; (307&quot;)&lt;br&gt;lower ht 23' 8&quot; (284&quot;)&lt;br&gt;total used in III 12½'&lt;br&gt;13' 1&quot; (157&quot;) upper discard&lt;br&gt;11' 2&quot; (134&quot;) lower discard</td>
<td>26Gws/12½' in nave&lt;br&gt;total used in III 12½'&lt;br&gt;13' 1&quot; (157&quot;) upper discard&lt;br&gt;11' 2&quot; (134&quot;) lower discard</td>
<td>15Gws/12½' in nave&lt;br&gt;16Gws/12½' in nave</td>
<td>28Gws/12½' in nave&lt;br&gt;total used in III 12½'&lt;br&gt;13' 1&quot; (157&quot;) upper discard&lt;br&gt;11' 2&quot; (134&quot;) lower discard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
epa that was not used, the maximum extent measuring 157" (13' 1"). The companion epa 6 was handled in the same manner to produce 28Gws (or any other nave or transept panel in III). There is no evidence that these hefty leftovers were employed in the building as all the single-stemmed manaia panels have now been accounted for. If they are extant, their location is not known and there was no photographic or other record made of them prior to their disappearance. It is conceivable that large discarded segments of the original Manutuke IIB epa were not in good shape and were therefore not saved. Be that as it may, inevitably, it is not always possible to refashion works for installation in another monument without losing some carving. Re-sizing panels for the third church with minimal loss of epa was feasible for those destined for the sanctuary because in the easternmost portion of the edifice the panels were slightly shorter. Keeping losses to just small sections was not possible with respect to western epa 4 and 6 where only one more panel per epa was needed to complete the Manutuke III scheme. To obtain the last two additional Manutuke III panels, both for areas outside the sanctuary, lengths of 12' 6" were required, but two such lengths (for a total of 25') could not be extracted from either epa 4 or 6 since their usable height was limited to 23' 8" (284"). Therefore, it was necessary to use 12' 6" of epa 4 to create panel 26Gws; this resulted in discarding the remaining 157" (13' 1") of carved epa work. Epa 6 was sawn in the same fashion to produce a panel, 28Gws (also 12' 6" high), and this resulted in the same amount of loss.

**INVENTORY OF THE STEMMED MANAIA PANELS OF MANUTUKE IIB’S ENDWALLS (INVENTORY II)**

While a one-to-one relationship between the single-stemmed manaia panels in Manutuke IIB (as in Plan 2) would add more slabs to the inventory, the reconstruction of the endwalls as proposed above (Plan 4, Fig. 24a, b), which operates on the principal of greater economy, contributes fewer slabs towards the total of 60 panels said to have been made for the church. Still, the Plan 4 proposal for the terminal walls is far more elaborate than the one depicted in the CMI illustration. After much reflection, this less expansive tripartite configuration appears to be a more likely reconstruction for Manutuke IIB than the five-part system discussed above and other schemes which I have considered and which I will briefly mention later. Among them, there is one scheme that would be more economical and result in less discarded work than in the preferred tripartite arrangement (Plan 4) that I am proposing, but it would involve assigning some of the single-stemmed manaia panels to the
long sides of Manutuke IIB. This raises a number of compositional problems that militate against accepting such a reconstruction for reasons that will be explained shortly.

I now turn to the second instalment of the panel inventory in Chart 2. It brings together all stemmed *manaia* panels, both single- and double-stemmed. This inventory assumes an endwall reconstruction based on the three-part configuration of single-stemmed *manaia* panels as explained in the notes above and illustrated in Plan 4 and cross-sections in Fig. 24a, b. Below I will argue that the lone two-stemmed *manaia* panel (27Gwss) was not part of an endwall system, but rather a feature of the sidewalls, a *poupou* and as such just a single slab.

Chart 2. Inventory II: Stemmed *manaia* panels, lost and extant works (s = one central stem motif, ss = two stems—one on either side).

---

**A. LOST WORKS KNOWN FROM PHOTOGRAPHIC SOURCES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total of all stemmed-<em>manaia</em> G-series panels in Manutuke III: 11 panels, not adjusted:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1Gws, 2Gws, 3Gws, 4Gws, 5Gws, 15Gws, 16Gws, 26Gws, 27Gwss, 28Gws, 39Gws</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Eight Half-Lengths (single-stem) adjusted to 4 Full-Length endwall panels (in positions 4, 5, 6)*:

| 1Gws+2Gws, 3Gws+4Gws, 5Gws+39Gws, 15Gws+16Gws: with a total of 122" discarded |

*Two Half-Lengths (single-stem) adjusted to 2 Full-Length endwall panels*:

| 26Gws corresponds to 1 Full-Length *epa*: 157" discarded |
| 28Gws corresponds to 1 Full-Length *epa*: 157" discarded |

*One panel (double-stem) corresponding to 1 Full-Length sidewall panel*:

| 27Gwss corresponds to 1 Full-Length *poupou*: 36" discarded |

**TOTAL of Full-Length stemmed *manaia* panels (all types): 7 panels**

*Based on configuration as set forth in Plan 4 and corresponding to Fig. 24a-b

---

**B. EXTANT WORK**

Panel Re10 (in Auckland) is a fragment of a single-stemmed *manaia* panel. It is not counted here on the assumption that it was a segment of one of the above panels, and not a separate slab. Thus: Re10 = 0

---

**C. ACCOUNTING FOR ALL STEMMED-MANAIA PANELS: A plus B**

Eleven stemmed-manaia panels in Manutuke III = 7 panels in Manutuke IIB

| A: 7 + B: 0 = 7 |
TOTAL NUMBER OF ALL CARVED PANELS FROM INVENTORIES I AND II (43-46)

The results of Inventory I of 36 panels (certain) and 39 (probable), and the 7 (certain) panels documented in Inventory II added together yields a grand total of 43 panels (certain) and 46 (probable) that can be counted towards the 60 wall posts that defined the full perimeter of Manutuke IIB. This amounts to 72 to 77 percent of the total carved œuvre. If a one-to-one relationship of slabs had been the principle guiding the installation of Manutuke IIB’s carvings in the third church, the numbers would have obviously been higher. My inclination has been to work on the assumption that Manutuke III’s designers attempted to re-employ the carved ēpa and poupou of the second church as efficiently as possible within the parameters imposed by the size and form of the third church, that is, in a manner that minimised the loss of carved relief and to discard only those panels (whole or in part) in poor condition. If such economy and respect for the carvings had not been a pre-eminent consideration (which seems unlikely based on the results of the inventories), this would have resulted in large segments of manaia (with and without the stem motif) being discarded (see, e.g., Plan 2, Fig. 23a, b), and perhaps even entire panels. If so, why do so few pieces survive? The only ones are the three at Muriwai (A, B and C), none of which are entire lengths, and the one very fragmentary piece at Auckland (Re10). Is this small group of extant relief work an indication that there was not much sculpted work left to save after the erection of the third church? Could it be, as some commentators have posited, that some planks of the second church were not carved—Māori having lost heart in the project—leaving the building to be erected with several posts left smooth, which were then finished off by painting them with lively kōwhaiwhai patterns? That between 14 and 17 panels cannot be accounted for is a sufficiently large number to provide support for the claim that the building was “incomplete” in the sense that not all the carved work originally intended for the church in 1849 was realised. This view would gain credibility if the six painted kōwhaiwhai panels from Manutuke IIB could be proven to have been poupou as some have alleged, rather than heke as others have maintained, all without offering direct proof. The nature of these painted panels and their function within the second church will be explored in Part II (September 2008 issue). Part II also features a detailed discussion of my reconstruction of Manutuke IIB’s interior and some speculation about the meaning of its carved imagery.
NOTES

1. The late 1880s or 1887 are other dates given for the dismantling (or disassembly). Sources also do not agree as to what prompted this: general disrepair, condition threatening collapse, or actual collapse. (See Dana 1964: 39, GT 29 January 1910, JPS 1930a: 199, Phillipps 1944: 89, Pipiwaharauoa 1913: 9, Ria 1987: 85). The nature of the decay that St John (1873: 181-82) described when he visited the church in 1869 suggests vandalism was the main culprit.

2. This anonymous Māori article was published by Phillipps (1944: 90-91) in a partial English translation made by R. W. Halbert.

3. William F. Crawford was a prominent Gisborne businessman and its first mayor, as well as a prolific photographer. He was born in Tipperary in 1844 and arrived in New Zealand in 1864. Ten years later he settled in Gisborne to manage a brewery. He died in December 1916 (Mackay 1966: 343, 394-95, Robinson 1990: 9-15).

With a few exceptions, where clarity, space considerations and other publication necessities demand it, the photographs of the panels (grouped or as single pieces) are presented in their “raw” state, i.e., as documents (thus, for example, some include the photographer’s writing on the negative), and with a minimal amount of cropping in order to show the environment in which the works existed when photographed, as well as their condition and state of preservation, which in every case is different from that of the present for all those that are extant (these having been cut down further, variously restored, repainted, and moved to new locations—mostly indoors).

4. The alphabetical ordering for most of these corresponds to their display sequence at Muriwai, and thereafter the order in which the remainder became known to me.

5. Herbert Williams (1860-1937), Leonard’s son, served as principal of Te Rau College from 1894 to 1902 (Biggs 2007). The College closed in 1920 (Robinson 1990: 137).

6. When the photograph is enlarged it is clear that these are two separate panels, not one.

7. Panels J, K and I in this photograph probably do not belong to the Manutuke church.

8. “The building has progressed so far as the erection of the frame work, beyond which it cannot proceed without considerable funds, as it is intended to be finished outside with boards” (Brittan et al. n.d.: 16)

9. The Rev. Williams was perhaps moved to view the situation at Manutuke in this light because of the family connections binding Turanga and Otaki, and the resulting ties that increased interchange between the two missions. Williams’ daughter, Mary, was married to the Rev. Samuel Williams (a cousin), who was sent to Otaki in 1847 to run the station after the Rev. Hadfield took ill. Before this assignment, Samuel had visited Turanga and so impressed the Māori community that they petitioned Bishop Selwyn for him to stay as assistant to Williams. After Samuel’s appointment to Hadfield’s post, the Williamses of Turanga and of Otaki kept in touch for family reasons, a situation that could have only
heightened awareness among Manutuke people of events transpiring at Otaki. (See TJ 30 September 1846: 392-93, 6 July 1847: 434, 22 November 1847: 456, 30 November 1848: 515.)

10. After visiting the impressive whare-style church at Waikanae in 1843, the Rev. Taylor opined that the sight of this edifice “so charmed old Rauparaha that he is determined to have a still finer one in his pa [at Otaki]” (1838-44 [II], 27 August 1843: 277). This notion was seconded by Hadfield (1902: 14) who mentioned that Otaki’s inhabitants had “determined to have a better and a larger” church in their town than the one at Waikanae. Besides the proximity of these two communities, which allowed Te Rauparaha to make frequent visits between them, he had supplied some of Waikanae’s major timbers, which lends credence to Taylor’s speculation on the elderly chief’s intention to build an even grander church in his own village of Otaki (Hadfield 1902: 14-15, Ramsden 1951: 57-58, Rangiātea 1997: 34).

11. The ridgepole was in the process of being raised in mid-May 1848 (see Sundt 1999: 17-25 on matters relating to the extent of framing). According to Hadfield (1902: 15), a special service was held in the church in November 1849, but “it was some little time before the Church was ready for regular services, and in 1852 the Bishop of New Zealand held his first confirmation there”.

12. His negatives and prints are now preserved in the Tairāwhiti Museum, Gisborne. For a thorough overview of his photographic work and range of subjects, see Robinson 1990.

13. Corner āpa are sometimes considerably narrower than other terminal wall panels and even some poupou. (For examples, see Mead 1986: figs 71, 87 and Neich 1994: fig. 57.)

14. For fulsome definitions of these concepts related to Māori being, consult Marsden (1992: 118-21).

15. For example, closely based on the Manutuke design is the front, inner endwall of the Tokomaru Bay house, Te Hone-ki-Rarotonga (1934). It was carved in the Waiaupu or Turanga style by Pine Taiapa, Waka Graham and Wiremu Puketapu (Mead 1986: 84, fig. 87). Similar too is the poupou and lower end of one of the heke of Whītirēia in Whāngārā, on the East Coast, carved by members of the Rotorua Arts and Crafts School under Pine Taiapa’s supervision (Simmons 2006: 52-53).

16. In the 1852 CMI illustration only the centre slab (posttuarongo) carries the stem motif; all the evidence indicates that there were three stemmed panels in the sanctuary end.

17. On manaia as a development from animal to a human-like form, see Mead 1975: 204-6. Barrow’s (1969: 56-67) analysis of manaia is based on a range of examples that includes not just the ones with easily identified manaia characteristics (as his figs 58 and 66) but those where the creature’s basic form (as in figs 67, 70 and 76) is hard to discern because some parts are eliminated and/or treated in a highly abstract way, challenging even the trained eye to follow the intricacies of design (see Barrow 1984: 38-39).
18. His role as chief carver and overseer is nowhere documented or specified, although it is routinely assumed. The Māori source in *Pipiwharauroa* (1913: 9) credits Paratene Turangi as the person who adzed the panels with “others”, but does not say who they were. Paratene may have simply adzed the raw timber into slabs while others did the carving. Williams does not indicate a leader among the carvers he names. He does hint at Rukupo being in charge of the operation when the church needed to be completed by the addition of weatherboards; Williams consulted with him in 1853 about ways to obtain the sawn timber (Williams 1853-55: 30 August 1853, 1030-31).

19. The larger widths of some of Manutuke’s panels, and more significantly their greater number, would have created an overly dense environment if distributed across just 36' (in contrast to Otaki’s seven). This would have mandated using at Manutuke the very narrowest of lancets (.508m), much narrower than Otaki’s (.750m wide) (Cochran 1995: 8). The result at Manutuke would have been an uncharacteristically narrow fenestration system.

20. The church designated Manutuke I in the Māori essay corresponds to the one I call Manutuke IIB.

21. In certain cases some of the ornamented sections immediately above the footing might also have been removed to eliminate any deteriorated parts resulting from contact with the ground.

22. Several panels appear to have been trimmed along their flanks in order to fit a given width. The outer edges of some *manaia* bodies have been shaved off. See, for example, 32Gn and 33Gn (Fig. 7, far right) and panels A and C. Panel Ri2 (in Fig. 5, far right corner on the floor and below the bottle) appears to be a flank cut off from some panel.

23. This may reflect the preference of the designer of the third church for using the wider panels, hence the relatively few of narrow width visible in the Crawford photographs.

24. The step into the apse of the present church is 6"; the same can be reasonably presumed for Manutuke IIB.

25. Slightly less would have to be subtracted if the slabs were sourced instead from corner *epa* (positions 1 and 9) since their usable height, 14' 4½" (172½"), was about one foot less than a *poupou*’s.

26. The triangular sections of the transepts are more compressed owing to their terminal walls being slightly narrower than those of the western end; the measurements taken here are less reliable, but sufficient for drawing conclusions.

27. Judging from remarks by William Williams (1852b: 48) and his son Leonard Williams (1932: 20), the opposite terminal wall had a similarly carved panel in position 5 (the *poutāhuhu*).

28. With widths in excess of 36", stemmed *manaia* panels such as Re10 and those in the transept (5Gws and 39Gws) are likely to have been sourced from the *poutuarongo* and *poutāhuhu* of Manutuke IIB. Their dimensions conform to the over 3-foot thickness Williams gives for one of the ridgepole supports obtained by the builders in 1849 (*TJ* 20 December 1849: 551).
GLOSSARY

epa: endwall upright with angled crown conforming to the slope of the heketipi running above it
heke: rafter
heketipi: sloping timber running above the epa and below the ceiling
kakaho: stemwork used as wall or ceiling liner
kape: indented crescent-like art motif
köwhaiwhai: curvilinear painted designs
maihi: barge boards
manaia: hybrid creature and/or human figure, most often in profile
manawa: long, narrow band in köwhaiwhai design
marae: ceremonial grounds and associated buildings
pā: stockaded village
pare: lintel over door on window
pātaka: elevated storehouse
pitau: scroll or spiral design
poupou: post or panel of a sidewall
poutāhu: central endwall panel on the entrance side of a whare
poutokomanawa: free-standing post along the central axis of a whare holding up the ridgepole
poutuarongo: central endwall member on the rear of a whare (sanctuary end of a church)
pukatea (Laurelia novae-zelandiae): tree whose wood is sometimes used in construction
tāhu: ridgepole
taurapa: stern post of a canoe
tōtara (Podocarpus totara): tree whose wood is commonly used for carving and construction
tukutuku: latticework panel
waka: canoe, vessel
whare: general term for house of any type; architecturally, a traditional building with the roof carried by a ridgepole, often supported between the central endwall posts by one or more poutokomanawa
whare kai: dining hall
whare karakia: house of prayer, church
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