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Abstract

George Wēpiha Melbourne was one of the last Tūhoe (tribal iwi) whare tūpuna (ancestral house) architects. His works included: Kura Mihi Rangi, a wharepuni at Te Rewarewa Marae in Rūātoki, and Hiona (also known as Te Whare Kawana) at Maungapohatu, one of the most recognisable buildings in ‘Māori’ architecture.

At present, there is no comprehensive analysis of a hapū architecture. George Wēpiha Melbourne is of Te Māhurehure hapū, making his work a significant starting point in the study of architecture rooted in a hapū-specific context.

To explore the events that likely influenced George Melbourne’s works, this paper investigates a Tūhoe and Te Māhurehure history through the socio-relational and geographic lens of a selected George Wēpiha Melbourne whakapapa line. From this position of shared identity, elements of a hapū-focused architecture will be stipulated, thereby allowing for the works of George Wēpiha Melbourne to be studied and presented accordingly in this paper.

Whakatupunga: Introductory Cultivation

Matemateāone is a phrase specific to Tūhoe. It describes an affectionate relationship Tūhoe have with one another and their whenūa (a binary [spiritual and physical] relationship to a place). This paper investigates architecture from a Tūhoe and Te Māhurehure kaupapa (approach) based on a specific whakapapa. Matemateāone grounds the position of this work within a Tūhoe dialect from the start, thereby allowing the boundaries of Te Māhurehure within this work to be organised by the selected whakapapa line presented in the “Ngā Paia/The Roots: An Investigation of a Tūhoe and Te Māhurehure History through a George Wēpiha Melbourne Whakapapa” section of this paper.

Before a general outline of this paper is introduced, the terms Te Ao Māori, whakapapa, hapū, whare tūpuna and Māori architecture will be presented to ensure a greater level of shared
understanding. As there are many variations to these terms, the extent to which they are presented here is simply for the use of this paper.

In her text *Māori Philosophy: Indigenous Thinking from Aotearoa*, Georgina Stewart (Ngāpuhi) perceives ‘Te Ao Māori’ in two senses. The first is the ‘traditional Māori world’ that Stewart describes as being the Māori world frozen in time by colonisation. The second sense is the Māori world that has and will continue to evolve under the influence of everything that has happened since colonisation.¹ Stewart’s kōrero (discussion) is the cornerstone of how Te Ao Māori will be understood in this work.

Hirini Moko Mead (Ngāti Awa, Ngāti Tūwharetoa, Tūhoe and Tūhourangi), in *Tikanga Māori: Living by Māori Values*, affirms ‘whakapapa’ as an enduring element that connects all ecologies within Te Ao Māori.² Similarly, Stewart describes whakapapa as a guide to world and human behaviours by viewing the world as a genealogical model that provides an ethical basis for the relationship between nature and people (whānaungatanga [kinship] and kaitiakitanga [guardianship]).³ In *Tikanga Whakaaro: Key concept in Māori Culture*, Cleve Barlow describes whakapapa as the genealogical descent of all living things from the gods to the present. These bigger concepts of whakapapa provide context to the approximated English translations of whakapapa. Genealogy, for example, is not restricted to human lineage within a whakapapa context. Another translation of whakapapa is to ‘lay on top of another’ or ‘stacking’, which could suggest a vertical component, possibly referencing the Papatuanuku (earth mother) and Ranginui (sky father) separation narrative, which would affirm Barlow’s position. Drawing from the above kōrero, this work understands whakapapa as an evolving spatial axis of socio-geographic connections.

![Figure 1. Whakapapa. From left, the blue illustration indicates ongoing Whakawhanaungatanga (kinship). The yellow illustration indicates Wā (place) specific to whakawhanaungatanga. The green illustrates Whakapapa in the context of this work (Whakawhanaungatanga + Wā): evolving spatial axis of socio–geographic connections (Amber Ruckes, 2022).](image-url)
As this work is centred on a hapū analysis of architecture, the parameters of hapū must be outlined. Mead explains that a hapū generally consists of more than one whānau (family group), with whakapapa being the binding agent connecting the whānau units. Mead goes on to say that hapū was used as a metaphor by our tūpuna for pregnancy which asserts all members of a hapū are born of the same womb. Today, a hapū can be found within a hapū, sometimes due to political boundaries that intersect an iwi or hapū territory. In other cases, it is simply a result of population growth or migration from rural to urban centres. Leonie Pihama (Te Atiawa, Ngāti Mahanga and Nga Mahanga a Tairi) notes that the Treaty of Waitangi settlement process has favoured iwi, consequently marginalising hapū and whānau, and in doing so, giving more contemporary prominence, especially within mainstream environments, to iwi. This work perceives hapū as a reconstitution of whakapapa at a smaller scale. The union between George Wēpiha Melbourne and Hinematioro Te Purewa will define the hapū scope of this work. This union will be explained further in “Ngā Paia/The Roots: An Investigation of Tūhoe and Te Māhurehure History through a George Wēpiha Melbourne Whakapapa.”

The term ‘whare tūpuna’ will be understood both as an ancestral meeting house and an extension of the lived tūpuna (ancestor) of which the house is named. Though some whare tūpuna have carved elements, ethnographer Elsdon Best outlines an Io (Supreme being) narrative, stating that Whare-kura, a replica of the temple of the same name at Maraenui, Rangi-parauri (the third heave if ascending), was the first house constructed on Papatuanuku. The decorative designs of Whare-kura were said to be painted not carved. George Wēpiha Melbourne’s works are predominantly painted. Hence the definition of whare tūpuna within this work is anchored to suit.
Expanding on the above ideas of whare tūpuna, in *Speaking to and Talking about Māori Architecture*, Michael Linzey highlights that when “talking about” Māori architecture, we are standing in a European mindset. However, when we are “speaking to” Māori architecture, we are coming from the position of the orator who is standing on a marae and is speaking to the whare tūpuna. Linzey expresses that “talking about” and “speaking to” are two distinctly different ways of understanding architecture. In “speaking to” a whare tūpuna is not like an ancestor, it is an ancestor. Rau Hoskins’ (Ngāti Hau, Ngāpuhi) understanding of Māori architecture is anything involving a Māori client with a Māori focus. Robin Skinner notes when discussing Māori architecture that Māori buildings tended to be understood as simple responses to the material, climate and society. Deidre Brown (Ngāpuhi, Ngāti Kahu) grounds Māori architecture in a reputation founded on changing, rather than static, traditions, with multiple development strands that sometimes compete with each other.

Prioritising a “speaking to” approach, Māori architecture will be understood as a physical genealogical manifestation experienced from a simultaneously reflecting and evolving Te Ao Māori. Hence Māori architecture is also both a building and a body. Brown’s whakāro (thinking), specifically “multiple strands of development,” aligns with Mead’s hapū kaupapa of multiple whānau units connected through whakapapa.

Finally, George Wēpiha Melbourne will be abbreviated down to “Melbourne” moving forward. All other persons with the name Melbourne will be stated in full. For example, James Melbourne.
At present, there is no comprehensive analysis of hapū architecture. This paper aims to demonstrate what a preliminary hapū architectural typology could be. Melbourne is of Te Māhurehure hapū, making his work a significant starting point in the study of architecture rooted in a hapū-specific context.

This paper will first aim to locate the reader. In “Ngā Paia/The Roots: An Investigation of a Tūhoe and Te Māhurehure History through a George Wēpiha Melbourne Whakapapa,” a brief outline of selected events occurring in the Tūhoe rohe (region) at the time of Melbourne’s birth, upbringing, and culminating with his marriage to Hinematioro Te Purewa, will be stated. Running in parallel to these events, Melbourne’s direct whakapapa from James Melbourne (father) and Peata Motoi (mother) through to myself will be presented. The primary focus of this section is to present the hapū parameters of this work.

“He Rākau/A Tree: The Intersection between Whakapapa and Architecture” begins by exploring the roles of “Tohunga Whakairo” and “architect.” Tohunga Whakairo will be discussed with specific reference to Melbourne’s whakapapa as outlined in “Ngā Paia/The Roots” and will outline Melbourne’s likely influences foreshadowing his design skill and processes. “He Rākau/A Tree” will conclude by introducing the architectural works of importance relative to the socio-geographic relationships celebrated in “Ngā Paia/The Roots.”

“He Wao/A Forest: A Hapū Architecture” aims to critically reflect on the works presented in “He Rākau/A Tree,” outlining a hapū architecture typology through the evolution of selected works by Melbourne. “He Wao/A Forest” will conclude by reflecting on how a Melbourne hapū kaupapa is situated with more recent architectural works in Tūhoe and Te Māhurehure.

Finally, “Whakatiputipu te Maunga/Raising the Mountain: Concluding Comments and Ongoing Work” will conclude the kaupapa of this work by reflecting on the work presented and possible challenges that lie ahead in future studies within this topic.
Ngā Paia/The Roots: An Investigation of a Tūhoe and Te Māhurehure History through a George Wēpiha Melbourne Whakapapa

Figure 4. Locating George Wēpiha Melbourne within Aotearoa – New Zealand (Amber Ruckes, 2022).

Melbourne was born in 1867 in Whakatāne to James Melbourne and Peata Motoi. Melbourne’s Whakatāne birth places Melbourne in a Ngāti Awa (iwi), and Ngāti Hokopu (hapū) territory, a neighbouring iwi with genealogical connections to Tūhoe.

James Melbourne and Peata Motoi married in Rūātoki (a district within the Tūhoe rohe) likely in early 1865. An account notes that Reverend Carl Volkner performed the marriage ceremony between James Melbourne and Peata Motoi. Volkner, a German-born Anglican missionary, was stationed in Ōpōtiki in Whakatōhea (iwi) territory. In her text Encircled Lands: Te Urewera, 1820-1921, Judith Binney notes that Whakatōhea and Ngāti Awa knew Volkner was acting as an informant for the government. Binney suggests that Volkner’s two roles were in conflict, and as a result was warned not to return to Ōpōtiki following a visit to Auckland in February 1865.

Kereopa Te Rau of Ngāti Rangiwewehi (a hapū of the Te Arawa iwi) and Patara Te Raukaturi, representatives of Pai Mārire (Good and Peaceful) the movement were sent to Ōpōtiki in 1865 by Te Ua Haumene (Pai Mārire leader). Binney states that the teachings of Haumene were grounded in future liberation from colonial forces. Te Rau and Te Raukaturi placed a kati (blockage) in the Ōpōtiki region with the aim of stopping Volkner’s return. Volkner arrived back in Ōpōtiki on 1 March, and though Te Rau singled out Volkner, a collective decision was made by a rūnanga (self-governing Māori district council) to execute Volkner that same evening.
Volkner’s execution was taken as evidence of Tūhoe, Ngāti Awa and Whakatōhea political rebellion by the government. Volkner’s connection to Melbourne, through his parent's marriage, contextualises Melbourne’s whakapapa in the wider events occurring in Tūhoe, Ngāti Awa and Whakatōhea rohe of the time.

The death of James Te Mautaranui Fulloon, only months after Volkner’s death, prompted a more aggressive response from the government. Fulloon was not only Governor Grey’s personal interpreter, but he also had whakapapa to Tūhoe and was a cousin to Wēpīha Apanui, one of the last Ariki (high chiefs) and Tohunga Whakairo of Ngāti Awa. Fulloon was promoted to captain in the military in 1865 following a government-sponsored visit to Whakatāne and Ōpotiki. Fulloon was searching for information on Te Rau but was unsuccessful. This led to more ambitious military plans for the Ngāti Awa, Tūhoe and Whakatōhea rohe by Fulloon, ultimately leading to his death. The government imposed martial law and set its forces to invade Ngāti Awa, Tūhoe and Whakatōhea rohe as a response. Tūhoe insisted that they played no part in Fulloon’s death as he was one of them. The same can be said for Apanui and Ngāti Awa. The government’s response overwhelmed Tūhoe and Ngāti Awa.

Focusing on Tūhoe, the 1866 land confiscations, as a part of the government’s response, ignited a rebellion in Tūhoe that had not been seen. Confiscated lands were taken without an understanding of how it would affect hapū. The Native Land Court became the new battleground where iwi and hapū were pitched against each other, dividing those loyal to the government and those termed as rebels. Melbourne’s upbringing sits alongside the preliminary effects of the Native Land Court. Remembering that Melbourne was born and raised in Whakatāne, it is important to note that in 1866, a year before Melbourne’s birth, most lands from Ngāti Awa hapū were also confiscated.

Melbourne was roughly two at the time his father passed away in September 1869. Wēpīha Apanui, Ariki and Tohunga Whakairo of Ngāti Awa, and his wife Huhana Waihapūarangi, who was of Whakatōhea, whangai (adopted) Ani (Melbourne’s sister) who was six at the time, and Melbourne as Motoi was unable to care for her children. In discussions with Taiarahia Melbourne (Tūhoe), it is understood that Apanui and James Melbourne were very good friends. Apanui was highly respected and had a lot of influence and power within Ngāti Awa politics.
In Mātauranga Tūhoe: The Centrality of Mātauranga-a-iwi to Māori Education, William Doherty (Tūhoe, Ngāti Awa) indicates that Pākehā traders of this time often married into local hapū. In doing so the trader adhered to the local Rangātira (chief) in exchange for protection. For the Rangātira there was an element of mana (balance) in sponsoring traders as they significantly impacted the economy and the occupational patterns of local hapū.27

Motoi was born in the Ngāti Tawhaki (hapū) area of Tūhoe (Maungapōhatu) and was a descendant of Paraheka, the younger brother of Taiwhakaea. Taiwhakaea was the Rangātiti of the Taiwhakaea (hapū of Ngāti Awa). Motoi, therefore, has whakapapa to Ngāti Awa. The whakapapa of James Melbourne and Motoi to Apanui and Ngāti Awa indicates that though Melbourne and his sister were whangai, whakapapa is still present.

Melbourne was given the name Wēpiha by Apanui because of a tradition that the eldest male child would take on his father’s first name. Apanui also had a nephew from a younger brother, Te Hurunui, who took on Wēpiha Apanui’s second name, thus becoming Te Hurunui Apanui. As a biological relative, Te Hurunui Apanui was the next Ariki of Ngāti Awa. This did not demote Melbourne. Having been given the name Wēpiha and the whakapapa relationship Melbourne had with Apanui through his parents, Melbourne’s position could suggest that he likely played a vital role within Ngāti Awa at this time.

An acknowledgement of Melbourne’s Tūhoe whakapapa and position within Ngāti Awa can be seen through his marriage to Hine Matoirop Te Purewa. It is understood that some Tūhoe had joined the Te Kooti Arikirangi Te Turuki-led raid on Whakatāne in 1869, two years after
Melbourne’s birth. This added to tensions between Tūhoe and Ngāti Awa. It is believed that the marriage of Melbourne and Hine Matioro Te Purewa was arranged under a Tatatu Pounamu, a political marriage. The construction of a whare tupuna was often supported by a Tatau Pounamu. A Tatau Pounamu would secure peace and end conflict between groups by connecting and or reaffirming whakapapa lines. Hine Matioro Te Purewa was of Tamakimoana (hapū) in Maungapohatu, and was the daughter of Te Purewa II, grandson of Te Purewa. Te Purewa is considered the prominent founding ancestor of Te Māhurehure from a Te Rewarewa marae perspective. The union between Melbourne and Hine Matioro Te Purewa helped to solidify connections between Ngāti Awa and Tūhoe, thus aiding reconciliation between Tūhoe and certain Ngāti Awa hapū. This marriage affirms Melbourne’s position within Ngāti Awa politics while also placing him in a prominent position within Tūhoe and Te Māhurehure respectively. Te Māhurehure is an extension of Tamakimoana which could suggest that it is a specific place that helps to reimagine the parameter of a hapū. In this instance Rūātoki (Te Māhurehure) and Tamakimoana (Maungapohatu). Whakapapa simultaneously blurs and redefines the boundaries of place due to its socio-geographic relationships, Matemateāone.

Melbourne’s whakapapa places him at the forefront of pan-iwi, iwi and hapū relationships between Ngāti Awa and Tūhoe towards the end of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The Te Māhurehure hapū parameters of this work are thus conditioned by the marriage between Melbourne and Hine Matioro Te Purewa. The following section will attempt to unpack these elements further by exploring architecture from the whakapapa as laid out above.

He Rākau/A Tree: The Intersection between Whakapapa and Architecture

Wēpiha Apanui held the role of Tohunga Whakairo in conjunction with his Ariki position. Mead notes that an Ariki was expected to be able to build and/or negotiate the building of large houses such as storehouses, chief’s houses, cooking sheds and canoes either through his own active participation or through organisational skills or economic power. Taiarahia Melbourne states that a Tohunga Whakairo played a crucial role in uplifting and maintaining hapū and iwi history, where a whare whakairo (carved houses) was reserved for telling, sharing and preserving knowledge. A whare whakairo is often named after an ancestor, hence whare tupuna as discussed earlier. Damian Skinner also expresses that a whare whakairo reflects history.
The Oxford dictionary defines the term architect as a person who designs buildings and in many cases also supervises the construction of that building. Though there are apparent similarities between the roles of Tohunga Whakairo and the architect, Mead, Taiarahia Melbourne and Skinner all challenge the role of Tohunga Whakairo beyond the typical master carver definition. This suggests holistic teaching methodologies and influences should be considered relative to Melbourne’s own training.

Under the influence of Apanui, and given Melbourne’s position within pan-iwi, iwi and hapū politics between Tūhoe and Ngāti Awa, one can assume that Melbourne was exposed to a Tohunga Whakairo through Apanui. It is important to note that aspects of Apanui’s Tohunga Whakairo skill were hereditary through the art of the whao, the carver's chisel. The whao was a manual craft skill passed on from father to son and was accompanied by a sacred ceremony before the passing of the senior (Te Hoamiawaho, Apanui’s father). Melbourne was eight when Mataatua opened and was likely exposed to the construction process of Mataatua. In fact, it has been suggested that one of the Tatau Pounamu that was arranged under the construction of Mataatua was Melbourne’s marriage to Hine Matioro Te Purewa. Though Melbourne’s position has been certified, it is likely only a partial skillset was passed on to Melbourne through Apanui as no records currently suggest that the whao was passed onto Melbourne in this manner. Thus alternate methods of influence must be considered.
A possibility for Melbourne might have been Tupapa-rau, a Whare-wananga, or house of learning located at Wairaka Heads in Whakatāne, Opheiwhanaungakore. Tupapa-rau was said to be where the history of the people of Mataatua waka (which includes Ngāti Awa) and other lore pertaining to their religion, including mythology, and anthropology was taught. Taiarahia Melbourne notes one of the kawa (protocol and or prayer) of Tupapa-rau was in relation to Tiki, the use of weaponry. A possible extension of this can be explained by Hori Ropiha (Ngati Kahungungu) where the first of the three rakau (wood/timber) craft involved handling weapons and bird spears. The second rakau involved agricultural implements (working the gardens/quest for food), with the final rakau craft relating to the construction of buildings. Wharehuia Hemara (Ngāti Maniapoto, Ngāpuhi) suggests that whare wananga were attended by sons of great chiefs and that only the most exceptional candidates were able to assimilate the corpus of kōrero tawhito (iwi history). Melbourne was well placed within Ngāti Awa to attend whare wananga.

Melbourne’s Tūhoe whakapapa could have made Mairerangi, located at Te Honoi between Rūātoki and Ruatahuna, another whare wananga option. Mairerangi followed similar tikanga and kawa to Tupapa-rau and was still in practice in 1915. One of Mairerangi’s pupils, Kokouri, was said to be well versed in Tohunga Whakairo, suggesting that Mairerangi was at least supportive of the craft of Tohunga Whakairo and whare construction.

This work also considers the development of the Whakatāne settlement, especially following the aftermath of Te Kooti’s raids, as a possible influence on Melbourne’s work. A Whakatāne
Built Heritage Study notes that the style of houses changed from small raupo whare in the 1870s to simple wooden cottages, including larger and grander villas and stucco bungalows.\(^3^7\) Whakatāne soon became a popular holiday destination, which led to many homes being altered to create short-term holiday accommodations for visitors. Exposure to European tools and practices likely influenced Melbourne for several reasons. Firstly, Melbourne built a house, known as the ‘Castle’, for his family in Rūātoki. The Castle was the only house in Rūātoki at the time with four bedrooms, a large kitchen with a wood-burning stove and running water, and a veranda. The description of the Castle aligns closely with the modern architectural developments occurring in Whakatāne during this time.

Figure 8. Castle Whare interpretation located at the base of Taiarahia (maunga/mountain), Rūātoki. Illustration is based on verbal description by family, typical villa plan during the 1900s in Aotearoa New Zealand, and an aerial photo map of the site from sometime around 1960, and prior to construction of the current dwelling (Amber Ruckes, 2022).

Secondly, Melbourne’s interaction with European culture reflects the change being recognised within Māori politics between the years 1890-1910. Māori were aware of the significance of European presence and power. The damage to the social and cultural structure was significant. Iwi, with once a diverse hapū structure, was now under the influence of the government. Hence Māori began to develop and define themselves based on both European and Māori cultures.\(^3^8\) In the early 1870s, intense political and religious alignment saw various iwi groupings aspiring to establish their own identity.\(^3^9\) Melbourne’s first known work was not complete until 1908, putting his work in this age of transition.

Though Hiona was Melbourne’s first work, this paper will focus on Kura Mihi Rangi, a wharepuni (sleeping house), located at Te Rewarewa Marae in Rūātoki to anchor a Te
Māhurehure-specific architecture. Kura Mihi Rangi was Melbourne’s second known work. Hiona however will be used as a reflective element in exploring a Te Māhurehure-specific architecture. Before outlining a hapū architecture typology, Hiona and Kura Mihi Rangi must first be located within Melbourne’s whakapapa.

Melbourne’s relationship with Tūhoe prophet Rua Kenana may have started from a political position. As Apanui had aspirations for peace, Melbourne’s whakapapa and marriage connections to Maungapohatu presented Melbourne as a suitable candidate for managing Kenana. Another possibility might relate to alcohol. Though Kenana was initially against alcohol, regulating alcohol became his best approach to managing its impact on his community. Kenana could not establish a liquor licence due to the discriminatory laws pertaining to liquor at the time. Melbourne was half-English and may have been able to overcome some restrictions and possibly be able to support Kenana’s liquor pursuits in some way. Melbourne’s relationship with Kenana was significant, to the point that some accounts suggest Melbourne sold his mother’s lands, likely in Ngāti Tawhaki hapū area, to raise the capital needed to help Kenana build his Maungapōhatu community.

Kura Mihi Rangi is one of Hine Matioro Te Purewa’s tupuna and is who the wharepuni Kuri Mihi Rangi is an extension of. Tamakimoana and Ngāti Tawhaki are neighbouring hapū and Te Māhurehure is an extension of Tamakimoana. As noted earlier, Hine Matioro Te Purewa’s great grandfather is Te Purewa, founder of Te Māhurehure from a Te Rewarewa marae kaupapa. Though there are various complexities at play here with respect to hapū and personal relationships, it stands true that the Te Māhurehure hapū parameters of this work are highlighted, as mentioned, by marriage between Melbourne and Hine Matioro Te Purewa.

**He Wao/A Forest: A Hapū Architecture**

Though Hiona is not named after a specific ancestor, relative to whare tupuna, Hiona is considered to be a whare tupuna for this work.
Figure 9. Hiona depiction. At Maungapohatu, completed 1908 (Amber Ruckes, 2022).

Hiona’s palisaded circular form is said to have been inspired by the late sixth-century mosque, the Dome of Rock in Jerusalem. Although octagonal in base, many scriptural illustrations of the Dome of Rock depict it as circular. As a result of its circular nature, the floor plan of Hiona is more wandering than directional, possibly suggesting unity and/or continuity between the people of Maungapohatu and higher beings. It should also be noted that St Joseph’s Church, the first church built in Wairakia, Whakatāne, in 1895 featured a domed element at its altar. St Joseph’s may not have influenced the design of Hiona, but its presence deserves further consideration. Melbourne may have been involved or at least aware of the construction of St Joseph’s for several reasons. Melbourne would have been familiar with the Wairaka area as that is where both Apanui and Waihaipūarangi lived, as well as where his family home was located. Melbourne’s position with Ngāti Awa politics also likely meant he would have been privy to the construction of a significant religious building within the area at this time.
Another possible influence pertaining to the buildability of Hiona may be grounded through the construction of Victorian bay villas that were being built in Whakatāne at the end of the nineteenth century. The octagonal structural elements of the bay rooms can be seen in the structural elements of Hiona.

Hiona is also a departure from the singular level whare tupuna of Kura Mihi Rangi as it operates across two levels. The upper level of Hiona is reserved only for the Tumuaki (Leaders; Rua and his family). This pulpit-type feature is accessed from the outside, giving both levels separate entry and exit points.

Like Kura Mihi Rangi, Hiona features painted elements. The playing card motifs painted around Hiona’s exterior can be viewed as mnemonic forms of biblical scriptures for those who could not read. Rau Hoskins describes the repeating diamond and club pattern as acknowledging the Father, Son and Holy Spirit. In a 1991 contemporary art exhibition titled *Te Mihaia Hou: Maungapohatu and the Prophet Rua Kenana*, oral accounts by Tamakimoana suggest that the clubs could also be interpreted as Tamakimoana principles of humility and willingness to serve others, just as clubs are the lowest suit in a deck of cards. This thinking aligns with the kaupapa of Tāne Nui a Rangi, a whare tupuna at Te Māpou Marae, Maungapohatu. Tāne Nui a Rangi has playing card emblems painted on its ceiling, placing such patterning in a more familiar whare tupuna tikanga context.
The interior of Kura Mihi Rangi is an example of carving being transposed into figurative paintings. There are also no traditional tukutuku panels in Kura Mihi Rangi, instead, a modern vertical herringbone arrangement is used. A herringbone quality can also be seen in Hiona.
Kura Mihi Rangi painted figures differed from Roger Neich’s characterisation of northern Tūhoe whare, which were based on native trees and bird hunting scenes, as Kura Mihi Rangi features a portrait painting of Native Minister James Carrol. Painted portraits must closely relate to the person or people they are representing. This suggests that Melbourne and Carroll crossed paths at some point, allowing Melbourne to support the painting of Carrol by Rehu Kerema, a local painter. Also featured in the figurative painting of Kura Mihi Rangi are marakihau figures. Māori artist Lisa Reihana (Ngāpuhi, Ngāti Hine, Ngaituteauru) in her work “Digital Marae: Marakihau,” describes marakihau, or taniwha, as a word specific only to carving. This comment by Reihana supports Kura Mihi Rangi as an example of carving transposed into figurative paintings. Melbourne was likely exposed to carving tectonics during his time with Apanui or through a whare wananga practice. Though no records suggest that Melbourne was a carver, Kura Mihi Rangi suggests that he could still work with craving practices in new media.

Kura Mihi Rangi was built and completed in 1916 by Tamakimoana, possibly suggesting that there may have been persons who had built Hiona that built Kura Mihi Rangi. Kura Mihi Rangi however was built to align with the Ringatu Church, not like Kura Mihi Rangi neighbour, Te Rangi Moaho, which was built for Kenana and his Ihiraia followers as at Te Rewarewa marae. Te Māhurehure has a diverse history that is symbolised by the two whare tupuna at Te Rewarewa. Hiona and Kura Mihi Rangi reflect this in Melbourne’s work.

This duality can be challenging to navigate if the whakapapa is not clear. Melbourne’s architectural works sit in an age of transition where the hybridisation of European and Māori...
architectural practices from construction and materiality is evident. Though Hiona’s form is less conventional than what has become the typical whare tupuna form, the painted features of Kura Mihi Rangi are more political. In conversations with Hori Utanuku (Tūhoe), Te Rewarewa is the closest marae to the Confiscation line and was consequently used as a dominant marae for hosting hui relating to Pākeha from 1916 onwards. This could explain the political nature of some of the painted elements of Kura Mihi Rangi.

Both works aspire to support their communities in attaining independence and to heal their communities during a time when Māori aimed to reclaim their identity in this new colonial landscape.

Whakatiputipu te Maunga/Raising the Mountain: Concluding Comments and Ongoing Work

Te Uru Taumata in Tanēatua, a more recent build within Tūhoe, is New Zealand’s first building to be built under the international Living Building Challenge. Co-design practices undertaken in this work might resemble elements of whakapapa as well. However, the hapū kaupapa in Te Uru Taumata requires further study. Additional work is required to develop the points presented in this paper. It is evident that there is space for architectural research based on whakapapa. There is, however, a limitation to this work currently. A Tūhoe and Te Māhurehure typology based on a George Melbourne whakapapa cannot be presented fully without another whakapapa and its associated works to reflect and define the work above while also highlighting the same in that work. For many talking to a whakapapa outside of their own, if it is not already published publicly, can challenge tikanga. Ongoing work will seek to further define a Tūhoe and Te Māhurehure typology based on a specific George Melbourne whakapapa line relative to published whakapapa only. This suggests that the parameters of a Tūhoe and Te Māhurehure typology will alter as more study and more voices contribute to this area of study.
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