



<http://researchspace.auckland.ac.nz>

ResearchSpace@Auckland

Copyright Statement

The digital copy of this thesis is protected by the Copyright Act 1994 (New Zealand).

This thesis may be consulted by you, provided you comply with the provisions of the Act and the following conditions of use:

- Any use you make of these documents or images must be for research or private study purposes only, and you may not make them available to any other person.
- Authors control the copyright of their thesis. You will recognise the author's right to be identified as the author of this thesis, and due acknowledgement will be made to the author where appropriate.
- You will obtain the author's permission before publishing any material from their thesis.

To request permissions please use the Feedback form on our webpage.

<http://researchspace.auckland.ac.nz/feedback>

General copyright and disclaimer

In addition to the above conditions, authors give their consent for the digital copy of their work to be used subject to the conditions specified on the Library Thesis Consent Form.

Myth, Symbol, Ornament: the Loss of Meaning in Transition

Anna-Christina Engels-Schwarzpaul

A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy in Education and Art History, The University of Auckland

© A. - Chr. Engels-Schwarzpaul 2001
and, for verbatim quotes from interviews, the research participants

Abstract

How meaning is articulated, suggested or repressed in transition processes is an inherently social phenomenon. The history of theorising about ornament bears evidence to this as much as do current practices of ornamentation. From myths, as narratives of meaning, to 'mere ornament' – the various signifying practices (and forms of life within which they take place) determine how meaning changes. People will perceive such change differently, depending on their perspectives and circumstances and, under certain conditions, change can be conceived of as loss.

This thesis, in its theoretical part, explores issues pertaining to meaning and ornament in epistemology, philosophy, sociology, semiotics, aesthetics and psychoanalysis. In its practical part it seeks to make connections with signifying practices involving ornament in the life-worlds of users, the use of ornament in public buildings, bicultural relationships involving appropriation or misappropriation, and the education of designers in New Zealand. For that, data derived from four empirical research projects are presented and theorised. In the fourth part, theories and practices are brought together to shed light on struggles with ornamental meaning in the past and in the present.

Theories, with their classification of myths, symbols and ornament, ignore wide ranges of signifying practices and privilege some form of significations at the expense of others. Because of their separation from the language-games and forms of life of ornamental practice, they often fail to grasp issues that are important to non-theorists. All the research projects demonstrated that the large majority of participants like and relate to ornament. They also showed, however, that Pakeha traditions of ornament are not only perceived to have suffered the same historical rupture as those in the West but also that the theoretical discreditation upon which they were based was used as a tool of oppression when applied to Maori art.

Attempts to explain bicultural practices of appropriation or misappropriation without reference to the history of colonisation and present power configurations must fail. Whether or not a cultural image retains or loses its meaning depends on factors such as knowledge, understanding, relationality and co-operation. If culture is, however, treated as a resource for commodification – as it is by the culture industries – cultural elements are subjected to rules inherent in marketing and capitalist economies and their meaning is deliberately changed. Those who ought to be able to deal competently with these issues (designers and other cultural intermediaries) receive little in their education to prepare them for the ornamental strategies and tactics of their future clients. The academic environment is still largely determined by modernist agendas, and ornament – as a topic and as practice – continues to be repressed.

If a meaningful ornamental language and practice relevant to Aotearoa is to be shared, created, and sustained the divisions between theory and the life-world need to be interrogated; the distance through an assumed superiority of Pakeha to Maori history, culture and people relinquished; and a type of conversation must commence that takes seriously the Treaty of Waitangi as the founding document of this country. The partnership concept of this document facilitates conversation about differential positions and rules and can 'take us out of our old selves by the power of strangeness, to aid us in becoming new beings' (Rorty, 1980: 289).

Acknowledgements

Mo Anni Engels me Sophie Kaa

For Sophie Kaa and Anni Engels

Over the years, many individuals and groups have had considerable input into my thesis project. Firstly, I would like to thank all those people who have mentored me in coming to an understanding of the subject matter and its background. Some of them have passed away but their presence continues.

In particular, I would like to acknowledge the guidance provided by formal and informal supervisors and supporters. Michael Peters, as first supervisor, has been continuously empathetic and encouraging, never directly steering me but providing me with possibilities and choices. The confidence he placed in me often motivated me when I was starting to doubt the value of my work. Len Bell, as second supervisor, was not only an interested observer but supplied me with valuable 'devil's advocate' arguments that caused me to dig deeper when I was in danger of sweeping over particularities. Mel Whaanga, co-researcher in one of the empirical projects, has continued to accompany me as supporter since then and has provided me with an environment in which I could test and develop my theoretical hunches in bicultural matters. Geographically further away, but nevertheless consistently there, Bob Jahnke has acted as an external advisor on whose judgement and knowledge – as well as frankness and humour – I have always been able to rely. Alex Davidson and Peter Rutland have challenged me, as supervisors of empirical projects, with their different kinds of knowledge and expertise and helped me to maintain focus.

A number of participants in the research projects subsequently took on the role of mentors. It is moving and rewarding if people continue to stay in contact and take an interest in the progression of one's work of their own accord. Similarly Ngawai Simpson, who took care of most of the data input, has shared her impressions with me, and challenged and stimulated my thoughts. Nicci Loader, who was just supposed to proof-read, went much further and provided editing that sometimes helped reveal ideas still hiding between the lines.

I am very grateful to those of my personal friends who have chosen to share in my research interests and who have been important listeners and disputants all along the way, particularly Lucy Holmes and Pefi Kingi (who will soon complete their own theses). How can I even start to thank my father, Wiebke, Wilm, Levin, Tame, Babs and Charl?

Many other people have influenced my work considerably, who will know of my gratitude even though their names are not mentioned here. I hope that my efforts honour the support I have so generously been given, and that this thesis is a contribution to a process we all care about.



I cannot say, to be sure, whether it is going to get better if it changes. However, this much I can say; things need to change if good is to come of it.¹

¹ 'Georg Christoph Lichtenberg (b. July 1, 1742, Ober-Ramstadt, near Darmstadt, Hesse [Germany]--d. Feb. 24, 1799, Göttingen, Hanover), German physicist and satirical writer, best known for his ridicule of metaphysical and romantic excesses.' (1997b)

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|------------|
| Part One: Passageways | 1 |
| <i>I Approaching</i> | <i>1</i> |
| <i>II Positioning</i> | <i>9</i> |
| 1 Relations out of which the research arises | 10 |
| 2 Rules and conditions of its production | 14 |
| <i>III Mapping</i> | <i>18</i> |
| 1 Research and reality | 18 |
| 1.1 <i>The limits of disciplines</i> | <i>24</i> |
| 1.2 <i>Theories and 'data'</i> | <i>26</i> |
| 2 Strategies and decisions | 29 |
| 3 Reporting and editing | 34 |
| 3.1 <i>Principal issues of accountability</i> | <i>34</i> |
| 3.2 <i>Writing styles</i> | <i>35</i> |
| 4 Concepts and definitions | 39 |
| 4.1 <i>Key terms around the subject area</i> | <i>43</i> |
| 4.2 <i>Models as abstractions from life</i> | <i>51</i> |
| <i>IV Implementing</i> | <i>59</i> |
| 1 The projects | 60 |
| 2 Research methods | 62 |
| 3 Integration of research into PhD thesis | 67 |
| Part Two: The place of theories | 68 |
| <i>V Contingency of knowledge</i> | <i>69</i> |
| 1 Science and the life-world | 75 |
| 1.1 <i>Scientific and common sense knowledge</i> | <i>75</i> |
| 1.2 <i>Social Representations</i> | <i>78</i> |
| 1.3 <i>Socialisation and Professionalisation</i> | <i>80</i> |
| 1.4 <i>Control and classification of knowledge</i> | <i>83</i> |
| 2 Marginalisation of knowledge: ornament – a problematic topic | 87 |
| 2.1 <i>Desymbolisation of knowledges</i> | <i>89</i> |
| 2.2 <i>Rationalisation and mimesis</i> | <i>92</i> |
| 2.3 <i>Discursive and non-discursive reasoning</i> | <i>96</i> |
| <i>VI Myth and Meaning</i> | <i>97</i> |
| 1 Meaning | 98 |
| 1.1 <i>Accounts of meaning</i> | <i>98</i> |
| 1.2 <i>Loss and recovery of meaning</i> | <i>105</i> |
| 2 Myths | 112 |
| 2.1 <i>Perspectives on myth</i> | <i>113</i> |

| | | |
|------|--|------------|
| 2.2 | <i>Myth in use</i> | 118 |
| VII | <i>Symbol and Ornament</i> | 126 |
| 1 | Semiotics | 126 |
| 1.1 | <i>On the margins of mastery</i> | 128 |
| 1.2 | <i>Interfaces of meaning</i> | 134 |
| 1.3 | <i>The context of practices: rules and codes</i> | 141 |
| 1.4 | <i>Units and lexica</i> | 142 |
| 1.5 | <i>Words and images</i> | 143 |
| 1.6 | <i>Signs and symbols</i> | 146 |
| 1.7 | <i>Allegory and metaphor</i> | 150 |
| 2 | Aesthetics | 153 |
| 2.1 | <i>Classifications of ornament</i> | 154 |
| 2.2 | <i>Ornamental content: semantics</i> | 157 |
| 2.3 | <i>Ornamental rules: syntax</i> | 170 |
| 2.4 | <i>Ornamental use: pragmatics</i> | 180 |
| VIII | <i>Transition and Change</i> | 203 |
| 1 | Modes of perception | 204 |
| 2 | Tradition and Modernisation | 208 |
| 2.1 | <i>The process of civilisation</i> | 209 |
| 2.2 | <i>Modernisation and detraditionalisation</i> | 211 |
| 3 | Colonisation and Globalisation | 218 |
| 3.1 | <i>Globalisation and commodification</i> | 225 |
| 3.2 | <i>Maori culture and the aesthetisation of commercial life</i> | 231 |
| | Part Three: The time of practices | 239 |
| IX | <i>Practices of everyday life</i> | 239 |
| 1 | Users and the system | 240 |
| 2 | Users' relationship with ornamentation | 242 |
| 3 | Production and consumption | 244 |
| 4 | Positions of cultures | 249 |
| 5 | Ornamental practices | 257 |
| 5.1 | <i>Bricolage: interrogating what is at hand</i> | 259 |
| 5.2 | <i>Construction and maintenance of biographies</i> | 264 |
| 6 | Ornamental tactics | 269 |
| 6.1 | <i>Consensus or conflict of meaning</i> | 272 |
| 6.2 | <i>Actualisation and loss of meaning</i> | 276 |
| X | <i>Signifying practices and the use of culture</i> | 278 |
| 1 | Signifying practices in New Zealand | 280 |
| 2 | The use of ornament in public buildings | 281 |
| 2.1 | <i>Styles as means of persuasion</i> | 284 |
| 2.2 | <i>Transition processes</i> | 292 |
| 2.3 | <i>Stories of identity and community</i> | 305 |

| | | |
|-------------------|---|------------|
| 3 | The use of Maori cultural images by non-Maori in design | 312 |
| 3.1 | <i>The scaffolding of discourses</i> | 315 |
| 3.2 | <i>Theories in practice</i> | 334 |
| XI | <i>Rites of passage in design education</i> | 363 |
| 1 | Education: a phase of transition | 365 |
| 1.1 | <i>Knowledge construction in education</i> | 366 |
| 1.2 | <i>The theory/practice interface in design education</i> | 371 |
| 2 | Ornament as cultural practice in design education | 377 |
| 2.1 | <i>Students' use of ornament</i> | 378 |
| 2.2 | <i>The educational context</i> | 387 |
| 3 | Emergent theories and the gap between theory and design practice | 393 |
| Part Four: | At the end a beginning | 397 |
| XII | <i>Classifications and exclusions</i> | 399 |
| XIII | <i>Spheres of life</i> | 401 |
| 1 | Cultural boundaries and crossovers | 404 |
| 2 | Use and consumption | 410 |
| 3 | Cultural intermediaries | 414 |
| XIV | <i>The work of culture</i> | 418 |
| Part Five: | Appendices | 427 |
| 1 | Glossary | 427 |
| 2 | Bibliography | 429 |
| 3 | List of Illustrations | 451 |
| 4 | The Treaty of Waitangi - Tiriti o Waitangi (full text) | 457 |
| | <i>Further appendices on separate CD_ROM, for an overview see page</i> | 427 |