

***Raupo Whare* (c1860) and the Tale of the Missing Dog Box**

Peter Wood, Architecture Programme, School of Architecture, Victoria University, Wellington

ABSTRACT: In *A History of New Zealand Architecture*, Peter Shaw describes the European settlers of the 1840s encountering an architecturally-impooverished landscape. Skilled carpenters were still an uncommon migrant at that time and while some of the wealthier settlers brought prefabricated houses with them, for many their first accommodation in New Zealand were deserted shoreline whare. Moreover, these newest of New Zealanders were without familiar building materials and, as Shaw writes, they "emulated the style and construction methods of Maori dwellings and adapted them according to European ideas of hygiene and comfort." This explanation is characteristically ethnocentric in its confident view that European society, at that time, was architecturally superior. Sinclair has stated that it was colonial contact (principally commercial trade) which drew Māori from their sanitary patterns found in pā occupation. The grand view here is that the settlers adopted an indigenous typology to suit their own physical needs but that they maintained certain environmental and occupancy standards from "home." That is, the settlers would have preferred to have built in the model of the places they had just left but were forced, by the limits of land and labour, to adopt local materials and knowledge, and particularly those of Māori.

Shaw illustrates this with a photograph titled "*Raupo whare* (c. 1860)," with captioning that emphasises the European features – door and window frames – but which also goes on to suggest that the material fabric of what is essentially a cottage consists of tied bundles of raupō "which European settlers were taught by the Maori."

The scene set by Shaw is one of convivial colonial adaptation. Newly landed settlers, confronted by an environment far less hospitable than they had expected, adopt and adapt a local typology using architectural elements they have brought with them but with the support of Māori technology. This is not to say the "*raupō whare*" was a popular or permanent accommodation. Typically it was neither, but nonetheless Shaw creates the image of a nascent architectural biculturalism where settlers acknowledged the whare as an appropriate regional building type and adopted its essential form. That is, the "*raupō whare*" is a cultural hybrid or, in the pejorative terminology that has been used to describe mixed genealogies, it is a half-caste house.

This photograph then is an important piece of visual evidence for a bicultural architecture where each culture is present yet not easily separated or abstracted. To fully appreciate how fine the thread used to tie this image to a claim of mutual cultural interaction is, one then needs to view the full frame version of photograph rather than the cropped one used by Shaw. In the original image the house is shown in a wider context that is not altogether faltering to a reading of successful settler adaptation. Revealed is the extent of disarray in the garden, evidence perhaps of the ready reliance of the 1860s settler on the production of others. To the far right are three barrels suggesting an acceptance of an outdoor lifestyle not readily apparent in Shaw's cropped image. Finally, and most significantly for my reading, there is a dog kennel whose care in design and construction can be said to significantly eclipse that of the cottage. There is, in this diminutive animal shelter, an architectural authority not consistent with Shaw's version of biculturalism. It is elevated, has a different aspect, is made to greater precision and of better machined materials. Given a chance (it seems to say) the settler would be much happier living in complete rejection of indigenous influence. This 1860s dog house throws into doubt simplistic interpretations of the period. What was the status of the colonial dog, and what questions of architecture of this period does it pose? What conclusions can be drawn about colonial settlement in this period and the models it adopted? And - we must ask – what has become of the colonial dog that occupied such superior lodgings?

In *A History of New Zealand Architecture*, Peter Shaw describes the European settlers of the 1860s as encountering an architecturally-

impooverished landscape. Skilled carpenters were still an uncommon migrant group at that time, and while some of the wealthier settlers

brought prefabricated houses with them, in his reading of the period the first accommodation for many new arrivals in



Figure 1: "Raupo House near New Plymouth" ca 1860.



Figure 2: "House at Pukearuhe" ca 1860s or 1870s.

New Zealand were deserted shoreline whare.¹

Moreover, these newest of New Zealanders were without familiar building materials and, as Shaw writes, they "emulated the style and construction methods of Maori dwellings and adapted them according to European ideas of hygiene and comfort."² Alternatively, Keith Sinclair suggested that it was colonial contact that created the pejorative view of Māori settlements as unsanitary, as early commercial trade drew Māori from established patterns found in traditional pā occupation. It is, I suggest, an understandable assumption on Shaw's part as a historiographer that he would want to portray a technologically-superior society - as the settlers undoubtedly were in many areas - meeting and embracing certain indigenous characteristics. This version of history implies the potential, if not expectation, of a bicultural synthesis: the hard-earned local knowledge of style and construction meets the cultural progress of cleanliness and sanitation and all else that this brings. Indeed, Shaw risks mythologising such potential. This, I suspect, is what

¹ "On 31 March 1841 the William Bryan anchored off Moturoa Beach at New Plymouth. Some of the 141 steerage passengers were said to be reluctant to disembark, even after the exigencies of a five-month voyage." Shaw *A History of New Zealand Architecture* p 14.

² Shaw *A History of New Zealand Architecture* p 14.

happens when we look at the past with an expectation of the present. Elsewhere in *New Zealand Architecture* Shaw makes a similar point about Te Papa. Acknowledging Clinton Bird's observation, regarding the lack of expressive Māori architectural form in our urban centres, Shaw describes the National Museum of New Zealand as a flawed but significant exception to this pattern.³ But how much significance should we place in such searches, and particularly so when they come from Pākehā? As Bennington has written, narratives of this kind are common to myths of national origins, apparent as the stories we tell of founding fathers and our genealogies of heroes.⁴ New Zealand in the 1860s is a particularly fertile field in this regard. It marks a period in New Zealand history when a land uncertain in conflict matured into a conditionally independent state looking for its own stories. A neglected part of this story, at least in architecture, is the price paid by Māori. In 1860 Wiremu Kīngi wrote "peace will not be made, I will continue to fight, and

³ Shaw draws upon an essay by Bird to reach this conclusion. Clinton "The invention of Urban Form in Post-Colonial Aotearoa/NZ."

⁴ Bennington "Postal Politics and the Institution of the Nation" p 121.

the Pakehas will be exterminated."⁵ By 1870 the fire of the New Zealand Land Wars was largely spent and along the way much if, not most, Māori land had passed into white ownership. At the end of the decade the settlers had, to paraphrase Michael King, taken control demographically, economically and politically, transforming the country in ways the tangata whenua could never have foreseen.⁶

It was, to understate it greatly, a decade of change in New Zealand that affected Māori far more than Pākehā, and I think this is a part of what Shaw find so irresistible about the raupō whare. In its expressive hybridity, of Pākehā form and Māori method, it can easily be presented as a sign of conditional unification. The raupō whare provides Shaw with an origin for architectural biculturalism, which he traces through *A History of New Zealand*, all the way to Te Papa in the book's dying pages.

Shaw begins this journey with the photograph titled "Raupō whare (c. 1860)," captioned to emphasise the European features – door and

⁵ Sinclair *A History of New Zealand* p 128.

⁶ King *The Penguin History of New Zealand* p 191.

window frames – but which also goes on to say that the material fabric consists of tied bundles of raupō "which European settlers were taught by the Maori."⁷

The scene set by Shaw is one of colonial collaboration and cultural cooperation. Newly landed settlers, confronted by an environment far less hospitable than they had expected, adopt and adapt a local typology using architectural elements they have brought with them, but with the support of Māori technology.

This is not to say the "raupō whare" was a popular or permanent accommodation. Typically, it was neither.⁸ Charles Hursthouse Jnr, for one, saw a cottage "in the native style" as temporary accommodation, good for only three to four years.⁹ Nonetheless Shaw creates the image of a nascent architectural biculturalism where settlers acknowledged the whare as an appropriate regional building

⁷ Shaw *A History of New Zealand Architecture* p 15.

⁸ Shaw cites Hursthouse's period view that a cottage "in the native style" was good for 3-4 years. Hursthouse quoted, Shaw *A History of New Zealand Architecture* p 15. See also Hursthouse *An Account of the Settlement of New Plymouth*.

⁹ Hursthouse quoted, Shaw *A History of New Zealand Architecture* p 15.

type and adopted its essential material form. The "raupō whare" is a cultural hybrid or, to invoke the recent work of Bill McKay,¹⁰ the mixed architectural genealogies mean it could also be described a half-caste house; both indigenous and imported, but not quite either.

To fully appreciate how fine the thread used to tie this image to a claim of mutual cultural interaction is, one needs to know that there is more to this photograph than - dare I say it - meets the eye.

The photograph published in Shaw, in general theme depicts a colonial cottage in a European pattern but which is realised in local materials and indigenous techniques, particularly the use of raupō for cladding. Sitting to one side of the doorway is a woman in Victorian dress. She holds a young child on her lap whose features are blurred by movement during the lengthy exposure time required. Nearby is a Victorian perambulator. The door is wide open but the darkness of the interior realm denies further intrusion. A link, perhaps, to Sarah Treadwell's observation on images of Rangiatea (the celebrated Māori church at Ōtaki, 1848-51) that "the blackness of the

¹⁰ McKay "Halfcaste or B.icultural"

interior looms up."¹¹ This image has no interior, just lace curtains hanging sullenly in the small windows. It is, without a doubt, an image of hardship, but, as Shaw recognizes, it implies a hardship that is the product of cultural exchange.

Elsewhere in the Alexander Turnbull Library (ATL), the original negative from which this reproduction was made is housed.¹² In this image the house is shown in a wider context that is not altogether flattering to a reading of successful settler adaptation. The extent of disarray in the garden is revealed. To the far right are three barrels suggesting an acceptance of an outdoor lifestyle not apparent in Shaw's cropped image. Finally, and most importantly for my reading, there is a dog kennel whose care in design and construction can be said to significantly eclipse that of the cottage. There is in this diminutive animal shelter an architectural authority not consistent with Shaw's version of biculturalism. It is elevated, has a different aspect, and is made to greater precision and of better materials. Given a chance (it seems to

¹¹ Treadwell "Rangiatea: Architecture between the Colonial and the Indigenous" p 23.

¹² Unidentified photographer "Raupo house near New Plymouth" ca 1860.

say) the settler would be much happier living in complete rejection of indigenous influence. This 1860s' dog house throws into doubt simplistic interpretations of the period. What was the status of the colonial dog, and what questions of architecture of this period does it pose? What conclusions can be drawn about colonial settlement in this period and the models it adopted? And - we must ask - what has become of the colonial dog that occupied such superior lodgings?

In researching this image further some evidence has presented itself that both clarifies and complicates the use of this photograph. The image published by Shaw is attributed to the ATL. The image I will be discussing is also drawn from the ATL. My assumption has been that they are from the same source in two versions: the original archival photograph and the edited reproduction in print. However, the ATL has not just these two versions of this photograph, each archived separately and with conflicting provenances.¹³

The photograph that includes the kennel is titled "Raupo House near New Plymouth" and

¹³ Collis "Raupo whare, Taranaki" 1875-85.

is dated ca 1860. It is described as a black and white negative and there can be no doubt that this is the complete image in its original form. It is also entered that the photographer is unknown. The archival description of the raupō whare published by Shaw is very different. It states that it is ca 1875 and 1885, and that the photographer was William Andrews Collis. I should state the problem here clearly. Shaw uses the latter image but he dates it to the former's entry description. Given his reliance upon the date of 1860 to establish the images role in New Zealand's emergent architectural history, this is a problem.

Even the difference in titles is confronting as the shift between "house" and "whare" is far more than semantic. In the first version raupō is simply a local building material applied to an imported colonial form. In the second version raupō reinforces a synthesis of material and form that defines an indigenous relationship over a foreign placement. The difference between "house" and "whare" transcends raupō as a cladding material and alludes instead to the authority of naming to direct historic interpretation. It is particularly so here, where it is presented as a crucial link in a formal historiography. Following the

thought of Carlo Ginzberg, the slippage between "house" and "whare" in this context conflates proof with rhetoric which, in itself, is not a problem for Ginzberg until we present the rhetoric in the guise of positivistic historiography.¹⁴ This is what Shaw does in calling his monograph *A History of New Zealand Architecture*.¹⁵

House to whare? A small point but an important one when constructing legitimated history. Shaw is unequivocal in dating "Raupo whare" to ca 1860, a period we might take to include 1855 to 1865 and thus the period of expansive colonisation in the Taranaki region. This timeline is exceedingly important for this image to act as visual evidence of Shaw's claim of bi-lateral dependence, and of architectural ambivalence between colonial settler and Māori.

What is extremely interesting to me is that Shaw uses the cropped image with correct title, but the date of the anonymous negative,

¹⁴ Ginzberg *History, Rhetoric, and Proof* p 57.

¹⁵ I would contrast this with David Mitchell's influential work on New Zealand Architecture, *The Elegant Shed*, as the best local example of what Ginzberg calls the rhetorical dimension of history. See Mitchell and Chaplin *The Elegant Shed*.

leading me to an uncomfortable conclusion that he knew of both entries and compiled an amalgam that best suited his historical reconstruction. The truth is probably far more ordinary.

Jeremy Salmond, who, in his earlier book *Old New Zealand Houses*, reproduces the raupō whare photograph in its entirety, attributes it correctly to the appropriate Turnbull description of c1860.¹⁶ "European needs and expectations" he writes "brought about a transformation of the traditional whare."¹⁷ I think this is where Shaw makes his error. That is, Shaw saw the significance of Salmond's point, but not the detail in the image, and when he sought it for publication he inadvertently selected the cropped reproduction. In the context of a national architectural history the presence, or not, of a dog kennel could be easily understood as neither here nor there. A small mistake but one with implications. It is Salmond who states that the first house in New Zealand for many settlers was a raupō one, but it needs to be emphasised that he is referring to the period up to 1860. Shaw, I contend, uses the

¹⁶ Salmond *Old New Zealand Houses: 1800-1940* p 30.

¹⁷ Salmond *Old New Zealand Houses: 1800-1940* p 30.

raupō whare to look into the 1860s in order to extend Salmond's work into a full-blown nationhood narrative, locating the raupō whare in the decade of dominion.

The weight placed on such detail can be higher than expected. Miles Lewis, an Australian architectural historian, conflates Shaw and Salmond in a document he distributes through his personal website, giving Rahotu Redoubt of ca 1860 as a "good example" of rush wall construction. Indeed, Lewis goes so far as to suggest that New Zealand examples of this technique may have been the inspiration for the appearance of brush walls and tī-tree fencing in Australia.¹⁸ Lewis depends upon the reliability of dating this image to 1860, and this assumption has now moved across the Tasman and slipped in some small way into Australia's architectural history.

So what, then, is the correct date of this modest cottage? We might expect that the larger image is the more authentic given that it must better represent the whole. But it is likely that the ATL received these images on separate occasions, from different sources,

¹⁸ Lewis "Australian-Building" P 2.06.10. ftnte 139.

and thus no chronological relationship can be assumed. In fact it is the cropped image that has the better archival description, identifying the photographer as Collis, who, we know, was the photographer who accompanied the occupation of Parihaka in 1881, and who would have been a child in the 1860s.

Without a sound provenance this is a very difficult image to date based on its content. Representations of raupō dwellings available in the ATL extend across 100 years, depicted in drawings of the 1840s through to photographs in the 1940s (in the case of isolated huts).

In order to make any more progress with this image I would like to focus on one part of it not disclosed in the cropped "1860s" version used by Shaw. Specifically, I will be returning to the significance of the kennel.

The ATL has, elsewhere in its photographic collection, a second, strikingly similar kennel. The photograph this one appears in is titled "House at Pukearuhe" and is date ca 1860s or 1870s. As with "Raupo House near New Plymouth," it depicts a house clad in raupō with a stark white kennel visible nearby. This image, too, is located at New Plymouth. I have

no direct evidence to support my next hypothesis, but I wish to make the claim that these two kennels are not just similar; they are in fact the same.

To lend credence to this speculation it is necessary to appreciate how neglected dogs were for provision against nature. One pioneer account from the beginning of the twentieth century mentions sawing sections off hollow tōtara logs to make dog houses¹⁹ (an early example of adaptive reuse that can be found in the Dog's galvanised water tank seen in Footrot Flats).

A portrait of a gold miner's log hut in Westport, taken in the 1880s, includes two dog houses (and two dogs). While rudimentary in form and crude in execution they nonetheless appear to surpass the quality of their owner's domicile. Models, perhaps, of what the diggers imagined a kennel should be in a time and place where dogs inside would have made little impact on domestic decorum.²⁰

¹⁹ See: "Hollow Log Kennels" n.p.

²⁰ See "Diggers Hut, Westport" ca 1880s. The place of the dog in New Zealand in the 1960s is not well documented. Cowan has an 1867 account, from Taranaki, of survey party dogs clashing with native dogs, prompting the comment that it was an unusual

Neither of these examples compares very well with the raupō kennel. In its simplified formality it carries the legacy of nineteenth-century English manor dog houses such as the one remaining at Igtham Mote, in Kent.²¹ The kennel, I am suggesting, is consistent with an English aspiration rather than any colonial reality, and in a thorough search of photographic archives I can find no other examples. The chance that two such kennels should appear at about the same time in about the same place seems an unreasonable

thing for native dogs to show so much "pluck." Cowan *The New Zealand Wars* p 533. In 1870 another surveyor, William Searancke, precipitated considerable cultural disharmony after the wooden memorial he had erected over the grave of a favorite dog was removed to be placed against the earthwork of Pōtatau Te Whereowhero's Ngāruawāhia tomb. This led to rumours that Searancke had buried his dog in the vacant tomb, to the offense of Māori. Maclean "Searancke, William Nicholas 1817?-1904" n.p. But outside such isolated anecdotes the place of the dog in colonial New Zealand is very much under-recorded.

²¹ The only Grade 1 listed dog house in the UK can be found in the courtyard of the fourteenth-century manor house of Igtham Mote, in Kent. Although nineteenth century in origin, this kennel is a fine example of how the house of the dog was perceived by the aristocracy as a version of their own manor. In architectural proportion and detail the kennel mimics the house behind it but proof that it was more than whimsy can be found in the chain ring still attached to the jam.

coincidence. In order to pursue this line of thought further it is necessary to persevere with the house at Pukearuhe.

We are told that this is the house of Captain William Bazire Messenger of the Taranaki Militia. The life of Messenger is documented due to his prominence as a soldier in New Zealand for 44 years, including his pursuit of Titokowaru between 1871 and 1872.²² In February, 1864, Messenger was given command of the Taranaki Military Settlers and charged with building blockhouses in the district, including the one at Pukearuhe, which involved levelling an ancient pā. It is tempting to date the image to this period but it is further complicated by Messenger's return to Pukearuhe, between 1873-76, due to unrest in the area.²³

The obvious timeline here is not helpful to this claim. The smaller, rougher house is ca 1860. The larger more refined house is somewhere between 1860 and the 1870s. Superficially this is what we might expect to find historically, as crude dwellings gave way to bigger and more sophisticated homes. However, it is not

²² Bairstow *Captain (late Colonel) William Bazire Messenger Taranaki Militia*.

²³ "Colonel W. B. Messenger" p 8.

obvious why one would build in such an elaborate fashion in raupō as late as 1870. And then there is the kennel. In the view of Messenger's house, it is to the fore but at odds with the home's entry, which faces the right of the frame. The gable of the kennel aligns with that of the porch, but it is relegated to one side and set back, retiring away from the façade. In the "Raupo House" image, to repeat my earlier description, the kennel precedes the façade, it is raised above the window line of the house and its sharp lines are a point of focus for the eye. In "House at Pukearuhe" the kennel is an accessory, complementing the domestic scene with a secondary animal dwelling that links the aspirations of the owners to lines of pedigree. In *Raupo House*, I suggest, the kennel is all that remains of this aspiration. Pushed to the fore, it is a symbolic gesture of colonial ambition unfulfilled.

The photographs themselves are not terribly reliable indicators. There is a general disregard apparent in the photograph "Raupo House" that one might interpret as consistent with breaking in a new land. Yet, generally, settler cottages (rather than huts driven by economic contingency) are remarkably domesticated in their appearance. In landscapes displaying the effects of

apocalyptic violence, settler cottages, and their families, are points of composed and calm, with well kept gardens and neat fences.²⁴

"House at Pukearuhe" is an example of this kind. While the wider surroundings are not visible, and the detritus of recent work is apparent, the overall effect of the scene is one of restrained order. The house itself is well made and of a sufficiently complex expression to suggest clear controls over the project. The chimneys are complicated contraptions and although the ponga fence is evocative of pā rather than English gardens, even here order prevails.

"Raupo House" is the opposite. The image is one of entropic decline. The house lacks rigour in its construction and proportions, and may well have been built in two stages judging by the shift in window line. The raupō lacks the fine finish in the "Pukearuhe" photograph, especially along the roof edge, and ponga log construction is apparent through the sparse cladding. The immediate landscape is dishevelled with poorly contrasted fencing, rough terracing and broken trees. The garden is not just

²⁴ See: "Pioneer Family" ATL G65619 ½

overgrown: it has gone to seed, in a phrase that might as well be a metaphor for the entire enterprise. Detail enlargements are telling on this account. A discarded shovel lies against the wall, its handle long gone. Next to it the Victorian three-wheeled perambulator shows social and material status, but its construction is completely unsuited to the hostile terrain. To the right of the female figure is a derelict chair. The remains of the uprights identify it as an English balloon-back chair popular from the mid-nineteenth century onward, although I believe that the plainness of the legs, and the pegged construction, identify it as a locally-made example, and in its dilapidated state it hints at middle-class ambition which has unravelled.

I am able to make this last point due to William Cottrell's magnificent work on New Zealand colonial furniture, where the "Raupo Whare" appears in a third form. Cottrell, like Shaw, uses it as a general illustration to show the improvised existence led by settlers.²⁵ He identifies it as Rahotu Redoubt c. 1865 but this is unlikely. As late as 1886 Rahotu is described as a "new district,"²⁶ and, while Fulton's 1881

²⁵ Cottrell *Furniture of the New Zealand Colonial Era* p 51.

This third version is catalogued as ATL F-111063-1/2

²⁶ "Rahotu: Parihaka Road Board" p 2.

drawing of the Rahotu Stockade shows raupō cottages, it is, even at this date, still very much a tent encampment.²⁷ Photographs available of the Rahotu camp show a military tent-town surrounding a heavily timbered perimeter fence. There are no obvious signs of established dwellings, gardens, or families. And, as Cowan has shown in his account of the New Zealand Wars, Rahotu was more a stockade than a redoubt, serving principally as a stepping stone in the campaign leading to Parihaka, which dates it to 1880.²⁸

Moreover, William Andrew Collis (who the ATL identify as the photograph of the "Raupo Whare" photograph used by Shaw) also photographed Rahotu redoubt in 1881. His image does show one significant raupō dwelling but is it not the one I am discussing here. To put it bluntly, Cottrell is wrong about the date and place, and his mistake highlights the desire amongst historians to classify the raupō whare as an intermediary architecture, transitioning settlers from the immediacy of their arrival to ownership of their own piece of land.

²⁷ See: Fulton "Rahotu stockade" (ca. 1881).

²⁸ Cowan *The Maoris of New Zealand* p 484.

In preparing this paper it was my initial hypothesis that Shaw purposefully cropped "Raupo Whare" to "un-complicate" it from the formal attributes of the dog house, and thereby give a consistent image of this intermediate architecture. The history of Messenger at Pukearuhe presents an entirely different interpretation of the raupō whare in colonial New Zealand.

To show this alternative version I wish to compare two archival images that are identified as Pukearuhe. The first, which I have already discussed, is identified as the home of William Messenger and family, circa 1860-80s.²⁹ The second is a fine drawing by Philip Walsh, dated to August 30, 1875.³⁰ This later image is described as a large wooden and raupō house with bay window and verenday (sic), and as being "almost certainly" the home of Australian botanical artist,

²⁹ See "House at Pukearuhe" (ca 1860s or 1870s).

³⁰ See "Taranaki [Pukearuhe]" (Aug. 30 1875). "Shows part of a large wooden and raupo thatched roofed house on the foreshore, with the Pukearuhe cliffs beyond. The house is single-storeyed with a bay window and a veranday and was almost certainly the house occupied by Marion Ellis Rowan and her husband, 1873-77, while the 43rd Regiment was stationed at Pukearuhe. The house was close to the Pukearuhe Redoubt." ATL Ref: E-359-041.

Marion Ellis Rowan, and her husband, Captain Charles Rowan, between 1873 and 1877. Placed side by side there is little to suggest a direct relationship between these two houses. Both appear sizable but the one in the photograph is less refined and more reliant upon local materials and techniques, and it is partially hidden behind the protection of the ponga palisade. The drawing, in contrast, depicts a home of some pretension with its bay window and the promise of prospect that lies beyond it. The first is a dwelling crouching from immediate danger. The second has a distinctly more defiant stance. And, of course, they are attributed to two different families. The Messengers in the former, the Rowan's in the latter.

It is a fortuitous turn of research fate that William Messenger's second born son, Frank, became an architect. In his book on Frank Messenger's architectural work, Ian Pritchard makes mention of the family living at Pukearuhe, and he includes two illustrations that are of interest here.³¹

³¹ "The original Raupo whare at Pukearuhe. Note the bay window to the right and steel chimney stack." Pritchard *Frank Messenger* p 9.

Pritchard describes the first photograph as the "original whare" and asks that we note the bay window and steel chimney, and here lies the interesting paradox. The chimney, and the pattern of the raupō dwelling, are clearly that of the Messenger House, albeit at an earlier state of occupation judging by the disorganisation of the immediate surrounds. But the bay window is, in my view of it, recognisably the view drawn by Walsh. It shows the same shaped thatched roof and architectural proportions. An identical double gable in raupō is visible. The second drawing, ostensibly in Pritchard's reading a "replacement," is actually, I believe, the same house re-clad in timber, suggesting that that the original dwelling had been built on a milled timber rather than ponga trunk balloon frame, giving it considerably more endurance.³²

The only inconsistency in this interpretation is that in the drawing only a single gable is apparent. I suggest that the reason for this is most pragmatic but intriguing. If one imagines how impossible it would have been

³² "The original whare was replaced with a more substantial timber dwelling. From a sketch made in 1901, when Sergeant Gilbert occupied the home." Pritchard *Frank Messenger* p 8.

to have a watertight internal gutter in raupō the notion of a double-gable dwelling becomes highly impractical. What appears to be one large double gabled house in the photograph is, I think, two single gables built very close together, one belonging to the Messengers, and the other to the Rowans. I suggest that the difficulty of re-cladding between the houses later in their lives resulted in one being removed and the other extended with the second wing apparent in the 1901 sketch.

It is my hypothesis that the kennel locates the raupō whare to Pukearuhe about the time the Rowans lived there (1873-77). This is well beyond the 1860s implied by Shaw. The military significance of Pukearuhe faded into the relative peace in Taranaki in the 1880s. In a photograph from that period by Burton Brothers, a colonial soldier peers northward along the Taranaki coast.³³ Behind him a small white gable roof intrudes into the scene from the top of a gully. I think we should take this to be the last resting place of our colonial dog house. In the relative calm of the 1880s it has become redundant, along with the camp it

³³ See Burton Brothers Photography Studio. "Paranini, from Pukearuhe, or White Cliffs" (ca 1880s).

came from.

If you accept my premise that the dog house locates the raupō whare then we can draw some conclusions. By the 1860s raupō structures were already uncommon as permanent dwelling. Photographs of New Plymouth in the 1860s (as just one example) show a small but dense township built in milled timber. Indeed, The Raupo Act, of 1842, formalised a political reaction against raupō dwellings, on the grounds that they posed a high fire risk to new timber towns. I wonder if it might be the case that they also posed a culture risk as residual artifacts of Māori settlement?³⁴ Whatever the case, by the 1860s the most likely place to find a raupō dwelling was in a military outpost. The reasons for this are apparent: timber was expensive and military housing was temporary. In this the raupō whare was an instrument of colonial occupation and military violence, situated, architecturally, between the mobility of the bell tent and the stability of the redoubt. This is a vastly different reading to the one given by Shaw, who wishes that the raupō whare stand as a

symbol of bicultural architectural origins. It does this, but it is not the story of benign mediation Shaw describes. The raupō whare I began with is a not an image of benign cultural compromise for an emergent society but is actually an active agent of colonial warfare.

Unfortunately, this does not get me any closer to my initial question: what of the dog that once occupied this kennel? A possibility lies in yet another archival photograph. This one depicts a line of seven soldiers facing the camera, with an eighth apparently preparing a keg. The dress of the men, and the detail on the blockhouse behind them, lends strong support to the claim that these are members of No 9 Company Taranaki Military Settlers, ca 1864-66, at Pukearuhe.³⁵ What makes it so interesting as an image is the large pale animal that lies at their feet. This, I contend, is the missing dog. But what of the occasion? Perhaps the dog is just sleeping, but why photograph it so, and why the keg? No, it is clear to me: the men are mourning, the dog is dead, and the kennel was never anything more than an ornament in a martial garden.

³⁴ See: "Raupo Act" p 2. "Raupo House Ordinance" p 2. "New Plymouth, October 2, 1858" p 2.

³⁵ See "No 9 Company Taranaki Military Settlers" (1864-66).

REFERENCES

- Bairstow, Aubrey *Captain (late Colonel) William Bazire Messenger Taranaki Militia, also Bush Rangers, Armed Constabulary, NZ Militia and 10th NZ Contingent*. www.diggerhistory.info/pages-heroes/messenger.htm. Accessed 01 November 2010.
- Bennington, Geoffrey "Postal Politics and the Institution of the Nation" Homi K. Bhabha (ed) *Nation and Narration* London and New York: Routledge, 1990:121-137.
- Bird, Clinton "The invention of Urban Form in Post-Colonial Aotearoa/NZ" Unpublished paper, School of Architecture, 1992.
- "Colonel W. B. Messenger." *Evening Post* (10 December 1922):8.
- Cottrell, William *Furniture of the New Zealand Colonial Era: An Illustrated History 1830-1900* Auckland: Reed, 2006.
- Cowan, James *The Maoris of New Zealand* Christchurch, Wellington, and Dunedin: Whitcombe and Tombs Limited, 1910.
- Cowan, James *The New Zealand Wars: A History of the Maori Campaigns and the Pioneering Period Vol II: The Hauhau Wars, 1864-1872* Wellington: R. E. Owen, Government Printer 1956.
- Ginzberg, Carlo *History, Rhetoric, and Proof: The Menahem Stern Jerusalem Lectures* Hanover and London: University Press of New England, 1999.
- "Hollow Log Kennels" *Campbell Family Stories* <http://awarua.gen.nz/stories.html> Accessed 1 October 2010.
- Hursthouse, Charles *An Account of the Settlement of New Plymouth* Christchurch: Capper Press, 1975.
- King, Michael *The Penguin History of New Zealand* Auckland: Penguin Books, 2003.
- Lewis, Miles "Australian-Bulding" www.mileslewis.net/australian-building/pdf/timber-grass/timber'grass-thatch.pdf. Accessed 5 November 2010.
- McKay, Bill "Halfcaste or Bicultural: John Scott, Maori and Architecture in the 1960s" Terrance McMinn, John Stephens and Steve Basson (eds) *SAHANZ 2006: Contested Terrains* Perth, Australia: Society of Architectural Historians, Australia and New Zealand, 2006:363-69
- Maclean, Sally "Searancke, William Nicholas 1817?-1904." *Dictionary of New Zealand Biography*. www.dnzb.co.nz. Accessed 4 November, 2010.
- Mitchell, David, and Gillian Chaplin. *The Elegant Shed: New Zealand Architecture since 1945*. Auckland: Oxford University Press, 1984.
- "New Plymouth, October 2, 1858" *The Taranaki Herald* (2 October, 1858):2.
- Pritchard, Ian *Frank Messenger: The Work of a New Plymouth Architect*. New Plymouth: Ian Pritchard 1994.
- "Rahotu: Parihaka Road Board" *Hawera & Normanby Star* (21 December 1886):2.
- "Raupo Act" *New Zealand Gazette and Wellington Spectator* (27 December 1843) IV(310):2.
- "Raupo House Ordinance" *New Zealand Gazette and Wellington Spectator* (22 February 1843) III(222): 2.
- Salmond, Jeremy *Old New Zealand Houses: 1800-1940*. Auckland: Heinemann Reed, 1986.
- Shaw, Peter *A History of New Zealand Architecture* Auckland: Hodder Moa Beckett, 2003.
- Sinclair, Keith *A History of New Zealand*. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Books Ltd, 1951.
- Treadwell, Sarah "Rangiatea: Architecture between the Colonial and the Indigenous" *Fabrications: The Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians, Australia and New Zealand* (1991) 2(3):19-34.

PHOTOGRAPHS

Burton Brothers Photography Studio. "Paranini, from Pukearuhe, or White Cliffs" (ca 1880s) Te Papa National Museum of New Zealand.

Registration Number: C.013463

Collis, William Andrews (of New Plymouth) "Raupo whare, Taranaki" 1875-85. Alexander Turnbull Library ID: PA1-q-183-25-2

"Diggers Hut, Westport" ca 1880s. Alexander Turnbull Library PAColl-4346-1-4.

Fulton, W. W. "Rahotu stockade" (ca. 1881) Reference Number:

Alexander Turnbull Library A-081-010.

"No 9 Company Taranaki Military Settlers" (1864-66) Puke Ariki Museum Accession No. PHO2009-118.

"Taranaki [Pukearuhe]" (Aug. 30 1875) Philip Walsh. Alexander Turnbull Library E-359-041.

Unidentified photographer. "House at Pukearuhe" (ca 1860s or 1870s)

Alexander Turnbull Library PA1-q-092-08.

Unidentified photographer. "Raupo house near New Plymouth" ca 1860.

Alexander Turnbull Library ID: 1/2-011751-F