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How do Christians today understand and express honour to one another?

Honour is a term with many meanings and expressions in and outside the church and across cultures. Honouring one another is a biblical command (Philippians 2:1-11; Romans 12:1-21; Ephesians 4:1-14) and is vital to healthy relationships yet can be difficult to understand, easy to misinterpret and challenging to live out. Using an account of hospitality in Luke 7:36-50 as its reference point, this project was a comparative study exploring ways four ethnic groups within the New Zealand Church understand and express honour in the context of hospitality.

Study participants drawn from NZ Maori, NZ European (Pakeha), NZ Chinese and NZ Samoan ethnicities were given Luke 7:36-50, with a brief outline of its characters and setting, and asked to identify comparative hospitality events in their family of origin and current faith community. Questions exploring the various expressions of honour, shame, dignity and value arising from Luke 7:36-50 were used to help elicit the participants’ understanding of those concepts in both settings.

What emerged is a clear distinction on concepts, language and expressions of honour between individuals from more collectivist cultures, which retain some hierarchical structures and which connect honour with identity, as against the Pakeha or non-hierarchical individualist group who had not previously given much thought to honour or their own cultural identity. It also became evident that cultural expressions of honour or lack of such expressions influenced but did not govern how each understood the honour God calls us to.
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CHAPTER 1: WHY HONOUR

Introduction

You prepare a table before me
in the presence of my enemies;
you anoint my head with oil;
my cup overflows.
Surely goodness and mercy shall follow me
all the days of my life,
and I shall dwell in the house of the LORD
my whole life long.
Psalm 23 (NRSVA)

Embodied in these last verses of Psalm 23 is an image of dwelling with honour. The psalmist describes a feast, prepared for the guest who is honoured with abundant food, fine oils to cool and refresh the brow, a cup full to overflowing and the security of belonging. This picture of multiple honours sings of the welcome and hospitality of God. Psalm 23:5 reflects some of the hospitality protocols that Jesus lists in Luke 7:36-50, another feast where cultural ways of making a guest welcome included oil, water, a kiss of greeting as well as food and a cup. Yet Simon the Pharisee falls short in his role as host in this passage, offering a form of hospitality but one lacking in both welcome and honour, and his guest does not let this pass.

Jesus made a practice of challenging the Jewish leaders of his day, like Simon, for keeping the letter of the law but not its spirit, for valuing outward appearances more than heart attitudes and thus falling into the trap of measuring another’s worth (Matthew 5-7). The values of honour and shame that have been part of many hierarchical cultures for centuries also focus on behaviour, outward

---

1 See Appendix 3 for the text of this passage or the end of Chapter 3 for the text with a detailed discussion, pp 63-72.
appearances and how one is perceived in the eyes of one’s peers, and enable members to rely on various external measures such as status, gender and citizenship, to assess human worth and associated requirements of honour. In contrast, Western individualist cultures are no longer hierarchical and do little to acknowledge traditional codes of honour, and yet they too enable individuals to use external measures like achievement, wealth, image and celebrity to assess human value and identity.

Judgment is a necessary part of human society, comes in different forms and requires standards of measurement. In the context of teaching on this necessary practice in Matthew 7:1-5, Jesus prohibits judgment that measures worth and qualifies how best to judge behaviour. While discerning good and evil in behaviour is a valid and necessary exercise of judgment, measuring worth is rooted in an often unrecognised attitude of contempt towards the self and the other, an attitude that stands in opposition to the honour and dignity due to one another as God’s image bearers. Just as Jesus challenged this approach to human value in his own culture, he does so today. This paper aims to explore to what extent these cultural measures of worth are held within the communities of New Zealand’s multicultural church.

Over the last few decades, scholars have identified honour and shame values in modern Mediterranean, Ancient Greek and Roman cultures, with debate around the level to which these values were absorbed into Jewish culture and their importance to understanding biblical texts. The New Testament account of the

---

woman with the alabaster jar of ointment who anoints Jesus’ feet in Luke 7:36-50 illustrates the way cultures rooted in honour and shame shape hospitality protocols, behaviour and attitudes. With the discernment of one who yields his cultural values to those of his heavenly Father, Jesus recognises that Simon’s judgment of others is rooted in a contempt of other human beings. Jesus’ teaching on judgment and discernment in Matthew 7:1-5 provides a framework for his challenge to Simon, allowing it to be understood as confronting the way Simon judges, or measures, the value of the players in this story – host, guest and unwelcome guest. Simon’s judgment followed acceptable social codes of shame and honour, yet it reveals a lack of humility and a contempt for creatures made in God’s image. This hinders his ability to see himself and others truly, and impedes his ability to love rightly.

Jesus’ framework is distinct from the frameworks of social codes which measure human worth by external attributes such as status, wealth, gender, citizenship, age, image or fame. While Jesus evaluates human attitudes and actions, he does not measure worth through honour or any other external code. In Jesus’ kingdom framework, what is measured is human behaviour and intent, not value. Discernment of good and evil is vital for human flourishing; measurement of the worth of human creatures, made in the image of God and therefore priceless, is forbidden. When human beings recognise one another as made in the image of God, space is made to respond to the other with honour, not contempt. This requires wise discernment of good and evil and the practice of truth-telling, both only possible where the love of God releases human beings to esteem his creation. In calling Simon to account for his lack of love, evidenced in his contempt for his fellow human beings, Jesus calls Simon to stand up into the dignity of a son of God. In calling his people to honour others above themselves, Jesus also calls them to stand in the glory of God’s image bearers.
When Paul commands the church in Rome to “love one another with mutual affection; outdo one another in showing honour” (Rom 12:10), he’s writing to a community drawn from multiple ethnic and social backgrounds who bring a range of interpretations to what it means to show honour to one another. Entry into the family of God requires that they constantly re-examine and rewrite social relations and not least their concepts of family and honour, and the same applies to God’s family, the church, today. My exploration of cultural understandings of honour in the context of hospitality within the NZ church is structured around a biblical example of hospitality (Luke 7:36-50) together with illustrations of hospitality in four different ethnic groups. Underlying this consideration of cultural perspectives is the premise that to truly welcome another requires a recognition and honouring of difference. As cultural ethicist and author of *Strange Virtues*, Bernard Adeney says:

>A first step in overcoming ethnocentrism is the recognition that my own values are not necessarily the same as God’s. All Christians hold many values derived from their culture. A second step is to understand that our own interpretation of Scripture comes from a particular cultural context. A third step is to see that God’s values may be “enfleshed” differently in another culture from how they are in my own.\(^6\)

Consequently this conversation begins by talking about culture and a review of some definitions of culture and ethnicity together with a brief history of NZ’s cultures.

In today’s increasingly multi-cultural societies, it’s likely that many will at some point find themselves on the boundaries of cultures. My own experience includes a sense of this life on the boundaries. I was born on the Melanesian island of Bougainville, then Territory of PNG, to third generation Pakeha New Zealanders. My early memories of arriving in Auckland for primary school include confusion at being surrounded by white faces instead of black, and a sense of no longer having a

---

good hold of the social “rules” that determined welcome. This awareness of difference has offered opportunities for insight as well as motivation for this research.

Definitions in Context

In *Strange Virtues*, Adeney could be said to give an individualist approach to defining culture as he highlights the challenges and importance of defining how words are used. He says, “The word *culture*, like the word *religion*, is very difficult to define. In one sense every different person is from a different culture. We each have our own symbol system and ways of defining meaning in our life.” Before delving more deeply into what honour looks like in different cultural settings, it’s helpful to review how terms like culture, ethnicity and race are currently applied.

**RACE AND ETHNICITY**

Writing for the *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences*, published in 2001, Professor Tracey Meares notes that the term “race” is no longer in common use due to a lack of “scientific validation.” Historically it “referred to the ‘major biological divisions of mankind’ (Caucasoid, Negroid, and Mongoloid), as characterized by skin color, hair texture, and other physical features.” Meares remarks that “race is now recognized as a social construct used by groups seeking to delineate themselves from others.” She then describes the similarly debated concept of “ethnicity” as one “that principally refers to the countries from which an individual’s heritage can be traced (e.g., ‘Hispanic’ refers to those with Spanish ancestry), although it is also associated with language, religion, cultural practices,

---

7 Ibid., 16.
and self-perception.”¹⁰ Statistics New Zealand offer a definition of “ethnicity”¹¹ that identifies it as a “self-perceived” “measure of cultural affiliation.” New Zealand nursing educator, Dianne Wepa, editor of Cultural Safety in Aotearoa New Zealand, distinguishes “ethnicity” from “race” because “it is based on more factors than physical characteristics, nor does it require a dominant group to label the other groups.” In defining ethnicity, Wepa includes the element of “a common or distinctive history or common destiny” and identifies the following differentiating factors “between ethnic groups”:

Language, religion, history, styles of dress, ancestry, adornment. All of us belong to a variety of groups (for example, church, sport and leisure organisations). Ethnicity is one further dimension of such group identity. It captures the sense of belonging which, in turn, helps mould an identity for an individual .... The “self-identification” of a person with an ethnic group can be: influenced by social and political factors; inconsistent over time as one group merges with another; difficult if there are a number of identities.¹²

**CULTURE**

Turning now to culture, Statistics New Zealand states, “Cultural affiliation is the social, historical, geographical, linguistic, behavioural, religious, and self-perceived affinity between a person and an ethnic group.”¹³ Psychologist Adam

---

¹¹ [http://www.stats.govt.nz/methods/classifications-and-standards/classification-related-stats-standards/ethnicity/definition.aspx] (15 January 2014). The Statistics New Zealand website gives this definition: “Ethnicity is the ethnic group or groups that people identify with or feel they belong to. Ethnicity is a measure of cultural affiliation, as opposed to race, ancestry, nationality or citizenship. Ethnicity is self perceived and people can belong to more than one ethnic group. An ethnic group is made up of people who have some or all of the following characteristics: a common proper name; one or more elements of common culture which need not be specified, but may include religion, customs, or language; unique community of interests, feelings and actions; a shared sense of common origins or ancestry; and a common geographic origin.”
Cohen, in a journal article entitled “Many Forms of Culture,” shows that the challenge of defining “culture” is not new:

Defining culture is exceptionally tricky. More than 50 years ago, Kroeber and Kluckhohn (1952) collected 164 definitions of culture, which they organized into several categories: broad definitions that focused on content; definitions that focused on social heritage or tradition; normative definitions that focused on rules or ways of doing things; psychological definitions that focused on adjustment or problem solving; structural definitions that focused on patterns and organizations; genetic definitions that focused on culture as a product or artifact; as well as incomplete or metaphorical definitions that Kroeber and Kluckhohn called “on-the-side stabs in passing” at definitions.14

In an encyclopedia entry entitled “Culture: Contemporary Views,” anthropologist R. A. Shweder favours Robert Redfield’s definition of culture for its simplicity, describing culture as “shared understandings made manifest in act and artefact.” Shweder acknowledges that all the definitions given require “specification and clarification”15 and then aligns “the standard North American anthropological view of ‘culture’” with:

[W]hat the British philosopher Isaiah Berlin (1976) called “goals, values and pictures of the world” that are made manifest in the speech, laws, and routine practices of some self-monitoring and self-perpetuating group. A cultural account spells out those “goals, values, and pictures of the world.” A cultural account thus assists us in explaining why, the members of a particular cultural community say the things they say and do the things they do to each other with their words and other actions.16

Due to the significant overlap of meaning between the terms “culture” and “ethnicity” this thesis will use these terms interchangeably, and will use Dianne Wepa’s definition of culture as found in Cultural Safety in Aotearoa New Zealand. There, Wepa defines culture as “our way of living” and continues:

15 R. A. Shweder, “Culture: Contemporary Views,” in International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences, ed. Neil J. Smelser and Paul B. Baltes (Oxford: Pergamon, 2001), 3152-3. At 3153, Shweder comments that “The definitions proposed by Kroeber and [Kluckhohn], Redfield, Geertz, and D’Andrade call out for specification and clarification. Nevertheless, those definitions are a good reference point for understanding current debates about the values and dangers associated with the very idea of ‘culture.’”
16 Ibid., 3153.
It’s our taken-for-grantedness that determines and defines our culture. The way we brush our teeth, the way we bury people, the way we express ourselves through our art, religion, eating habits, rituals, humour, science, law, and sport; the way we celebrate occasions (from 21sts, to weddings, to birthdays) is our culture. All these actions we carry out consciously and unconsciously.\textsuperscript{17}

Much of the “culture” investigated in this thesis is subtle and intangible, perhaps most typically evidenced through an expression such as “that’s just how we do things.” For example, when a Pakeha household gathers with the wider family for a meal, it’s likely the women will communicate beforehand about what food each household will bring. It’s also likely that they will not realise that this communication practice and style is culturally distinct from how Maori, Chinese or Samoan families may arrange hospitality. Richard Bolstad, a NZ communications specialist, describes how a Maori household preparing for such a gathering found this forthright planning of Pakeha “humiliating,” even “petty and rude,” as “[S]urely they should just take whatever they could, and things would work out.”\textsuperscript{18}

The ways things are done within a culture, as well as the values behind those actions, are more often modelled than articulated, transferred unconsciously, through common practice and ritual. The result is that the way things are done within any cultural group is assumed by those within it to be the norm, so obvious as to be unquestioned, and even unseen, and only becomes visible when another’s way of doing things challenges that norm.

\textsuperscript{17} Wepa, “Culture and Ethnicity: What is the question?,” 31. Wepa continues, “Broadly speaking, culture includes our activities, ideas, our belongings, relationships, what we do, say, think, are. Culture is central to the manner in which all people develop and grow and view themselves and others. It is the outcome of the influences and principles of people’s ancestors, ideology, philosophies of life and geographical situation. A culture is never completely static and all cultures are affected and modified by the proximity and influences of other cultures.”

ON THE BOUNDARIES OF CULTURE

As the worlds’ peoples become increasingly mobile, a growing number of children are born into the boundaries of cultures, growing up with an awareness of both belonging and not belonging to more than one culture. Manying Ip, from interviews with Chinese New Zealanders, reports how third generation New Zealander, journalist and communications expert, Gilbert Wong, grew up in Whangarei in the 1960s-70s where he remembers “feeling different from New Zealand kids.” His parents, Jim and Pauline, had grown up in 1940s Whangarei and Napier and been kept fully occupied by school and helping in the family business; they’d been given limited time for sport and not encouraged to socialise with non-Chinese. Feeling their isolation from Kiwi culture, they were determined to raise their “children as ‘any other New Zealander.’”19 Their eldest son, Gilbert, was one of the few of Chinese ethnicity in his school, and by default yet with his parents’ tacit consent, his close friends were mostly NZ European. He describes his awareness of difference:

I know that I am Chinese ... because of my physical appearance.... Even now, in the 1990s, if you are not European or Maori, you can’t help feeling an outsider.... You can be a “New Zealander” in all your habits: you can have a barbeque, you can go to the beach, you can play rugby – like Dad, or cricket – you still feel an outsider.... Our identity is shaped by how others see us ... and how we feel others see us. You always know that you look different!20

Gilbert Wong has continued to explore his identity, along with other NZ Chinese,21 and their experience of being on the edge of two cultures and unsure of belonging and identity connected with my own experience of welcome. Many New Zealanders grow up aware of multiple cultures and a brief history of those cultures is next, along

20 Ibid., 28-29.
with an explanation of terms like Maori, Pakeha and New Zealander and related cultural descriptions.

**AOTEAROA NEW ZEALAND: CULTURES IN CONTEXT**

Increasingly culturally diverse today, Aotearoa New Zealand was first settled by peoples from East Polynesia, arriving in the late 13th century. These various tribes came to be known as Maori, a term used by British translators to collectively describe an indigenous people, not a term previously used that way. Dianne Wepa describes how the term “Maori” came into use:

Prior to European contact, Maori had no single term for themselves. People were distinguished from one another by their tribal [iwi] names. The word “Maori” means “normal,” “usual” or “ordinary” and, through usage, has become capitalised to refer to the Maori people collectively. Before the signing of Te Tiriti o Waitangi, Maori had been variously referred to as “New Zealanders,” “natives” and “aborigines.” Te Tiriti therefore is the first official document to cite Maori as the first indigenous people of New Zealand (Walker, 1990).

Aotearoa New Zealand is the youngest nation to have been colonised by the British, with early settlement happening while the British parliament debated the abolition of slavery. The shift in thinking on human dignity and honour in Britain influenced the relationship between the British and Maori. Rather than dismiss Maori as

---

22 “In the 2000s the generally accepted understanding is ... that Polynesians were the first settlers in New Zealand, arriving in the late 1200s. Some time after 1300, possibly around 1500, a number of these people sailed east over some 800 km of open sea to the Chatham Islands. There they became isolated and developed their own distinctive culture. In the 1830s some Māori arrived at the Chatham Islands on a European sailing ship. This was the first time these two peoples, who shared the same Polynesian ancestry, had met in about 300 years. The Chatham Islands people decided to call themselves Moriori – their version of the word Māori.” [http://www.teara.govt.nz/en/ideas-of-maori-origins/page-5> (17 December 2013).  
23 Wepa, “Culture and Ethnicity: What is the question,?” 35; Joan Metge, “Huarangatia: Maori Words in New Zealand English,” in Tuamaka: The Challenge of Difference in Aotearoa New Zealand (Auckland, N.Z.: Auckland University Press, 2010), 57-62. While Tangata whenua (“people of the land”) is often used by non-Maori to refer to the indigenous people of New Zealand, i.e. Maori, the meaning among contemporary Maori is localised to “those who have authority in a particular place. This is based on their deep relationship with that place, through their births and their ancestors’ births. As tangata whenua express themselves in that place, they gain the authority and confidence to project themselves into the world. This idea, in turn, underpins the notion of manawhenua – spiritual authority in a given area.” [http://www.teara.govt.nz/en/papatuanuku-the-land/page-4> (3 March 2014).  
second class citizens and claim ownership, as had been its practice for its colonising history, Britain negotiated with Maori in *Te Tiriti o Waitangi* (the Treaty of Waitangi), signed in 1840. This willingness to engage in conversations, negotiate and so share power and honour with the land’s first settlers is a significant element in how New Zealand is defined constitutionally and relationally. It is an inherent recognition of the dignity of these first peoples of Aotearoa New Zealand. While the Treaty was quickly breached by private land speculators and the Crown through illegal land confiscations which led to war, attempts to honour Aotearoa New Zealand’s first peoples are again evident in negotiations for Treaty settlements between the Crown and *Iwi* (tribe) over recent decades.25

Maori settlement had been established for nearly 500 years when the first wave of immigrants from Europe and then China arrived during the nineteenth century. Other Pacific peoples (for example, Niuean, Samoan, and Tongan) began arriving from the mid-twentieth century followed by further waves from Europe, Asia and Africa.26 Today, New Zealand’s majority ethnicity originates from Europe, particularly the British Isles. While this group is referred to by many as “New Zealanders,” being a “New Zealander” encompasses people from many ethnic backgrounds. In order to honour all ethnicities who call NZ home and for clarity, the term “Pakeha” will be used in this paper to identify those of NZ European

ethnicity. Richard Bolstad helps clarify the rich identity to be found in the word “Pakeha.”

What I like about the word “Pakeha” is that it reminds me that I am a New Zealander, not a European. It was developed at a time of friendship between European explorers and Maori, and used by the British to refer to themselves when they wrote Te Tiriti o Waitangi (the treaty by which Maori agreed to become British subjects). Its most likely origin is the older Maori word “Pakehakeha” (“imaginary beings resembling people with fair skins,” according to *A Dictionary of the Maori Language* by H.W. Williams).²⁷

This understanding of the root of *Pakeha* aligns with the comparative Samoan term, *Palagi*, also used for white visitors, which “depicts the strangeness of that being; (one who) comes from heaven and burst – when white explorers first arrived, they were thought to have burst through the heavens.”²⁸ When New Zealanders of European descent describe themselves as Pakeha they honour the unique relationship between Maori and European where Maori first made the European welcome. They also practice hospitality by making room for New Zealanders of different ethnic backgrounds to describe themselves as New Zealanders. These ways of making space for others reflect the deep sense of honouring one another that Christ calls his people to.

**WHAT CULTURE?**

In much the same way that Pakeha may assume entitlement to an ethnic description of New Zealander, it is characteristic of majority cultures to assume that their way of doing life is normative, and that the meaning they give to words is shared by others. Yet those in minority cultures who cannot avoid some awareness of cultural differences are not immune to cultural blindness. People from all cultures can go through life unaware that those around them bring significantly different

---

²⁷ Bolstad, *Transforming Communication*, 16.
meanings to shared language, especially to a foundational cultural concept such as honour. The very “taken-for-grantedness” that lies at the essence of a culture is also what hides it from those who form it and are formed by it. In *Talking Past Each Other*, a handbook on cross-cultural communication, social anthropologists Joan Metge and Patricia Kinloch note that

>a good deal of miscommunication occurs between [Maori, Samoan and Pakeha] because the parties interpret each other’s words and actions in terms of their own understandings, assuming that these are shared when in fact they are not – in other words, because of cultural differences that are not recognised because we all take our own culture very largely for granted and do not question its general applicability.29

A likely consequence of these assumptions among the research participants is that the concepts of culture and honour that Maori bring to those very words, “culture” and “honour,” will differ from the way the same words are understood by Pakeha, NZ Chinese and NZ Samoan, despite all being English language speakers.

Two more aspects of culture in NZ are worth introducing at this point: the inability of many Pakeha, shared by many of the minority cultures growing up alongside Pakeha, to describe Pakeha, and secondly, the developing nature of a shared New Zealand culture. In conversations leading up to and during the course of this research, the prevalent response from New Zealanders when asked to define Pakeha culture, is “we/you don’t have one.” What these answers signify is not that Pakeha have no culture, unless one is using a definition of culture where “act and artefact” is clearly observable as in Maori or Samoan ways of doing or being (for example the haka, *Poi* (dance) and *pounamu* (greenstone), or dances like the *Sa’asa’a* and *Sasa*) but that few Pakeha examine their own culture enough to identify it clearly. In terms of Phinney’s ethnic identity theory, as outlined by Rosalind Willis,

---

many Pakeha are still in the unexamined stage where there is “little questioning of one’s ethnicity.” Like many in a majority culture they face few challenges to their sense of identity with the result that there is little to stimulate a shift into the second stage called “moratorium … characterised by high exploration of ethnicity, but no firm commitment to an ethnic identity,” which means that even fewer have reached the “achieved” stage of having “completed their exploration of ethnicity and … become committed to an ethnic identity.” Although Pakeha lack the distinct and easily identifiable symbols of culture belonging to Maori or Samoan, or the communal sense of identity available to more collectivist cultures, they can still claim a distinct (if mostly unarticulated) cultural identity. Often it is during their “O.E.” (overseas experience) when Pakeha live and work in cultures outside New Zealand that insight comes into the uniqueness of the “ways we do things” as New Zealanders. This insight marks the beginning of a shift from unexamined ethnicity into explorations around what it means to be a New Zealander, although more exploration will be needed to articulate what exactly makes up Pakeha culture.

Discovering our identity as New Zealanders and enabling all to flourish will require a valuing of both ethnic diversity and the common history of shared relationships in this isolated location. A characteristic of ethnic identity is that it is subject to change, both becoming more like, and more distinct from, others who share the same geographic location, as a University of Wellington study indicates. Researchers there studied Individualist-Collectivist values and behaviours of four ethnic groups and found indications that three ethnicities who have shared Aotearoa New Zealand for several generations have more common values than expected. Against their hypotheses, Pakeha culture was more collectivist, and Maori and

-----

Chinese less collectivist than expected, with Pacific Island strongly collectivist, as expected.\(^{31}\)

Identifying a “New Zealand” culture raises questions around validating and honouring difference while recognising the effects of common location and shared histories. Stephen Turner asks if a focus on an inclusive New Zealandness promotes a devaluing of New Zealand’s distinct ethnic groups beginning with, but not limited to, Maori and their place as tangata whenua (people of the land) or first peoples. Turner identifies the necessity of honouring the uniqueness of distinct cultural groups in the face of valid fears that minority ethnicities will be smothered by majority ways of living.\(^{32}\) The art of celebrating well what it means to be a New Zealander is dependent on the ability to validate the nation’s diversity. Valuing the richness and strengths of diverse ethnic and cultural groups is a necessary part of supporting the secure identity and wellbeing in each, and provides a safe foundation to explore the values New Zealanders share in common.

This journey of exploring shared values is just beginning as evident in the discussion on NZ cultural values from the academic and sporting fields reported in two media summaries. On the eve of New Zealand’s 2006 celebration of the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi, New Zealand Herald writer Cathrin Schaer interviewed Taruni Falconer regarding her team’s research into New Zealand culture. Falconer and colleagues had identified six positive values prioritised by Kiwis: Earthy, Modesty, Restraint, Fairness, Ingenuity and Informality.\(^{33}\) Their corresponding negative

---


\(^{33}\) “Kiwi” is New Zealand’s national bird, a protected species. It is also used by New Zealanders to refer to themselves in conversation and newspaper articles, though less often in academic material. Outside NZ,
values are Unsophisticated, Unintentionally misleading, Overcautious, Hyper-democratic, Close enough is good enough and Disrespectful. All the participants in my research were born in NZ and despite their different ethnic backgrounds this collation of NZ values offers an initial summary of shared values. The last few decades has seen a growing discussion of different forms of team and corporate cultures, particularly the cultures of national sports teams and the second summary of “Kiwi” cultural values comes from one of NZ’s high performing sports teams. In an article discussing All Black culture and leadership values, James Kerr lists: “personal humility … character as well as talent … continual improvement … a compelling sense of higher purpose” and “Keep a blue head.” Elsewhere Kerr defines a “Red Head” as a “resourceful state in which you are off task, panicked and ineffective. ‘Blue Head’, on the other hand, is an optimal state in which you are on task and performing to your best ability.” This highly valued team culture with its focus on character, relationship, humility and honour, as well as talent, has drawn on many of the cultures, collectivist and individualist that call the islands of Aotearoa New Zealand home. In doing so, it honours strengths from different cultures and recognises the connections formed over time by geographical isolation, association and shared histories.

While this brief sketch of New Zealand’s history and ethnic makeup leaves much unsaid, it gives a glimpse of the potential for confusion over a concept like

---


honour. The following examples of honour’s many faces provide both an overview and a few close-up images of how honour is expressed and misunderstood.
CHAPTER 2: DEFINING HONOUR

The Many Faces of Honour

“HONOR occupies about the same place in contemporary usage as chastity.”36 So begins Peter Berger’s 1970 essay “On The Obsolescence of the Concept of Honor,” which argues that

[t]he contemporary denial of the reality of honor and of offences against honor is so much part of a taken-for-granted world that a deliberate effort is required to even see it as a problem. The effort is worthwhile, for it can result in some, perhaps unexpected, new insights into the structure of modern consciousness.37

Honour is a term with many meanings and expressions in and outside the church and across cultures. Honouring one another is a biblical command (Philippians 2:1-11; Romans 12:1-21; Ephesians 4:1-14)38 and is vital to healthy relationships yet can be difficult to understand, easy to misinterpret and challenging to live out. Using an account of hospitality in Luke 7:36-50 as its reference point, this project is a comparative study exploring ways four ethnic groups within the New Zealand Church understand and express honour in the context of hospitality, both in their childhood homes and in their current church communities.

The account in Luke 7:36-50 of Jesus’ meal with Simon the Pharisee is a rich illustration of different understandings of honour in a setting of hospitality. It offers a glimpse into the multicultural world of the New Testament, insight into ways honour is influenced by culture, and an example of Jesus challenging cultural values. Should they wish to take it, Jesus, Simon and his guests are all provided with cultural grounds for offence when expected welcome protocols are omitted, an

37 Ibid., 339.
38 For example, Romans 12:9-11 (NRSV) “Let love be genuine; hate what is evil, hold fast to what is good; love one another with mutual affection; outdo one another in showing honor. Do not lag in zeal, be ardent in spirit, serve the Lord.”
unwanted guest behaves inappropriately and when the guest of honour uses the host’s lack of welcome as his teaching illustration. Within a few decades of this meal, a conversation between a Roman official and Paul, Jewish Apostle to the Gentiles, further demonstrates the Greco-Roman cultural understandings of honour (Acts 22:28). In that hierarchical society honour defined a person’s status and therefore worth, was a limited commodity and consequently highly prized.39 This is apparent in the Roman tribune’s response when Paul claims his rights as a Roman citizen by birth.

Honour has been a key marker of identity in various ways across many cultures, times and places.40 Throughout history, the concept of honour functioned as a system to maintain relationship and behaviour in hierarchical societies. Identity was secured by fulfilling the role one was born to, belonging required following the patterns of behaviour defined by a person’s place, and breaking the in-house code could result in exclusion or death. Tracking the path of honour across Europe reveals 17th century members of the elite classes fighting duels to the death without legal penalties. The duel was a means of settling disputes and offences against honour, often over women and cheating at cards. While the death of one party was often a consequence, it was not the aim; what was vital was that each party showed himself willing to risk his life to defend his honour. By the mid-nineteenth century a revolution of thought had occurred in England: duelling had become a cause for

39 Bruce J. Malina, The New Testament World: Insights from Cultural Anthropology (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001), 33, 36 and chapters 4 and 5; Crook, “Honor, shame, and social status,” 593. Crook and Malina mention that an aspect common to honour cultures is their view of honour as a tradable commodity of limited supply, as in this example where the tribune had purchased his Roman Citizenship and the rights and honour that citizenship gave. Citizenship was not freely available and therefore costly. Its value was also related to its nature: being born a Roman Citizen was something that could not be bought, limited to a small circle of the population, and therefore worthy of more honour.
shame and even the gallows, and honour had begun its slide into obsolescence. Historians struggle to explain this shift in the concepts of honour and human dignity and the subsequent significant impact on behaviour and law reform across the British Empire. Two hundred years later, and half a world apart, the more than one thousand Japanese pilots who willingly flew their aircraft into enemy battleships during WW2 did so, not because life was considered cheap, but because their country’s honour was so high, or as they phrased it, “Life is as the weight of a feather compared to one’s duty.”

Berger finds that the strongest traces of honour in Western society have survived into the modern era best in groups retaining a hierarchical view of society, such as the nobility, the military and traditional professions like law and medicine. In such groups honor is a direct expression of status, a source of solidarity among social equals and a demarcation line against social inferiors. Honor, indeed, also dictates certain standards of behavior in dealing with inferiors, but the full code of honor only applies among those who share the same status in the hierarchy.

The more traditional hierarchical structure of the New Zealand Fire Service offers a rare glimpse of the type of honour that Berger argues is on the decline. In this community, where the work of fighting fires and saving lives requires a member to put his or her life in another’s hands, the connection to the institution these men and women belong to, with the associated values of loyalty, family and tradition are integral to one’s place, worth and identity. During an attempted restructure of the NZFS in the 1990s, non-union firefighters who took new contracts were perceived by firefighter union members as having committed an act of betrayal against their

---


honour code so deep that they were still treated as outcasts in 2005, a decade on from their perceived act of disloyalty.\textsuperscript{45} This illustrates an understanding of the concept of honour as one which “implies that identity is essentially … linked to institutional roles” and where “the individual discovers his true identity in his roles.” Berger argues that it has been mostly replaced in the West by a definition of identity which “is essentially independent of institutional roles,” especially as moderns came to see these “socially imposed roles” as “masks, entangling [modern man] in illusion, ‘alienation’ and ‘bad faith.’” Instead he continues, true identity is now sourced in the “modern concept of dignity.”\textsuperscript{46}

Two decades on from Berger’s essay, social anthropologists J.G. Peristiany and Julian Pitt-Rivers define honour more widely as “a conceptual field within which people find the means to express their self-esteem or their esteem for others.”\textsuperscript{47} Illustrations of the breadth of this conceptual field with its varying expressions of honour are spread across the cultures and social groups of twenty-first century New Zealand. Honour is clearly and generously given to New Zealanders with significant international achievements: Sir Edmund Hilary’s conquering of Everest and his philanthropic work, All Black winners of the Rugby World Cup, other sporting heroes like Valerie Adams and Lydia Ko, and Sir Peter Jackson and other Kiwi

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{45} <http://www.employment.org.nz/Case%20study%20NZ%20Fire%20Service.pdf> (17 December 2013) and personal observation.
\textsuperscript{46} Berger, “Obsolescence of the Concept of Honor”, 343. From p343, “The concept of honor implies that identity is essentially, or at least importantly, linked to institutional roles. The modern concept of dignity, by contrast, implies that identity is essentially independent of institutional roles…. In a world of honor, the individual discovers his true identity in his roles, and to turn away from the roles is to turn away from himself—in ‘false consciousness’, one is tempted to add. In a world of dignity, the individual can only discover his true identity by emancipating himself from his socially imposed roles—the latter are only masks, entangling him in illusion, ‘alienation’ and ‘bad faith’.” Interestingly, the NZFS have topped the list of NZ’s most trusted professions for most of the last ten years. <http://www.readersdigest.co.nz/New%20Zealands-most-trusted-professions> (5 August 2014).
\end{flushleft}
filmmakers, to list a few. Another means of expressing “esteem for others” is found in a regular weekly television item, “Good Sorts,” which invites communities to honour their unsung heroes, and in a more hands-on style, the “Mucking In” programme provides a practical way for local communities to honour those whose contributions build others up. For a few, traces of honour surround the RSVP protocols for an invitation to a formal event such as a wedding with guests who break etiquette to reply late, not at all or just turn up, perceived by the hosts as disrespecting and therefore dishonouring to them. All these are examples of honour that many Pakeha New Zealanders acknowledge. From anecdotal conversation and those interviewed, Pakeha did not articulate honour as central to identity or relations with others; supporting Berger’s conclusion that honour is not a defining concept for the identity of these Westerners.

Beyond the remits of Berger’s essay, for many of the ethnic groups who call NZ home, honour and the protocols surrounding it are intrinsically connected to one’s place in the world, to family, to how one relates to the world, and to identity. These honour protocols vary widely between different cultures and are sometimes challenging to grasp. At a State level, New Zealand and BBC media report public examples of clashes of values over honour: a New Zealand Prime Minister broke dress codes to wear designer trousers to a state function with HRH Queen Elizabeth II. The British media reported this as disrespectful behaviour by the Prime Minister, but the NZ media reported her as “very smart and casual” and couldn’t see why following a formal dress code was important in 2002. In 2014, cultural

---

49 <http://www.nzherald.co.nz/nz/news/article.cfm?c_id=1&objectid=11170288> (5 August 2014). “In total, 213 ethnic groups were identified in the [NZ] census [2013], whereas there are 196 countries recognised by Statistics New Zealand. The five largest ethnic groups in New Zealand are New Zealand European, Maori, Chinese, Samoan, and Indian, and ethnic diversity has been increasing.”
50 <http://tvnz.co.nz/content/83922/423466.html> (17 December 2013).
misunderstandings around both the values of and protocols required by a *Mihi*[^21] in order to appropriately honour the guests being welcomed have resulted in New Zealand government officials putting the Maori King in the awkward position of having to refuse a state visit from the Duke and Duchess of Cambridge, laying Maori leadership open to accusations of dishonour from a poorly informed media.[^52]

Honour is essentially communicated in the ability to make space for another to be acknowledged, to offer welcome. Honour and identity in some collectivist cultures include an awareness of being connected to and therefore having a responsibility to those who have gone before as well as the generations that follow, both physically and spiritually. In honouring their dead, a community acknowledges the debt they owe their ancestors, connecting them with their past and their future, and interpreting honour as gratitude and a recognition of their responsibility to live life well. In the story that follows, Maori and Chinese live their own values truthfully and in so doing, honour the other, as one community responds to another’s tragedy with integrity, bringing life to relationships. This recently uncovered story from Aotearoa New Zealand demonstrates how similar values of honour can bring separate cultures together with a profound connection that is beyond words through actions that reflect who they are with faithfulness, generosity and honour.

In 1902, the Ventnor set sail from Wellington, loaded with the bodies of nearly 500 Chinese gold miners who had died in Otago. Their families and communities were paying them the honour of returning them to their home soil for burial. The next day, the Ventnor sank off the Hokianga, on the northwest coast, and its precious cargo was lost to the Chinese families for 100 years. When Wong Liu

[^21]: *Mihi* is one part of the welcome ceremony, used by Tainui to refer to the complete set of protocols; other tribes use the term Powhiri or Pohiri (the beginning section) as shorthand for the whole welcome ceremony.
Sheung began researching the story for a documentary, she discovered that the bodies were not lost after all, but had been found by local Maori as they floated ashore, and buried with honour. Subsequent generations were told “by the old ones don’t forget to look after the Chinese people that are buried over there.” Shared values between Maori and Chinese around honouring their dead and a generosity of spirit in those Maori who received another community’s loved ones, caring for them in death as if they were their own, has brought “a respect that’s intertwined two family trees, two cultures and an ongoing relationship founded on a tragic accident.” One facet of this relationship between Chinese and Maori is revealed in the way local iwi (tribe) embraced the launching of the documentary, “Bai Shan,” honouring it with formal ceremonies of welcome, described here by Barry Barclay:

The enduring capacity of tikanga [protocols], through talk and ritual, to embrace outsiders, to show respect and love at the same moment, was beautifully revealed around the presentation of a short film, Bai Shan…. Liu Shueng’s family stood quietly with her as they waited for the karanga to call them onto the marae. Says festival director Heather Randerson, “Because Bai Shan was pertaining to the dead, we felt a very deep kaupapa was coming in and the kaumatua immediately wanted to honour and respect that. A second powhiri was arranged to honour the Chinese dead who had drowned and the bones that had been lost in transit. There had to be a late change in the programme to accommodate this for real welcome.”

Integral to these powhiri (ceremonies of welcome) are the meals that follow them; sharing food together reflects the new unity. This relationship was forged out of Maori hospitality and faithfulness to cultural values in response to a terrible calamity that washed strangers ashore. It is an example of how being true to one’s own values and honouring others can gift new life to otherwise non-existent

---

55 Barry Barclay, “Doing doughnuts on the Hokianga: filmmaker Barry Barclay reflects on the enriching experience that was the second biennial Hokianga Film Festival, held June 1-4.(FESTIVAL REVIEW),” Onfilm 24, no. 7 (2007).
relations, and in that way, it also parallels the initial hospitality given by Maori to Pakeha and Chinese in the previous centuries.

At the points where families and cultures interact, honour can be given or withheld without conscious awareness. In his Master’s thesis comparing First Testament hospitality to that of his native Samoa, Seve Fereti Panapa writes of the value in Samoan hospitality of gifts, given and received. For many Samoan, canned corned beef is a valued food item. Panapa describes a Samoan gathering where he witnessed a “Pakeha lady minister” refuse a gift of canned corned beef with the words:

“[T]hat is fattening, it is too much, I can’t take it all, better take it to a food store.”
This is really a shame and insult to the Samoan culture of Talimalo.... If something like this is given to a Samoan minister he/she will speak highly of it and at the end he can give it to the food store or distribute it to other people he/she knows after the function.56

Panapa is describing a culture where gift giving and receiving is highly relational. Gift-giving by representatives is reciprocal and integral to building and maintaining cohesive communities in collectivist societies by redistributing wealth to meet need.57 It fits within what sociologists call social capital. Stephen Cornell, professor of sociology at The University of Arizona includes the sharing of resources like hospitality as part of social capital common to immigrant groups from collectivist cultures.58

56 Panapa, The Significance of Hospitality, 73.
58 Social capital – “a resource evident in many immigrant groups, especially those from the more collectivist cultures. Examples include, families sharing accommodation (siblings, parents, in-laws, children and grandchildren); family loans for business start-ups, family working as staff supporting the family’s accretion of financial wealth and security.” Stephen E. Cornell, Ethnicity and race: making identities in a changing world, ed. Douglas Hartmann (Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Pine Forge Press, an Imprint of Sage Publication, 2007), 230.
In refusing the gift, this Pakeha minster was, however unintentionally, understood as refusing the relationship, insulting or dishonouring the givers as well as those who would benefit by her onward gift. A Pakeha, probably with Western values of individualism, honesty and direct speech, had been invited as a guest of honour because of her ministerial position into a culture where the gift is not given to the individual so much as to the communities she represented. A more culturally appropriate and honouring response at the sight of the high fat, high sodium, but very tasty gift would be to take the gift with sincere thanks, thus honouring the relationship, and then to quietly pass it on to someone who would appreciate it. The ability to receive the gift with integrity on behalf of wider family and community honours both communities, those who gave and those who receive.

In cross-cultural relations like these where values conflict on a public platform, it’s possible that the Pakeha visitor may be completely unaware of having given offence, or that as a member of the majority culture she may consider it her responsibility, even that she is honour-bound, to educate the newcomers on the right way to respond. This is, after all, “how we do things here.” This blind assumption of many in majority cultures that the “way we do things here is the right way and newcomers need to learn to fit in” dishonours all parties to the relationship. In welcoming others, a host does not need to require the guest to be the same in all respects. Welcome involves acceptance which includes an honouring of the gifts and differences that others bring. Yet this does not mean that welcome is un-boundaried. Hospitality also includes the protection of host and guest and the values that define them. The challenge lies in how this is worked out in practice.

These are but a few examples of misunderstandings that arise because of the multiple interpretations given to the word “honour” by different ethnic groups. In
Auckland, the world’s largest Pacific city,\textsuperscript{59} Maori, Pasifika and Asian communities with their distinctive yet often unarticulated understandings of honour dwell alongside a Western Pakeha culture for whom the term “honour” has essentially fallen into disuse.\textsuperscript{60}

With the benefit of hindsight, the account of cultural misunderstandings between Samoan and Pakeha illustrates how learning to understand another’s culture as well as to submit our own cultural perceptions to the light of Jesus’ teaching are both acts of honouring one another and practical ways to love our neighbour. Rather than promote any one particular cultural way of being Christian, cross-cultural ethicist Bernard Adeney, observes that “[a]ll Christians in every culture are invited to have the mind of Christ, to humble themselves and be servants to others (Phil 2).”\textsuperscript{61} Living in places where cultures interact more and more, it is timely to explore cultural and biblical understandings of honour. The central questions that shape this research include: What does honour look like in the New Zealand church today? How is it expressed differently by different cultures? What does this mean for a biblical understanding of honouring one another? What is the relationship between truth-telling and honour? How might a clearer picture of honour in multi-cultural communities be appropriated as one route to answering Jesus’ prayer for the church (John 13:34-35; 17:20-24) and Paul’s call to maturity in the body of Christ (Ephesians 4: 11-16)?

While these questions will be explored in Chapter 5 and following, we turn now to several concepts that relate to honour, namely honour and shame cultures, collectivist and individualist cultures, the concepts of shame/whakamaa, whakaiti, mana and face and the connection of each of these concepts to identity. Exploring

\textsuperscript{59} Ibid., 228.
\textsuperscript{60} Berger, “Obsolescence of the Concept of Honor”, 339-344.
\textsuperscript{61} Adeney, Strange Virtues, 15.
these concepts as they relate to honour prepares the way to discuss its obsolescence, before returning to biblical perspectives on honour.

How Cultures Define Honour

Anthropologist Michael Jackson is on the right track when he argues that honor is just one culturally specific variation on a whole continuum of human experiential responses to the anxiety of powerlessness or non-being. “The connotations of mana in Apolynesian,” he writes, of “dewa in Sumba, miran in Kuranko, and honor in circum-Mediterranean societies suggest that, despite cultural variations similarly embodied sensations of amplitude…. Everywhere constitute our sense of existence and autonomy.” Jackson doesn’t do enough to spell out just how honor and mana might for instance be related, but he points us towards something inherent in the human condition, differently “embodied sensations of amplitude” that take cultural form but are not simplistically reducible to culture.

In beginning this exploration of honour, two diverging paths quickly appeared. The first expanded into the field of honour and shame cultures, which closely overlap with collectivist cultures and are the subject of much academic discussion, a small portion of which is referenced below. The second was a voice calling out that the concept of honour was obsolete. While this voice focused on Western cultures, cultures that are synonymous with the rise of individualism, this essay by Peter Berger supplied a link between honour and identity, also linking back to honour and shame cultures. So to talk of honour is to talk about identity in individualist and collectivist cultures as well as honour and shame cultures. This chapter reviews these concepts, also exploring connections between honour and its loss and restoration through culturally diverse practices that engage with truth telling, such as ceremonies of apology, the application of whakamaa (shame) and the


63 Berger references Campbell’s work in his 1964 Oxford volume, Honour, Family, and Patronage. Material from this volume was republished in Honour and Shame including the essay “Honour and the Devil” and referred to again by Peristiany and Pitt-Rivers in Honor and Grace.
role of affirmation. While exploring these different approaches to honour, occasional glimpses of the “amplitude” identified by Michael Jackson and Don Seeman appear. I suggest that the biblical call to honour traces a path towards this abundance of being, distinct from and yet found in part within each culture’s different expressions of honour. Abundance of being requires a secure place to stand, this makes room for welcome, for hospitality, and this is at the heart of God. Just as God makes room for the richness of human cultures, God’s hospitality requires the same of those who follow him.

HONOUR AND SHAME CULTURES

Turning first to the field of honour and shame, Biblical scholars, recognising that a clearer understanding of original cultural contexts is an aid to biblical interpretation, have built on studies of present-day Mediterranean communities by social anthropologists Campbell, Peristiany, Pitt-Rivers and others. The last few decades have seen multiple works exploring the dynamics of honour and shame in biblical cultures, drawing on research of current Mediterranean communities as well as classicists. Biblical scholar, Peter Gosnell remarks that:

New Testament scholarship has increasingly recognized the importance of honor and shame dynamics in understanding NT texts. In spite of the criticism that models of honor and shame may anachronistically rely too much on data from contemporaneous Mediterranean settings, ongoing work by both classicists and biblical scholars has demonstrated how ancient literature itself expresses and affirms honor and shame dynamics.64

In exploring both the influence and subversion of honour and shame values in biblical cultures, the work of these biblical scholars65 also sheds light on how some

65 For example, Gosnell, Malina, Neyrey, Halvor Moxnes, and David deSilva.
present day cultures may understand honour, but first to some characteristics of honour and shame cultures.

All cultures have concepts of honour as ways of expressing esteem for self and others, but an honour and shame culture views honour as a “limited” and prized commodity. Zeba Crook notes how this value placed on honour, “distinguishes honor and shame cultures from non-honor and shame cultures: a non-honor and shame culture might well know honor and shame, but it does not see honor as a limited good and thus does not contest it with the same intensity.”

Where a family’s (or whole community’s) honour is an almost tangible property, it is worth protecting and worth fighting to achieve or regain if lost, a view that is also reflected by those 17th century men and 20th century Japanese pilots who considered their honour worth dying for.

It’s easy for a 21st century Westerner steeped in individualism and from a non-honour and shame culture to miss what Gosnell describes as the “other” centeredness of honour and shame cultures. This “other” centeredness is evident in their stronger focus on “‘attentiveness to appearances’ as opposed to the ‘attentiveness to the inner voice’ prominent in guilt-oriented cultures.” Honour in the eyes of the relevant community has connections to identity and value in ways unknown to members of non-honour and shame cultures, but also in ways that differ from group to group within a society. David deSilva, citing Pitt-Rivers, gives this definition of honour in such contexts:

Honour is the value of a person in his own eyes, but also in the eyes of his society. It is his estimation of his own worth, his claim to pride, but it is also acknowledgment of that claim, his excellence recognized by society.... [I]n a complex society where

---

66 Crook, “Honor, shame, and social status,” 593.
67 Malina, Insights from Cultural Anthropology, 33, 36 and chapters 4 and 5.
consensus is not uniform, the individual’s worth is not the same in the view of one group as in that of another.⁶⁹

Honour, as understood here, includes an acknowledgment that a characteristic of honour and shame cultures is the measurement of the worth of individuals relative to their relation to the group.

For many honour and shame cultures, family is paramount, kinship obligations are often unarticulated yet “inescapable” and personal choice is limited in a way alien to those with loose family ties. Peter Lau describes the strength of these ties in his work, on *Identity and Ethics in the Book of Ruth*:

In individualist societies people often withdraw from inconveniently demanding social groups, but this is not an option for members of a collectivist society. Even if the society makes costly demands on an individual, she cannot withdraw from her kinship group. The result is a person either accepts the obligation, or he refuses the obligation and accepts the consequences. These choices are associated with either honour or shame, the degree of which is determined by kinship proximity.⁷⁰

While Lau’s description is of a collectivist community in ancient Israel, the power of strong kinship ties on personal choice, honour and shame is still evident in many of today’s more collectivist cultures, found across Eastern Europe, the Mediterranean and Middle East, Africa, Asia, China, the Pacific and Latin America. The three more collectivist groups focused on in this research, Maori, Chinese and Samoan (all New Zealand born), typically place high value on family, respecting elders, hospitality and generosity.

A recent conflict between the New Zealand government and the Tainui people indicates similarities between the honour and shame cultures described by biblical scholars and the concept of honour within a Maori *Iwi* in 21st century New Zealand.

---

Zealand. Conflicting and misunderstood values of honour contributed to the confusion and frustration between the New Zealand Government, the officials acting for the Maori King, and the media in the recent negotiations over a visit by British royals. Actions taken by King Tuheitia’s Tainui officials precisely because they did not want to dishonour the Duke and Duchess of Cambridge with less than complete welcome protocols have been interpreted by British media as dishonouring to their own royalty, yet in the eyes of the Tainui people, for the Maori King to give less than full honour to these visitors would be to insult his guests and diminish his own honour. This illustrates how the “other” centeredness and stronger focus on “attentiveness to appearances” that distinguish an honour and shame culture and influence its interpretation of honour are at odds with how honour is understood by the other cultures party to that conversation.

CULTURE: FROM COLLECTIVIST TO INDIVIDUALIST

“Collectivist” and “Individualist” are terms that have been used across the social and health sciences to describe a distinctive divide in cultural values also corresponding to non-Western and Western cultures. In this research the terms are used to distinguish Pakeha from Maori, Chinese and Samoan ethnicities. A specialist in ethnic diversity, Dr. Rosalind Willis, in an article that challenges some Collectivist-Individualist observations on family care, gives this description of their meanings:

Collectivism is a cultural value in which the extended family is the central concept, and the needs of an individual family member are subordinate to a sense of family responsibilities … Collectivist families typically exhibit closeness and interdependence. In contrast, the cultural value of individualism promotes the needs of the nuclear family over the extended family, and key features are loose relationships, autonomy and independence … collectivists willingly provide informal

care out of affection for their family members whereas individualists are less willing to provide informal care and do so out of a sense of necessity.73

Willis’ research relies on Phinney’s ethnic identity theory to suggest that differences in care between Individualist and Collectivist (I-C) may be due in part to the differing levels of awareness of ethnic identity. Willis suggests that those with a strong sense of ethnic identity reference their ethnicity and values when giving reasons for care, while those with the low sense of ethnic identity often found among a majority individualist ethnic group, use more generic reference points when giving reasons for care of their elderly.

This I-C cultural distinction has been drawn on by psychologists to examine the self. Developmental psychologists, Michael F. Mascolo and Jin Li summarise the parallels between I-C cultural distinctions and self:

Corresponding to individualist cultures, individual selves are seen as having sharp and well-defined boundaries but loose ties between individuals; the individual is expected to look after himself or herself. In contrast, in collectivist cultures people are born into cohesive in-groups and are obligated to honor relationships; selves exhibit permeable or loose boundaries.74

Like Willis, Professors Mascolo and Li also contest the view that one is either individualist or collectivist. They suggest that labelling cultures and selves as either Individualist or Collectivist “fails to capture the nuances and textures of cultures and the multiplicity of the selves in development.”75 In this paper, the concepts of individualism and collectivism are understood as intrinsic in all individuals and cultures but to varying degrees, although for ease of reference, Individualist and Collectivist will be used to identify the side of the continuum a culture prefers. This


74 Mascolo and Li, “Editors’ notes,” 1.

75 Ibid., 3. See also Podsadlowski and Fox, “Collectivism in the New Zealand Context,” 5-7.
makes room for “collectivist” concepts in “individualist” cultures, and “individualist” concepts in “collectivist” cultures, namely space for “how interdependent, relational, and hierarchical selves develop within Western cultures… [and] how representations of individuality develop and function in non-Western cultures.”

HONOUR AND IDENTITY IN COLLECTIVIST CULTURES

Honour and shame cultures are typically collectivist and hierarchical with strong connections to institutions like family.77 What Gosnell referred to as the “other” centeredness of honour and shame cultures is evident in the way those within these cultures source identity relationally or collectively as is evident among Maori, Samoan and Chinese cultures. When identity is sourced relationally rather than individually, an individual’s actions that bring honour or shame directly impact the honour of the whole group. To illustrate these concepts I’ve drawn examples primarily from the work of Joan Metge, a social anthropologist whose writings on Maori perspectives promote cross-cultural awareness within NZ, but first, a personal experience.

In a pastoral care class I was part of at St John’s Theological College in 2001,78 I and the other students were asked to complete an exercise to indicate how we sourced identity, called an “identity exercise.” Participants were asked to describe their identity by completing the “I am...” statement several times. Those students raised in homes within some of Auckland’s Maori and Samoan cultures began their identity statements by describing a place in the wider family. Their focus was not on

76 Mascolo and Li, “Editors’ notes,” 3.
78 St Johns Theological College, Graduate Diploma in Theology through the Auckland Consortium of Theology.
the individual but on who that individual is related to, for example *I am a wife, mother, daughter, and sister and grand-daughter, niece, cousin.*

Exploring relational identity further reveals that the “I am…” question is itself based in an Individualist framework and that the exercise would benefit by including the question “Where are you from?” a question that connects more closely to the identity statements found in Maori informal welcome protocols (*mihimihi*), or even “‘O ai lou aiga?’ (Who is your family?), ‘O fea lou nu’u?’ (Where is your village?)” Such questions are likely to elicit fuller responses that describe the network where identity is found.

Bolstad, drawing on Metge, provides another example of conflicting understandings of honour, self and other between individualist and collectivist perspectives. He reports on the futility of a Pakeha counselling exercise for a Maori client who had been brought up to value *whakaiti* (modesty) and the *mana* (power, prestige, authority, honour) of the group rather than the individual. She was encouraged to list the things she was good at so as to strengthen her self-esteem, in other words, to honour herself and build her confidence with others. Her response suggests that, rather than therapeutic, she found the exercise almost shaming in its focus on promoting her own strengths rather than that of the group she belonged to:

“We were brought up to not look down on anyone, but to look up to the people who had mana, to the kuia [female elders] and koroua [male elders], and above all to be whakaiti [modest, to have humility], not to push yourself.” To be whakaiti is not the same, Metge explains, as being whakamaa (a word which implies shame, shyness, withdrawal, and loss of mana).

---


80 Metge, *In and Out of Touch*, 70.

81 Bolstad, *Transforming Communication*, 35; Citing Metge, *In and Out of Touch*. 
For Maori, relationships are central to identity. Family extends from parents and siblings to include grandparents, aunts, uncles, cousins and beyond. For those who grow up within such a cultural context, this network of connections, which also reaches back to ancestors, offers a sense of identity, acceptance and belonging that is almost immutable, and most simply illustrated by the phrase, “my family are always there for me.”

**CONCEPTS THAT RELATE TO HONOUR - SHAME/WHAKAMAA, WHAKAITI, MANA**

One consequence of such strong relational bonds is that actions of any one member of the community will cause the whole community varying degrees of either shame or honour, concepts contained in but not equivalent to whakamaa, whakaiti and mana. These concepts are best considered together as each one helps to define the others. They also take this conversation about honour into the field of Truth-telling. For Maori, when honour is diminished, shame emerges; for honour to be restored, shame must join with truthful living, a pattern that is illustrated shortly and one that echoes Jesus’ grouping of honour, shame and truth in his conversation with Simon the Pharisee. In Jesus’ actions, he honours the woman, releasing her from shame. As Jesus speaks the truth in love, he models the welcome of God, reminding Simon that he too belongs to God’s family, a community where welcome, forgiveness and acceptance are expressions of honour.

*Mana* is one of several Maori terms that have been adopted into English conversations among New Zealanders without translation. Common translations are power, prestige, or authority, but these English words fail to grasp the concept and lack the meaning found in its original context: how much mana a person has.
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<sup>82</sup> “Mana: n. power originating in the spiritual realm conferred from above (by the gods) and endorsed from below (by the people): 2. Authority stemming from the indwelling of spiritual power; 3. Prestige, standing; 4. Proven ability to do and get things done,” from the “Glossary” in Joan Metge, *Tuamaka: The Challenge of Difference in Aotearoa New Zealand* (Auckland, N.Z.: Auckland University Press, 2010), 125.
depends on one’s ancestors (lineage), place in family and iwi, as well as achievements and current standing. Concepts like mana, whakaiti and whakamaa cannot simply be translated as prestige, modesty and shame: because they are embedded in a collectivist cultural way of viewing the world they rely on the community to give them meaning through its responses. In a similar manner to the concept of “face” in Asia, mana could be said, in part, to be one measure of one’s standing in a community. Using a definition of honour from social anthropology as “a conceptual field within which people find the means to express their self-esteem or their esteem for others,” the combined concepts of mana and whakaiti both contribute to an understanding of honour. NZ based North American media lecturer and writer, Harriet Margolis, in an article on the impact of Eva Rickard’s own mana on her role in the film Mauri (life-spirit) considers links between mana and charisma before discussing mana in this 20th century Tainui leader. Defining charisma as “a free gift or favour specially vouchsafed by God; a grace, a talent” and from Max Weber as, “a gift or power of leadership or authority,” and “the capacity to inspire devotion or enthusiasm,” Margolis distinguishes charisma from mana.

Eva Rickard might be said to have gained mana on the grounds of her personal struggle to reclaim land that had been misappropriated from her people. Her own actions over the course of her life contributed to her personal mana, her association with the land increased her personal mana through the mana connected with the land and the benefits it provides, and she also accrued mana through association with the preceding and following generations by carrying on the struggles of her predecessors and helping those who followed her to continue the fight. A person with mana has the “power to inspire belief,” the “title to be believed,” that the OED attributes to an authority. By the end of her life, Eva Rickard was frequently called upon as an authority, by the pakeha media as well as her own Maori community.
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By the end of her life Eva Rickard’s *mana* had established itself as a force to be reckoned with, it demanded responses of respect and honour, not just by her own community but also across the wider New Zealand community. This increase in the honour given to her brought an increase in *mana* to her whole community.

Just as it’s possible for an individual’s actions to result in an increase of honour and *mana* for his or her community, if one member acts dishonourably, the whole community’s *mana* diminishes and their *whakamaa* increases, relative to the nature of the action and the closeness of the relationship. Dame Metge interviewed Maori researcher, Anaru Penrose, about the connections between honour, *whakaiti* and *whakamaa*. Bolstad refers to this interview citing Penrose who says, “Whakamaa is not taking a lowly position, it is being put in a lowly position. One does not seek whakamaa. Whakaiti is a lowly position that one might seek, adopt, incorporate into your philosophy, but a lowly position of honour. Whakamaa is a lowly position of dishonour.” Bolstad notes that, “the modesty or humility of whakaiti is an important part of esteem for Maori,” concluding with Metge’s comment, “Whakaiti goes with being secure in your identity, not simply as an individual but as a link in a descent line and a member of a descent group, and as a result of close association with older relatives in childhood.”

In her book, *In and Out of Touch: Whakamaa in Cross Cultural Context*, Dame Metge describes the role *whakamaa* plays in the *mana* of a community and in restoring relations and honour. *Whakamaa* can only be understood in the context of this community framework and in relation to *mana*. Individual Maori can also feel *whakamaa* when that individual is praised above his or her group, or when comparisons to other groups, even other ethnicities show, for example, Maori as somehow lower or less than, whether in academic achievements or a higher
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86 Bolstad, *Transforming Communication*, 35; citing Metge, *In and Out of Touch*. 38
representation of Maori in prisons, or because of poorer living or health conditions. *Whakamaa* is sometimes seen to strike people like an “affliction,” which usually requires the “help of others” for the sufferer to be restored to healthy connections again.87 A person can be *whakamaa* despite no wrongdoing, and in these situations, the community acts quickly to bring healing.88 Metge’s descriptions of a community that understands how to use *whakamaa* to bring restoration, knowing when to keep silent and let *whakamaa* do its work and when to speak, echo this description by Christine Pohl of a community learning the Christian Practice of Truth-Telling:

> Creating a culture of truthfulness involves knowing when we should speak, and when it is appropriate to conclude that God is at work and we do not need to say anything. It requires patience and wisdom to know what ought to be borne for a time, and what should be confronted.89

Where *whakamaa* results from wrongdoing, the process of restoration is slower. The family support which is the backbone of identity is also the foundation for the application of shame in the process of restoration, a restoration aimed at growth in character and wisdom, and a return to proper place and community. Within the last few generations, in this secure framework when a member offended, the “local community acted in concert to bring offenders to the point of confession and reparation.”90

Where a person is *whakamaa* because she has breached the moral code or deviated from a prescribed pattern of behaviour, those in a position to help stand back at least for a little while, leaving her to suffer, to be “punished by *whakamaa*”. How long they wait before taking positive steps depends on the seriousness of the offence and the intensity of the *whakamaa*.... When the elders were satisfied that the offender was repentant and had been adequately punished, they reached out and drew her back into the web of social relationships.91
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87 Metge, *In and Out of Touch*, 94.
88 Ibid., 98.
90 Metge, *In and Out of Touch*, 95.
91 Ibid., 94-95.
There are aspects of the communication style in this collectivist culture that those outside the culture may misunderstand; one is the passivity of the accused, who will stay silent and allow others to speak on his or her behalf. Like many collectivist cultures, Maori have a great reliance on non-verbal communication, frequently communicating “yes” or “no” with facial expressions only. These silent, visual exchanges of meaning are often misunderstood by more individualist cultures. In a restoration process, the more word-focused Pakeha look for evidence of genuine repentance through verbal statements acknowledging the wrongdoing and asking forgiveness and through a contrition that is recognisable to Pakeha as such by the facial expressions, posture and tone of the penitent. From my observations, Pakeha communication styles also tend to look for direct eye contact during the apology as part of taking responsibility.

In contrast, Metge describes how Maori often require few or even no words but look to recognise an individual’s repentance and forgiveness through his or her attitudes and actions. In some situations, the expression of whakamaa, often through avoidance of eye contact is accepted as sufficient penitence and without any words being spoken everyone moves on. For more serious offences, making acts of restitution may be required, with sometimes a simple phrase admitting fault like, “He Tika teena” (“You are right”), or a self-mocking phrase acknowledging the error, not directed to the party offended but “meant to be overheard” by him or her. Maori have so little need for a formal apology or request for forgiveness that the phrase “I’m sorry” has no equivalent in Te Reo Maori (Maori language). 92 Even in this communal system of restorative justice, where an offence is private then private restoration is usually most appropriate. Where an offence affects the wider community, the restoration process begins with frank discussions in the home and

92 Ibid., 97-98.
then moves to the wider forum. Here, the leadership often use strong words in their administration of justice to the offender. What might appear to Pakeha as overly harsh criticism is mitigated by the context of that unbreakable relationship, and for the repentant, the initial shame of public scrutiny dissipates in the security and acceptance back into the fold. This acceptance is solidified in the way the offence is not referred to again.

This type of restoration through *whakamaa* happens within the community and sits inside that character building and disciplinary aspect of truth-telling necessary for growing members up into maturity, in its way a reflection of Paul’s commands in Ephesians 4:15. It also reflects a community that understands the wisdom of silence, bringing a different perspective to Christine Pohl’s thoughts on silence and truthful living as she considers Alan Kreider’s words.

A community that loves the truth will understand the wisdom of silence. Speaking truthfully, as Mennonite theologian Alan Kreider notes, does not mean that we will “always say everything we think or know. There is ample room, in the truthful life for silence, discretion, the keeping of confidences and even the pleasantries that lubricate social interchange…. But this does mean that we are committed to making the words we utter true words.”

The restoration process of *whakamaa* gives room to bring justice and right relations with mercy by speaking the truth in a relationship of love. The space to bring correction and truth, sometimes very bluntly, yet always in an attitude of humility, honouring all present, is also offered as part of the welcome ceremony onto the marae. The formal process that welcomes strangers, closing the physical distance between them and transitioning them into friends includes a space for other types of distance to be closed: space for emotional and factual disagreements to be raised and resolutions found, and when that distance has been closed, time is made to eat together.
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93 Pohl, *Living into Community*, 150.
The practices described sit within the more traditional and formal expressions of Maori culture offering a model where a community raises a child, and continues to call him or her to account as adults. Its focus is reflective of parents’ positive “discipline” of children to grow them in character and responsibility to their communities. This is distinct from the more formal ethnic examples of dispute resolution or punishment for criminal behaviour, such as Samoan ceremonies of apology, although it may contain elements of these aspects. Mid-twentieth century New Zealand saw a movement from rural communities which nurtured traditional cultural practices into urban centres with subsequent dislocation and loss of community leadership and practices although this has seen some reversal in the last two decades. In response to these challenges, urban and rural Maori leadership have sought various ways to support their communities, work with local and national government, and champion more culturally appropriate responses to needs. The ability to speak for those who have no voice, to champion the needs of the weak and oppressed is another aspect of honour at work.

CONCEPTS THAT RELATE TO HONOUR – GENEROSITY, RESPECT AND FACE

Making others welcome is fundamental to hospitality, and the recognition that welcome means to make room for others, to acknowledge who they are, is in essence to honour them. While acknowledging that conflict has been, and is still, present within as well as between all cultures, a primary gift that Maori have made to the fabric of NZ society today is in their ability to honour others with a welcome that also honours tikanga and safeguards their own identity. It’s a gift that has cost much suffering and struggle, and one that has the power to shape NZ’s future even as it has forged its history. While some Pakeha reciprocated the welcome with its
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94 Metge, In and Out of Touch, 97; Law Commission, Preliminary Paper 47: Family Court Dispute Resolution, a discussion paper 2002.
inherent honour, many took the gift and trampled on the giver. The majority of the early Chinese arrivals however reciprocated the hospitality and welcome offered. Manying Ip, Professor of Asian Studies at the University of Auckland, has been researching the Chinese in New Zealand since her own arrival in 1974. She describes how the Chinese, arriving from the late 1860s onwards, encountered early hostility from their Pakeha recruiters via legislation that denied voting or land purchasing rights as well as the prohibitive poll tax. Those that chose to stay discovered much in common with Maori and these values are still evident today. Ip writes:

Anecdotally, both Chinese and Maori people often comment on some of these apparently shared cultural values. Both cultures respect their elders, cherish their families, share responsibility for raising their young, and tend to put collective welfare above individual interests. The communal practices of Chinese villages bear considerable resemblance to Maori custom.

Ip also reports how Maori appreciated the generosity of Chinese market gardeners who often provided meals for their workers, many of whom were local Maori. In interviews with Ip, Chinese New Zealander Frank Kwok and his sisters remember how their father taught these values, modelling them in his support of the schools they attended, “Father would always leave a crate of apples for all the kindy kids.” Describing his father, Frank Kwok continues:

William Kwok was also liberal enough to want all his children, including his nine daughters, to have the best possible education. All agree that Frank enjoyed no special favour as the only son, although it was understood that he would one day be “head of the family.” To this day Frank keeps his father’s handwritten motto to him: “Respect your elders. Obey your parents. Love your sisters.” It was dated 1938, when Frank finished primary school.

95 Kirsten Wong, “A Place to Stand.” The poll tax charged on any entry by Chinese to New Zealand was so high that the men who worked in NZ could not bring their wives and children.
97 Ibid., 231.
98 Ip, Dragons on the Long White Cloud, 51.
99 Ibid.
These threads of generosity, respect for elders, obedience to parents and responsibility for family members, all contribute to how honouring others is understood and practiced by both NZ Chinese and Maori.

Distinct from the values held in common by Maori and Chinese is the concept of saving face, a concept integral to the Chinese understanding of honour although not limited to Asian cultures. An aspect of saving face that Westerners struggle to come to terms with is its impact on a culture’s perspectives of honesty, fair play and truthful living. Within a large number of the world’s cultures, honouring others may look to others like avoiding the truth, covering it and even denying it. In Living into Community: Cultivating Practices that Sustain us, Christine Pohl reflects on the Christian Practice of living truthfully: the need for and the challenges involved in carrying out Paul’s command to the Ephesians to “tell the truth in love” (Ephesians 4:15), and how truth is fundamental if Christian communities are to thrive and human relations flourish.

What does a community or congregation look like that loves truth or lives truthfully? ... Philosophers and theologians[...].discussions often center on whether a person should ever lie. The discussions are also quite narrow when they assume that truth-telling primarily involves telling someone something they don’t want to hear. The importance of truthful living is much bigger than these issues.100

Living truthfully or Truth-telling, as it is also known, covers a wide field with theologians like Augustine on one side mooting that it is never right to lie and Bonhoeffer, about 1500 years later, arguing for an appreciation of context among the challenges of living truthfully in a deceitful society.101 Telling the truth is understood differently in different cultures102 and examining different cultural approaches to truth and truth-telling, as well as submitting those various cultural perspectives to

100 Pohl, Living into Community, 114.
101 Ibid., 117.
102 Adeney, Strange Virtues, 17-18.
the light of Christ, may result in a discovery of weaknesses in each culture as well as strengths to be shared.

In order to build a picture of what saving face might look like to NZ Chinese I’m referencing Campbell’s study of an honour and shame culture in the Mediterranean and a North American discussion of the concept of face in business negotiations between Chinese and North Americans entitled, “Fighting Dragons with Dragons.” The discussion of the modern Chinese negotiation style includes the Chinese negotiators’ valuing of cunning above fair play. A valuing of cunning is foreign to many Americans, and possibly just as remote to NZers including NZ Chinese belonging as they do, to “the least corrupt country in the world,” but the work of J.K. Campbell reveals a valuing of cunning on a remote Mediterranean island. Campbell’s early work in a remote rural Greek community not long after WWII describes an agonistic (competitive) culture of honour and shame, that at times required husbands and fathers to use cunning, lies and hostility to defend their family’s honour against xenos (strangers – any non-relative). Campbell notes that the lack of security and the struggle for survival fed the competitive aspects of the culture’s understanding of honour and challenged biblical concepts of truth-telling. Similar struggles for survival across nearly three millennia in the Chinese continent also elevate cunning against truth-telling in a way that is foreign to many of today’s Western cultures, New Zealand included. Strutton, Tran and Taylor, authors of an article on negotiations between American and Chinese businesses, define “face” as

103 Campbell, “Honour and the Devil,” 139-170.
the reflection one sees in the eyes of one’s peers. Face measures one’s standing in a community. Lose it, and one’s self-identity diminishes. Stripping face from Chinese negotiators is probably the worst tactical mistake managers can make. The possibility of future relationships is, essentially, decimated.\(^\text{107}\)

According to the authors, the sophisticated negotiating tactics developed in this ancient culture are rooted in Confucian wisdom as well as military strategies. Part of cunning is to “give face,” as honour is known in China, to not call attention to another’s faults, and to appear to yield ground for a time by not “resisting resistance.” “Bing Fa law [military based strategic thinking begun 2,700 years ago] prescribes to students: Combine in yourself the dove and the dragon, not as monster but as prodigy. Educated Chinese managers extract two explicit lessons from the law,”\(^\text{108}\) cunning construed as the strategic understanding of the power of both patience and balance in business negotiation. Strutton, Tran and Taylor identify how slow American business negotiators have been in grasping that the Chinese do not embrace Western concepts of fair play, and are content to appear to yield until the opposing side tires and so expose their weakness. Also mitigating against successful communication is an American dualistic (either/or) thinking with direct questioning styles that attempt to force “honest” answers but may instead result in the Chinese “losing face.”\(^\text{109}\) The authors explain:

Overt demands should never be employed to resolve conflict. Even seemingly innocuous questions such as ‘Do we have a deal?’ go too far. Chinese partners may have substantial difficulty responding to such ultimatums, because acquiescence might diminish face.\(^\text{110}\)

This “not to deceive but to be polite” has parallels to other Asian and some Pacific cultures. In *Strange Virtues*, cross-cultural ethicist, Adeney notes a similar
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\(^{108}\) Ibid., 565.
\(^{109}\) Ibid., 570.
\(^{110}\) Ibid.
confusion where one culture in a conversation held it to be discourteous to refuse a
direct request, instead replying with “Tomorrow.”

An Indonesian student from North Sulawesi expressed his frustration that when he
asked a neighbour if she could introduce them to a home helper, she answered,
“Yes.” When asked, “When?” she answered, “Tomorrow.” As is common in Java,
“tomorrow” never came.111

And to close this section on how vital it is to recognise the role honour or face can
play in a collectivist culture, Adeney tells how an American couple in Egypt found
themselves in conflict with their landlady. Their preference, supported by counsel
from home, was to “frankly discuss the problem” with her, but they followed the
advice of an Egyptian friend “to draw back, not to confront the situation, but to let
it die down…. As a result, the landlady saved face and eventually became their
closest friend.”112 Had they gone with their personal concept of the best way to deal
with conflict, confronted her and tried to force an open, frank discussion, she would
have been shamed and like the Chinese negotiators lost face, and the friendship
would have been lost.

CEREMONIES OF APOLOGY

An insightful view of the power of shame and honour is evident in the
existence of customs that promote restoration of relationship and honour. Where
family relationship is fundamental to cultural values, customary practices exist for
managing conflict, enabling reconciliation and where possible restoration, reflecting
the centrality of relations to the peace, well-being and prosperity of the whole
community.

111 Adeney, Strange Virtues, 18.
112 Ibid., 43. Adeney continues, “Typical American values in this situation would stress individual rights and
responsibilities, personal privacy and frank, open communication. In contrast Egyptian values stress group
solidarity, guarding the other’s honor and maintaining social harmony. The ‘right’ solution to the conflict
was that which was appropriate to the context.”
In *Living into Community*, Pohl, cites Tristan Anne Borer’s work, *Telling the Truths*, discussing the need for factual and narrative truth. Borer says:

Knowledge is akin to forensic truth – the factual aspect of truth. Forensic truth is the only type of truth ... that is an end in itself – that end being the creation of knowledge about the past. Narrative truth, in contrast, is a means to a different end, such as healing or affirming the dignity of victims and survivors. In this sense narrative truth closely resembles acknowledgement.\[113\]

Pohl continues, “To pursue reconciliation after any major rupture in relationships, it is helpful to work with both understandings of truth – we need knowledge, the facts – and the personal or communal acknowledgement of experience, hurt, betrayal, and loss. Only in this way can truth and truth-telling be fully connected to justice and healing.”\[114\]

The *ifoga*, a Samoan ceremony of apology, illustrates the strength of collectivist identity, the role of the whole group in the resolution of conflict, as well as changing values with respect to identity and honour. The *ifoga* sits at the formal end of traditional procedures for resolving “inter-group tensions” and is reserved for more serious offences\[115\] that cause “major rupture in relationships”\[116\] with long term consequences for survival. It is “a public act of self-humiliation - accompanied by the gift of ‘ie toga or fine mats, speeches of contrition and food - made as a form of apology by one group for the conduct of one of its members to another offended group.”\[117\] Performing the *ifoga* has “high personal, sociopolitical and economic costs” to both the offender and his or her group. They “are normally successful in resolving tensions because few benefit, and many may suffer, from unmanaged

---
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tension within either families or villages.” 118 Cluny Macpherson and La’avasa Macpherson give an overview of historical and current use before considering the impact of individualist cultures on potential future practices of this collectivist dispute resolution procedure. *Ifoga* aims to resolve disputes between families and relieve tension within a community, but does not consider any individual grievance.

In one example, when “a young, well-educated woman was raped in a village,” *ifoga* was performed and accepted by the families involved, but the young woman did not agree. Against senior family advice, she laid criminal charges, and the offender was subsequently convicted and imprisoned. Opinion regarding her decision was divided, with some considering her actions an affront to her family and their right to act on her behalf. Others deemed there was room for both, with the *ifoga* playing its role in restoring relations between the families, but that “its effect was confined to the restoration of relations between collectivities. It did not, they argued, resolve the dispute between the woman and the man.”

Another example of a ceremony of apology comes from one of Samoa’s south western neighbours, Fiji, and offers a more intimate perspective on the customary ceremony of apology. Found in a collection of student stories from around the Pacific, “Profile 79” tells briefly of an engagement that is ruptured by pregnancy prior to the wedding ceremony. The story, told through the eyes of a sibling, describes the restoration that results as the two families carry out the *Bulubulu* - a custom of asking for forgiveness of any kind, especially in the case of elopement and illegitimate pregnancies, which includes a *Magiti* or ceremonial feast. 120 This ceremony illustrates the power of customary protocols that allow

118 Ibid., 111.
119 Ibid., 123-124.
members to tell the truth about wrongdoing, offer forgiveness and exchange shame with honour, and to celebrate their reconciliation in a shared celebratory meal. Completion of these ceremonies of apology requires a high social cost to the participant communities and families, and the willingness to pay the cost reflects the commitment to maintaining relations while also providing a tangible exchange of honour that provides a platform for participants to forgive and move on.

There is discussion on the complications and weaknesses of these collectivist practices, where individual participants are bullied rather than valued and their human rights violated. The potential for exploitation is everywhere present and so the need to challenge and guard against it is a constant, yet that potential does not deny that such ceremonies also offer an opportunity to honour one another and the respective families and communities. The success of these protocols relies on a commitment to restoration by the community, not just of peaceful relations, but of right relations (as in justice). The same criteria for success could also be applied to the proliferation over the last few decades of official apologies by states and other actors in the West (such as corporations, universities and the Catholic Church).¹²¹

**Honour and Identity in Individualist Cultures**

While honour, and “honoured behaviour,” is interpreted differently from culture to culture,¹²² a clear divide exists between collectivist cultures and individualist cultures in both their definition of honour and the role it plays in
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¹²² “People in honor and shame settings perform in accordance with the reputation they must maintain, or avoid...D. deSilva refers to this public as ‘the court of reputation’ and points out that one reality making this court ambiguous for the Greco-Roman world is found in the multiplicity of cultures brought together within the Roman Empire. A given city can realistically have a wide cross-section of culture groups with competing senses of honored behavior.” From Gosnell, “Honor and Shame Rhetoric,” 107, 109.
relationships and identity. The Individualist-Collectivist divide is revealed both historically and culturally in the essay by sociologist Peter Berger, “On the Obsolescence of the Concept of Honor.” He identifies honour in early Western civilisation and traces its path to obsolescence in the late twentieth century. Berger initially locates honour in hierarchical societies, where identity was defined by a person’s relationship with societal institutions and held in place by honour and shame. As Western society became less connected to its institutions, Berger argues that it exchanged those sources of identity for an internal reference point, human dignity. Honour’s demise is linked with the transition in the West from collectivist societies and their hierarchical structures to the individualist and non-hierarchical cultures that dominate the West at the beginning of the twenty-first century.

For those raised within more individualist cultures like the New Zealand European or Pakeha, honour is a historical concept tied to societies’ institutions, and like those institutions, is only faintly visible now in a few remaining institutional and hierarchical strongholds such as the military, police, and fire service. For the most part, the concept of honour is now so obsolete that Berger’s argument in 1970 to that effect may appear to many today as a curiosity, and not the profound commentary that it is on the loss of honour and its service to our identity. Individualist groups structure themselves in non-hierarchical ways and as Berger

123 Berger, “Obsolescence of the Concept of Honor”, 338-347. Note on ”institution”: “Typically, contemporary sociologists use the term to refer to complex social forms that reproduce themselves such as governments, the family, human languages, universities, hospitals, business corporations, and legal systems. A typical definition is that proffered by Jonathan Turner (Turner, 1997: 6): ‘a complex of positions, roles, norms and values lodged in particular types of social structures and organising relatively stable patterns of human activity with respect to fundamental problems in producing life-sustaining resources, in reproducing individuals, and in sustaining viable societal structures within a given environment.’” <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/social-institutions/#Rel> (19 December 2013) citing Jonathan Turner, “The Institutional Order” (New York: Longman, 1997).
notes, this is associated with loose connections to societal institutions and a low value on honour.\textsuperscript{124}

In the “I am…” identity exercise referred to earlier, the pattern that emerged revealed those from more individualist cultures like my own, began these identity statements with their occupational descriptions, attributes, skills and talents, for example, I am a lawyer. This focus on the individual rather than the network of family relationships extends to how decisions are made, with responsibility now located more within an individual than with the parents or wider family group. For Pakeha families a few generations ago, it was the parents’ prerogative as hosts to decide the guest list for 21\textsuperscript{st} birthday or wedding celebrations. As the children’s contacts were also more usually restricted to the parents’ circle of wider family and local community, this gave little cause for conflict. Today these events can be sources of family tension, with children much more involved in how such events are celebrated and who is invited, and sometimes little overlap in circles of friends and family. Definitions of identity now have little connection to relationships within immediate family, let alone extended family, and honour is no longer understood in association with giving obedience or respect to parents and elders, reflecting a non-hierarchical structure within the family and a loose connection to the institution of the family.

\textsuperscript{124} Ibid., 344.
CHAPTER 3: DINING WITH TRUTH AND HONOUR

SEARCHES FOR AFFIRMATION

In cultures where a code of honour no longer anchors identity or offers a response “to the anxiety of powerlessness or non-being,” individuals must look elsewhere for “embodied sensations of amplitude;” they must achieve or find their own identity and worth, yet contrary to Berger’s hopes, few journey inward to source identity in human dignity. Instead the journey, though individual, remains external for most, with outward measures that have little intrinsic connection to either honour or dignity. The society’s values, reflected or perhaps refracted, through the media promote that successful identity and a sense of worth can be secured with the right image and connections, enough wealth, celebrity or sporting achievements. If these are not enough, any anxiety is best kept at bay by filling life with activity and entertainment leaving no time to stop and think. Success in these fields can bring much satisfaction with some requiring mature character, discipline and much effort, and as the All Black cultural values show, some are including core collectivist values of acknowledging connections and responsibility to wider family, community and future generations. As full of these good things as life can become, the temptation and trap for each of these standards is to use them to measure human value, of others and of self, a denial of honour or that “amplitude” referred to by Jackson and Seeman.

A consequence of setting up such standards is that failure is inevitable, resulting in anger and a condemnation of self and others, or in Jesus’ words, “with the judgment you make you will be judged, and the measure you give will be the measure you get” (Matthew 7:2). In Matthew 7:1-5, Jesus describes and prohibits this
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destructive cycle of measuring the worth of self and others, of judging that some are less than others and therefore opening the door to contempt. American philosopher, professor and writer on Christian spiritual formation, Dallas Willard wrote that the “intent and effect of contempt is always to exclude someone, push them away, leave them out and isolated.” Contempt stands opposed to welcome and honour. To measure the worth of human beings like this is to deny them honour, that “amplitude” or sense of substance and plenty, of being; to acknowledge another’s worth by offering affirmation and making room for them is central to building healthy community.

A non-negotiable element in being human is the need for significant relations with other human beings. We become who we are and find a sense of substance through dialogue within community. Fundamental to learning how to relate well with others, to growing “up into maturity,” is the acceptance of human imperfection with all the mistakes, misunderstandings and conflict that are part of community. When mistakes are made, it is also essential for the truth to be told, responsibility taken, apologies sought and forgiveness offered if restoration of relations is to be possible. Flourishing community relations depend on the ability of the parts, the individuals who make up the body, having the grace and wisdom to grow each other up into maturity. The practice of telling the truth, when carried out with kindness has multiple interpretations, and a key interpretation is the skill of affirming others well. Christine Pohl describes it like this:

People who love truth build others up with it rather than using it to tear them down; much of our truth-telling should involve affirming what is right and good. When Paul writes to the early church about moving toward deeper unity and maturity, he connects love and truth closely. “Speaking the truth in love” is at the heart of growing up in every way into Christ (Eph. 4:1-15).
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A malady that is rife in the West, with its focus on self, is self-hatred, prevalent where family and community struggle to affirm and honour one another. In *Restoring the Christian Soul through Healing Prayer*, Leanne Payne describes how necessary affirmation is for relational maturity and how it connects to truth-telling. In a personal illustration, Payne describes her Aunt Rhoda as a person who “loved truth and goodness” and who “somehow managed to see what was right and good in me and praised it.” “Truth-telling” as lived out by Aunt Rhoda, was the ability to “look through” her niece’s foolishness to the good in her. To do this “she didn’t ignore it. She simply called foolishness … by its real name. But she never saw that as the real me.” This ability to affirm others was rooted in Rhoda’s own healthy self-acceptance, enabling her to help others do the same. In contrast, Rhoda’s husband, Gus, a dry alcoholic, tended to “level others to a smaller size” in an attempt to deflect his own self-hatred. As a child, when Payne witnessed her uncle wound others, she in turn felt pained and would press into her aunt for support, which was delivered with robust humour and a southern drawl, “Now Gus, if you want to be a jackass, you go right ahead. But Leanne and I, we are not going to let that ruin our day, are we, Leanne?” And directly to Leanne, “Now, Child, you have to grow a niice thiiick alligator hide,” and “This is no skin off your nose, you know.” Rhoda offered comfort, not by avoiding the cause of the pain, but

[s]he put everything in its right perspective by speaking the truth that not only aptly named the problem, but reminded us that Gus did not have to live from his lower self. If he did, we were not responsible either for his act or to try to change him. It was in calling actions and situations by their real names, then, and not by trying to
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cover over or “fix” things that Aunt Rhoda ministered deeply to both the injured person and myself.  

In this form of truth-telling Rhoda always treated Gus “with respect, and never as less than a person.”  

By modelling this way of living out truth and goodness, Rhoda also enabled her nieces to learn to love their uncle, “because we were never under any illusion about calling foolishness by its real name, sin by its real name, hard ignorant prejudice by its real name.”  

The robustness of this affirmation is rooted in Rhoda’s love of both goodness and truth, and together they illustrate a steadfast loving kindness. Family and community cultures that constantly struggle not to give any offence, trying to “walk on eggshells,” as a saying goes, instead of looking through “foolishness” and calling forth the good in others, risk denying their members opportunities to grow robust selves or to exercise grace, that necessary element to healthy human communication. Payne’s illustration of healthy affirmation demonstrates the understanding of truth as faithfulness, or living truth filled lives. Pohl notes that “in the Psalms, the Hebrew word ‘emeth was often translated as ‘truth’” but more recent translations broaden it to “faithfulness.”  

In Psalm 85, as part of a plea for restoration, the psalmist connects love with faithfulness and truth, righteousness with peace, and identify all as constituents of restoration:

10 Steadfast love and faithfulness (emeth) will meet; righteousness and peace will kiss each other.
11 Faithfulness will spring up from the ground, and righteousness will look down from the sky.
12 The LORD will give what is good, and our land will yield its increase.
13 Righteousness will go before him, and will make a path for his steps.
Honour, truth-telling and restoration are capable of myriad expressions across cultures, yet in many cultures the three strands are woven with one another and together with hospitality. Common to all examples of restoration is the necessity for living truthfully, and living truthfully requires kindness, humility and honour.

ENCOUNTERING GOD’S HONOUR

Four decades on from Berger’s essay, many of the cultures now part of this conversation have not walked the West’s path to individualism, but have retained strong connections to their societal institutions and with them, the link between identity and the concept of honour. The cultural diversity now accessible opens up the discussion on honour and suggests that honour’s obsolescence is limited to the original context of Berger’s essay, the mid to late 20th century Western societies. In Honor and Grace, a 1992 collection of essays, Peristiany and Pitt-Rivers acknowledge new work in the field and the limited definitions of honour in their 1965 volume, Honour and Shame in Anthropology. Pitt-Rivers and Peristiany remark that because of this broader conversation, it “is therefore an error to regard honor as a single constant concept rather than a conceptual field within which people find the means to express their self-esteem or their esteem for others.” Professor Don Seeman of Emory University, writing on “a phenomenology of divine honor and its relationship to violence in modern times,” identifies opposing views in Jewish writing and how they have been aggravated by pragmatic politics which minimise
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concepts of honour. Seeman, in critiquing Berger, doesn’t source the meaning of honour in hierarchical societies or institutions but in the Hebrew word *kavod*:

Sociologist Peter Berger argued as early as the 1970s that the “obsolescence of the concept of honor” was fundamental to modern consciousness and that honor had been almost wholly replaced by the more egalitarian concept of “dignity” that is among “the principle achievements of modern man” (Berger 1973:96). Of course in Hebrew the same word (kavod) describes both ideas, and this merely calls attention to the fact that Berger’s analysis did not go deep enough.139

Seeman illustrates both the challenges of communicating across cultures and their richness. In following the Hebrew concept of honour or *kavod*, rooted in a biblical culture with strong collectivist yet non-hierarchical affinities,140 Seeman tracks a separate route to Berger. It is this deeper understanding of honour as including dignity that grounds biblical positions on honour. In identifying dignity in each human being, *kavod* differentiates the understanding of honour in Hebrew Scriptures from the honour and shame hierarchies found among both ancient Israel’s neighbours and today’s collectivist cultures, as well as those individualist Western cultures discussed by Berger. Biblical use of *kavod*, of honour, engages with the vertical relation between God and human beings and with the horizontal relations among human beings and the rest of God’s creation. This paper focuses on God’s honour and the motivation of honour as human dignity and then illustrates honour in the context of dinner at Simon’s.

While Seeman’s work on the phenomenology of honour is beyond the scope of this thesis, I’m drawing on his writing on the meaning of *kavod* as used in Scripture. Talking about *kavod*, he says it, “derives from a root that refers to weightiness or substance,” literally translated “gravitas” but that, “a slightly different inflection yields uniqueness or distinction,” corresponding with
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“meanings implied by the English term ‘honor.’” “In the biblical context... kavod participates in an extraordinarily broad semantic network that includes material wealth, power, and glory (or repute) as well as sheer force of material presence,” referencing both God and human actors, and central to biblical conversations linked to honour.141

In exploring honour, Seeman engages with the work of medieval Jewish philosopher, Maimonides (1135-1204) on Exodus 33-34. Seeman writes that for Maimonides, when God revealed his honour to Moses, this was no angelic vision or physical manifestation, but that:

To see God’s kavod in other words, is precisely to see nothing, but to gain a deeper understanding of the difference between God and every existent, or to distinguish the utter difference between God and all created things.... The person who seeks to “show concern for the honor of his Creator,” according to Maimonides, learns not just to appreciate God’s handiwork in nature but also to acknowledge the implications of human intellectual limits that prevent us from ever knowing God as God is. Even more radically, however, Maimonides argues that it is precisely the recognition of these intellectual limits that sets the stage for ethical knowledge... [O]ne learns to honor God by appreciating divine incommensurability (i.e. apprehending the error of the vernacular conception) while approximating divine actions in caring appropriately for others.142

This connection between God’s revelation of his glory, as kavod can be translated, to his servants, and their recognition of their own limitations is also found in Isaiah. Isaiah tells of the experience of encountering God’s honour (Isaiah 6:1-5) and his response of, “Woe is me, for I am undone! Because I am a man of unclean lips, and I dwell among a people of unclean lips; For my eyes have seen the King, the LORD of hosts!” (NKJV). His response recognises the “utter difference” between him and God, his own lack mediated by God’s acceptance of him as the coal touches his lips, and then God’s call and Isaiah’s willingness to act. Although
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the terms honour or glory do not appear in Luke’s account of Peter’s call, his response of, “Depart from me Lord for I am a sinful man” (Luke 5:8), echoes the response of Isaiah on encountering God’s honour, suggesting that in Peter’s encounter with the Lord over the miraculous provision of fish, he was invited into a revelation of the divine honour in Jesus. As kavod brings a deeper understanding that combines dignity together with honour, sourcing it in God and humanity, and differentiating ancient Israel from her neighbours, the Hebrew Scriptures also differentiate Israel’s motivation for the shared practice of hospitality.

**Motivations of Hospitality**

Every culture has protocols around shared community practices, and hospitality was a fundamental practice to the collectivist peoples across the Ancient Near East for at least one thousand years before the time of Jesus. Abraham’s welcome to the three passing strangers in Genesis 18 is an early biblical example of this regional practice. Both Paul Hanson and Christine Pohl discuss different aspects of hospitality in Ancient Israel which are foundational to the connections I make to welcome, acceptance, honour and discernment. Christine Pohl in *Making Room* notes that Israel’s law required that hospitality be offered not just to passing strangers, but unlike her neighbours, Israel also extended an active protection to “resident” strangers (Leviticus 19:33-34). This welcome was wide but not unqualified, the hospitality offered to the resident stranger was boundaried by the requirement of a mutual honouring; Israel’s “covenantal structure required the
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exclusion of particular strangers – those who could threaten Israel’s identity or unity.” 145 Thus strangers who chose to stay and honour the laws of Israel were entitled under the law to the same rights and protection as Israelites, there was no tiered value rating according to birth, race or status.

In “The Ancient Near Eastern Roots of Social Welfare,” Hanson acknowledges that in many ways Israel’s social welfare practices did not set her apart from other cultures of the Ancient Near East, many of whom conceded a moral requirement for forms of social welfare such as protection for passing strangers, widows, orphans and the poor. However he concludes that although the outworking of “social justice” by Israel and her neighbours was similar, Israel’s motivations were unique. While her neighbours were motivated by the need to secure their power base and the practical goal of crowd control, Israel’s covenantal structure reveals a theology that recognises the dignity of human beings, no matter what their social status. 146 Israel’s legal protection of these often vulnerable and weak groups in society was founded in the theological view that human beings are made in the image of God, and therefore their worth is beyond measure.

This determination of human value lies at the heart of her revelation of who God is and why he offers a hospitality of welcome and protection. Where Israel’s neighbours restricted any connection to the divine with its associated worth, dignity and protection, to its ruling classes, this people whose identity had been birthed out of slavery in a foreign land identified that each human being reflects aspects of the divine and is called to reflect the same heart of welcome. It was a revolutionary premise three millennia ago and though much advocated today, it remains a challenging practice to live out. Unsurprisingly, Israel’s practice did not often reflect
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this radical dignity and hospitality, but God did not allow her to forget it, sending the prophets to remind the people that God’s mercy extends to each of these groups and even to the Gentiles. These messengers too were ignored and persecuted, and finally God sent his son, Jesus, to the house of Israel, a nation focused in on itself, struggling to protect her identity through nationalistic and religious movements with rigorous and often burdensome ritual laws on their membership (Matthew 23, Luke 11). God in Jesus calls his people to a different route, one of gentleness and humility of heart (Matthew 11:28-30), to a wide welcoming hospitality that can only be offered from a secure identity, a safe place to stand.

**DINNER AT SIMON’S PLACE**

The theme of hospitality is strong in Luke’s writings, and he relates the gospel as one communicated and lived by Jesus through his sharing of life at table with tax collectors and sinners, religious leaders like Simon, a leader of the Pharisees, as well as with and by the disciples (Luke 10:7-8, Acts 2:46). What initially catches the eye in the approach to Luke’s account of Jesus’ meal with Simon the Pharisee is the mix of compassion and humour in Jesus’ confronting questions, questions designed to enable each listener to see more clearly. Having offered uncomfortable comfort to the Baptist’s question, “Are you the one who is to come?” (Luke 7: 18-23), Jesus turns to the crowds who are hungry for signs of pending liberation and to the Pharisees and Scribes, leaders who are curious and cautious, ready to shut down trouble makers and blasphemers. He sees a people who long for a saviour, yet struggle to recognise God’s promised one when he comes. Jesus is lightly self-mocking (Luke 7: 31-35) in his summary of the public debates over his identity. Could “a glutton and a drunkard” who eats at the same table as tax collectors and

---

"sinners" be a prophet or even the Son of Man? These accusations likely come from some among the Pharisees, and Luke with a touch of irony places Jesus next at their table. How each of these groups see Jesus determines how they respond to him, and this theme continues through the narrative and teaching parable that follow in Luke 7:36-50.\footnote{Barbara E. Reid, Choosing the Better Part? Women in the Gospel of Luke (Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 1996), 109-110, 120.} Barbara Reid, Professor of New Testament Studies at Catholic Theological Union in Chicago notes the primacy of the engagement between Simon and Jesus to the meaning of this passage, asking “can Simon ever see differently?”\footnote{Barbara Reid OP, ““Do You See This Woman?” (Luke 7:44) A Liberative Look at Luke 7:36-50 and Strategies for Reading Other Lucan Stories Against the Grain”, Dominican Life <http://www.domlife.org/PreachingResources/DoYouSeethisWoman.htm> (3 July 2014).} What follows is a short exegesis of this dinner at Simon’s place and an exploration of different ways of seeing with their connections to judgment, discernment, truth telling and honour.

LUKE 7:36-50

36 One of the Pharisees asked Jesus to eat with him, and he went into the Pharisee’s house and took his place at the table. 37 And a woman in the city, who was a sinner, having learned that he was eating in the Pharisee’s house, brought an alabaster jar of ointment. 38 She stood behind him at his feet, weeping, and began to bathe his feet with her tears and to dry them with her hair. Then she continued kissing his feet and anointing them with the ointment. 39 Now when the Pharisee who had invited him saw it, he said to himself, “If this man were a prophet, he would have known who and what kind of woman this is who is touching him—that she is a sinner.” 40 Jesus spoke up and said to him, “Simon, I have something to say to you.” “Teacher,” he replied, “Speak.” 41 A certain creditor had two debtors; one owed five hundred denarii, and the other fifty. 42 When they could not pay, he cancelled the debts for both of them. Now which of them will love him more?” 43 Simon answered, “I suppose the one for whom he cancelled the greater debt.” And Jesus said to him, “You have judged rightly.” 44 Then turning toward the woman, he said to Simon, “Do you see this woman? I entered your house; you gave me no water for my feet, but she has bathed my feet with her tears and dried them with her hair. 45 You gave me no kiss, but from the time I came in she has not stopped kissing my feet. 46 You did not anoint my head with oil, but she has anointed my feet with ointment. 47 Therefore, I tell you, her sins, which were many, have been forgiven; hence she has shown great love. But the one to whom little is forgiven, loves little.” 48 Then he said to her, “Your sins are forgiven.” 49 But those who were at the table with him
began to say among themselves, “Who is this who even forgives sins?” And he said to the woman, “Your faith has saved you; go in peace.”

Much exegesis of this passage debates its connections to the three other gospel reports of Jesus’ anointing which take place in Bethany near the end of Jesus’ ministry on earth (Mark 14:3-9; Matt 26:6-13; John 12:1-8). Luke sets this encounter much earlier, near the beginning of Jesus’ ministry and in Galilee. Each gospel recounts an act of extravagant adoration by a woman offered to Jesus while he is a guest in another’s home. In three accounts Jesus connects the anointing to his burial, but not in Luke. Instead he challenges his audiences on their perceptions of repentance, forgiveness and love, with I suggest, a subtext that raises questions of humility, honour, contempt and dishonour.

Luke gives a slice of life in an unnamed city where following Jewish custom the leader of the Pharisees, a devout group in the city, invites the visiting teacher home for a meal after the Sabbath synagogue meeting. The communal nature of Middle Eastern life allows Simon, his guest of honour and other guests to take their places, eat their meal together slowly over lively discussion and teaching, all in the presence of other community members, who don’t eat with the guests but are welcome to sit, watch the debates and listen to the teaching. The practice of hospitality, which is the setting of this account in first century Palestine, is still a central cultural value today, and Kenneth Bailey from his experience of living and
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researching in the Middle East over the last few decades considers that those values remain remarkably similar despite the passing of millennia.\textsuperscript{154}

Jesus’ list of welcome protocols in Luke 7:44-46 are recognised conventions for making a guest welcome and belonged to regional practices of hospitality.\textsuperscript{155} The list begins with the kiss of greeting, followed by the offer of water and in more affluent homes a servant to wash their feet, and then oil as a means of refreshment, possibly for hands or for the head as in Psalms 23:5 and 92:10.\textsuperscript{156} In that hot dusty climate the comfort of cool water and clean feet was an essential element in being made welcome, and fresh smelling oil that revived the senses was associated with hospitality, refreshment, sharing food and honoured guests. Part of the power of biblical narratives lies in the thinness of their story telling, requiring the audience to engage with and respond to actions and omissions.\textsuperscript{157} Here, Simon as a religious leader invites Jesus to a meal at his home as custom requires him, yet he is curious to see for himself if what the people are saying about Jesus is true, that this itinerant teacher is a prophet (Luke 7:16, 39).\textsuperscript{158} Then this community leader and therefore practiced host omits the customary practices of welcome. While some argue that
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\textsuperscript{157} In biblical narratives recorded from oral traditions, comparison with styles from other oral traditions may be fruitful. In commenting on Maori oral tradition transitioned into filmmaking, Harriet Margolis, Senior Lecturer in Film at Victoria University of Wellington writes, “In contrast, Ngati ... and Mauri ... attempt to tell their stories in an identifiably Maori way. They both reject the linear, stream-lined narrative style associated with mainstream fiction films. [Director,] Mita replac[es] the familiar cause and effect in film narrative with what she describes as ‘layering’ of the story which is based on a certain oral tradition. In place of the thrust of ‘what happens next’ plotline the viewer is invited to peel away layers of meaning to reveal the depth of interrelationships (Verhoeven 394–395),” from Margolis, “Indigenous Star: Can Mana and Authentic Community Survive International Coproductions?,” 22. Without referring to the narrative styles of oral tradition, Barbara Reid also notes Jesus’ invitational communication style, she says, “Jesus points John’s disciples to what they have seen and heard; but it is for them to interpret: to believe or not to believe,” from <http://www.domlife.org/PreachingResources/DoYouSeethisWoman.htm> (3 July 2014).
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these omissions are not noteworthy,\textsuperscript{159} Jesus considers them remarkable, later using them as evidence of a spiritual blindness and a lack of both humility and love. It seems that Simon, in measuring Jesus’ worth, chooses to treat his invited guest with contempt and to insult him.\textsuperscript{160} This open and unexpected breach in hospitality by the host must create tension among his fellow guests.

In any social setting like this, an uncomfortable pause occurs as the guests, waiting for the usual courtesies, realise they are not being offered and then brace themselves for Jesus’ angry and affronted departure that face-saving honour and shame protocols required.\textsuperscript{161} Luke records that Jesus responds to the breach of protocol, but not by departing in anger. Unexpectedly, Jesus “takes his place.” Bailey’s work on Middle Eastern practices describes how Jesus’ action here increases the drama in the room, much, no doubt, to the audience’s delight. They know, unlike today’s Western readers, that seating protocols declare that only the most senior rabbi (teacher) reclines first in the place of honour, and that while Jesus is a guest rabbi, he is likely to be the youngest present.\textsuperscript{162} His assumption of the place of authority is not challenged but, together with the woman’s approach, provokes Simon to reveal his heart attitude in his continued measuring of their worth. Reid connects Simon’s judgment of the woman to his judgment of Jesus:

Verse 39 gives Simon’s initial judgment. Note that two perceptions are intimately related: what Simon sees in the woman and her interaction with Jesus determines how Simon sees Jesus himself. Simon is clear about what he sees: she is a sinner and Jesus is not a prophet. Now it becomes apparent that Simon’s ability to see differently not only concerns his attitude toward the woman, but also his relationship with Jesus.\textsuperscript{163}
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In telling how Jesus “took his place at the table,” Luke’s term refers to the Greco-Roman practice of reclining at table, where guests lie on one side, rest an elbow and eat with the other hand.\(^{164}\) Following this custom would result in Jesus’ feet being at the end of his couch, accessible for the ministrations of the unexpected guest. Among the audience lining the walls was a woman with a city-wide reputation as one who was a “sinner” though the sin remains undisclosed.\(^{165}\) Reid, in *Choosing the Better Part, Women in the Gospel of Luke*, challenges traditional assumptions about the nature of this woman’s sin.

In a first-century, Galilean city, everyone knows everyone else’s business. This woman need only have been ill or disabled or have contact with Gentiles [for example, through midwifery or dyeing] to be considered a sinner by Jews in the city. Simon’s remark in verse 39 implies that the woman’s sinfulness is not immediately apparent to a stranger.\(^{166}\)

The woman’s presence is accepted as long as she keeps her place, which involves not speaking and not touching those reclining at table. In keeping with his initial lack of courtesy, Simon as host does not intervene to protect the guest of honour from her unclean touch. Simon wants to see how Jesus will respond. His lack of action and his “wait and see what the prophet, if he really is one, will do” attitude reveals again elements of contempt for his fellow human being.\(^{167}\) The woman’s reputation as a sinner meant that she dwelt on the outskirts of society; for her to bring attention to herself in this semi-public setting suggests either the sort of brazen shamelessness that recognises but defies conventions, a conclusion which some
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commentators also draw from the way she wipes Jesus’ feet with her hair,\textsuperscript{168} or she is not restrained by the shame that would be typical within an honour and shame milieu because she has already encountered the welcome and acceptance of Jesus and his kingdom. This intimate act is an expression of her love in response to his forgiveness. To do what she does indicates that she has encountered Jesus before\textsuperscript{169} and that he has treated her with such dignity and value that her shame has fallen away. In gratitude for his acceptance of her, she has sought out this opportunity to be in his presence, and sit at his feet as a disciple.\textsuperscript{170}

As one of the audience present on Jesus’ arrival, she has come with an alabaster jar of perfumed oil (Luke 7:37) but without water or towel, prepared to anoint Jesus but not equipped to wash his feet. She watches in horror as he is insulted and dishonoured, waiting expectantly for someone to fill the gap and carry out the welcome protocols. When it doesn’t happen, she steps forward and stands “behind him at his feet, weeping.” Having brought no towel with her, she wipes his feet with her hair. Her actions are spontaneous, springing from a desire to honour him in response to a welcome and acceptance already offered by Jesus. Having brought the oil with her, she anoints his feet. There’s no evidence of the shame that Simon thinks she should carry. This has gone and she is living under a different set of values. In washing his feet with her tears, wiping them with her hair, and breaking the costly jar of perfumed ointment over his feet, this unnamed woman wants to honour Jesus, perhaps even cover the community’s shame in Simon’s lack of honour.

Her actions of love and humility reveal her as both host and servant as well as guest. Unlike Simon, Jesus recognises the actions of this woman as an expression

\textsuperscript{168} Reid, \textit{Choosing the Better Part}, 118-121. Reid’s discussion includes several scenarios where un-braided hair has nothing to do with immodesty or prostitution.
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\textsuperscript{170} Jesus’ acceptance of women as disciples who travelled with the group and supported them (Luke 8:1-3) was antithetical to the practices of his day, directly confronting the lack of value and restrictions placed on women.
of love and gratitude. He doesn’t reject or ignore her but acknowledges her and lets her serve him in this way. He accepts her. The text notes that for much of the conversation with Simon, Jesus looks at the woman, difficult to do unless he is facing away from Simon. By giving her such attention he honours her in Simon’s presence, challenging Simon to reassess his attitudes. In the Matter of the Text: Material Engagements between Luke and the Five Senses, Anne Elvey puts it this way:

In the story world of the parable, the seeing of the Samaritan (10.33) stands in contrast to the seeing of the priest (10:31) and the Levite (10:32). For these latter two, seeing prompts not compassion but neglect of the other. In Luke 7.36-50, where the Lukan Jesus receives the loving hospitality of the woman’s touch, seeing is also at issue. The seeing of a Pharisee named Simon prompts a misjudgment of the woman and a misinterpretation of her touch (7.39). In the question “Do you see this woman?” (7:44), Simon is challenged to see as the Lukan Jesus sees and to recognize the visitation of God in the hospitality both of the woman’s touch and of divine forgiveness.

In extending the same welcome as his Father to the woman with a sinful reputation Jesus challenged Simon at the core of his identity: is this how God expects his sons and daughters to treat others who are also made in God’s image and invited to share in the wedding feast of the kingdom of God? Jesus reiterates that the welcome and acceptance revealed in the invitation to share food and companionship around a table encapsulate the heart of God.

In both his actions and his words Jesus practices an aspect of truth telling with Simon. This is not the narrow conception of truth telling as honesty, rather it is...
one of the less well known or practised tools necessary to grow one another up into character and maturity as Paul later instructs the church in Ephesians 4. Jesus’ conversation with Simon the Pharisee is an example of how to “speak the truth in love.” Jesus also models this form of truth telling in his account of the father gently correcting his elder son in Luke 15: 25-32, reinterpreting for him his younger brother’s return and reminding him of the security and welcome he has always had, helping him to see more clearly and inviting him to take on the character and secure sense of place of a true son. In showing such care for Simon’s soul, Jesus honours him. It is a masterly picture of Jesus loving Simon\textsuperscript{174} in what might be considered by some today as an unexpected and subversive, even controversial manner.

With the money lender parable (Luke 7:41-43), Jesus takes the role of teacher and prophet,\textsuperscript{175} again challenging Simon’s assumption of authority and judgment, and using a form of “truth telling” that motivates his listeners to think and reach their own conclusions. This is a style of communication popular in collectivist cultures but often misunderstood in individualist cultures, who might instead be muttering in frustration, “Say what you really mean!” It’s reminiscent of the prophet Nathan with David (2 Samuel 12:1-15), who confronted David first with a story and when David began to see the offence, Nathan drove home the true nature of David’s attitude, his contempt for the word of the Lord. Simon initially responds to the puzzling simplicity of Jesus’ story and question with a guarded, if not sarcastic, “I suppose…” showing again elements of judgment and contempt. Jesus replies to Simon, affirming his ability to discern rightly, honouring the woman for her expression of great love, re-interpreting her actions for Simon and thus giving him the opportunity to see more clearly. In this indirect manner, Jesus identifies that the woman who Simon had relegated to a category beyond God’s compassion was his
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neighbour, much as he named a Samaritan the neighbour to the wounded man on the road to Jericho (Luke 10: 25-37). Jesus also names Simon’s contempt of those around him, with its roots in a lack of both humility and love.

In his chastising of Simon for his lack of welcome, Jesus honours him, and he treats him much as the father who, having welcomed home the prodigal, lovingly chastises his elder son for resenting that welcome (Luke 15: 25-32). Yet it will take humility for Simon to acknowledge a contempt of others in himself and so a failure to keep the second commandment. If he can acknowledge both his own sinfulness and the rightness of Jesus’ words, he will see himself more clearly and like Simon Peter before him this will lead to a revelation of who Jesus is (Luke 5:8). To see his own unworthiness is only possible in the safety of Jesus’ welcoming acceptance of him. It comes by the gift of a divine love that honours each human being as made to reflect God’s glory. In inviting Simon not to use his judgment to measure human worth, but instead to discern good and evil behaviour, Jesus invites Simon to take the log of contempt out of his eye that he might see clearly. The account shows Jesus loving Simon and the un-named woman, treating each with honour, recognising their dignity and value. It is a powerful example of honour expressed in the welcome of hospitality. And as such, it offers a rich context from which to explore honour in the multicultural setting of the 21st century NZ church.

In summary, this passage offers perspectives on what determines the value of host, guests and honoured guest in the eyes of a religious leader, Simon the Pharisee and through the eyes of Jesus. I suggest that two opposing ways of measuring human value are exposed, one rooted in judgment that values some and holds others in contempt, the other in a recognition that all human beings reflect God’s image, and are worthy of honour. Also evident is a framework for exploring what honour looks like in a hospitality setting. In Jesus’ evaluation of how welcome protocols were given or withheld by Simon and the unnamed woman he challenges
Simon’s attitudes and practices in relation to honour, identity and value. Finally, the practice of speaking the truth in love is exemplified by Jesus as he models the welcome of God and reminds Simon of his identity as a son of God, calling Simon to enlarge his capacity for welcome as an expression of honour.
CHAPTER 4: RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODS

Luke 7:36-50 provides a structure for the research design, with interview questions following its outline. The interviews analysed below used Jesus’ meal with Simon the Pharisee as a reference point for identifying contemporary expressions of honour in the body of Christ in NZ today.

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

The interviews were in three parts beginning with introductory questions, followed by a set of questions for a childhood hospitality event which was then repeated for a current hospitality event. (For a copy of the Ethics Approval including the Interview Questions, see Appendix 1. A copy of the Information Sheet and Consent form can be found in Appendix 2.) The introductory questions aimed to stimulate memory around family, hospitality, conflict and truth telling in the childhood home. As discussed earlier, family and hospitality are central to collectivist cultures with their more hierarchical structures and their honour, shame and saving face dynamics. I anticipated that definitions of family and hospitality would be broader in the three more collectivist cultures than in the individualist culture, and that this Individualist-Collectivist distinction would also have some impact on practices around conflict and truth-telling.

For the second and third sections of the interviews, the participants were given Luke 7: 36-50, with a brief outline of its characters and setting, and asked to identify a comparative hospitality event from their family of origin and current community of faith. Questions exploring the various expressions of honour, shame, dignity and value arising from Luke 7:36-50 were used to help elicit the participants’ understanding of those concepts in both contexts. Beginning by asking how a participant determined who was honoured at this event, I aimed to elucidate how
he or she understood the concept of honour in a specific situation, while questions around welcome and acceptance offered an opportunity to explore shame, face, dignity and value, and any relation these might have to living truthful lives. Again a difference was anticipated between collectivist and individualist cultures, with participants from the more hierarchical collectivist groups expected to be both more familiar with the use of the word honour and more likely to identify status as a determinative of honour. Jesus’ public challenge of Simon (Luke 7: 40-50) is the foundation for asking in what situation, if at all, a host might ever be corrected at this hospitality event. From personal experience I anticipated that this is an unlikely but not impossible scenario for Pakeha, and with only hints at the public use of shame and whakamaa or of saving face, I had no measure to gauge likely responses among Maori, Chinese or Samoan.

Similarly, when anticipating responses from current faith communities, my personal experience suggested that NZ minority ethnicities may colour the English term “honour” with their cultural conceptions of the word and that this may result in misunderstanding across cultures in any discussion on honour within the church today. I also anticipated that due to the “obsolescence of the concept of honour” within my own culture, Pakeha may struggle to articulate a clear or common understanding of how honour is practiced in their Christian communities.

ETHICS APPROVAL AND ANALYSIS

Ethics Approval was obtained from the Department of Theology and Religion, University of Otago as well as a commitment from St Pauls Symonds St to provide pastoral support as needed to any participants connected to our community. Though no need for pastoral support eventuated, I’m grateful for their guidance and offer of support. As this exploration of honour is limited to the context of the NZ Church, participants were sought from within Christian church congregations in NZ
beginning with the Anglican Church. Other Anglican, Presbyterian, Methodist and Baptist churches were contacted with either no response or no members matching the criteria. All participants were identified through personal contacts, either directly or with one degree of separation. Ten of the 16 participants are from Anglican churches from both Pakeha and Maori dioceses, three belong to Pentecostal churches, two grew up within the Chinese Presbyterian Church of NZ and maintain varying degrees of affiliation as adults, and one grew up in a Samoan congregation of the Methodist Church of NZ and is now involved in a Seventh Day Adventist church, and all except two of these are in the Auckland region. Interviews were carried out face to face between October 2013 and May 2014. Video recordings of the interviews were made followed by transcripts which were then coded using QSR NVivo 10.

The purpose of the data analysis is to identify, explore and compare expressions and understandings of honour in hospitality settings in four ethnic groups within the NZ church, with a goal of contributing to a picture of how honour is understood and expressed in these communities and to inform ongoing data collection. Drawing on Applied Thematic Analysis, a simple structural coding took its lead from the questions, resulting in three main groupings around hospitality and host, honour and honoured guest, welcome protocols and truth-telling. A few additional themes were identified making connections between language and ethnic identity, and food, acceptance and welcome.

PARTICIPANT CRITERIA

The comparative nature of this research invites a form of honouring in its attempt to value difference within Aotearoa NZ. This has its own challenges. Recognising difference is essential in exploring how honour was expressed within ethnic groups and the NZ Church, yet in setting the interview criteria I wanted to make space for commonality as well as

---

distinction. Limiting participants to those who were born here and are therefore at least second generation NZers who share a connection to the land and cultures of Aotearoa New Zealand allowed opportunity for common experiences and some shared cultural values such as those identified by Falconer and colleagues.\(^{177}\) Against this background of commonality, it was important that participants also grew up with significant connections to their particular ethnic heritage. These connections allowed those ethnic differences to be discernable and are a necessary part of identifying how those groups understood honour. For these reasons, the criteria required participants to all be NZ born, with four of Maori ethnicity as NZ’s first peoples (identified as indigenous in the Participant Table below), four of Pakeha ethnic heritage as settlers of several generations and belonging to the majority ethnicity, four Chinese as immigrants of several generations and belonging to an ethnicity described as NZ’s “model minority,”\(^{178}\) and finally, four of Samoan ethnicity as more recent immigrants who also represent one of the many Pacific Island peoples who now call NZ home.

In looking for commonality the risk is loss of distinction by assimilation into the majority culture. The language criterion attempted to counter this on the basis that the symbols of a language create substantial ties to its particular ethnic heritage. The place of language in the home and around the table is a principal element in communicating those core cultural values that are rarely specifically articulated. Aveolela,\(^{179}\) a Samoan participant whose mother is Samoan and father is Maori reflecting on how her family communicated their values said, “I’ve never actually thought about that, but I think, it wasn’t actually anything that was said, it was just the environment that we were brought up in.”

Balancing the condition that participants be 2\(^{nd}\) generation or more New Zealanders was a

---

\(^{177}\) Interview with Taruni Falconer by Schaer, “She's right, mate”; Turner, “Inclusive Exclusion’: Managing Identity.”

\(^{178}\) Wong, “A Place to Stand,” 129-130.

\(^{179}\) All names of interviewees and those they named have been changed in order to safeguard confidentiality.
requirement that participants from the minority ethnicities (Maori, Chinese or Samoan) grow up in a household where that language was spoken by adults around them.

NZ’ERS, ETHNICITY AND PSEUDONYMS

There is no distinction between participants by birth as all are born in NZ. Thus the key distinguishing factor between them is their ethnicity within Aotearoa NZ; rather than refer to the ethnic groups as NZ Maori, NZ Pakeha, NZ Chinese and NZ Samoan, they are referred to in this thesis as Maori, Pakeha, Chinese and Samoan. To protect the identity of research participants, I’ve used pseudonyms, retaining ethnic distinctions by using Maori, Pakeha and Samoan names, shown in the pseudonym table with translations as the names chosen reflect elements I saw in the participants.

PSEUDONYM TABLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maori Participants</th>
<th>Pakeha Participants</th>
<th>Samoan Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kahurangi</td>
<td>Precious Gift</td>
<td>Peter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manawa</td>
<td>Heart of Welcome</td>
<td>Isobel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whakaaio</td>
<td>Make peaceful</td>
<td>Ruby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waiti</td>
<td>A star in Te Kahui o Matariki</td>
<td>Sam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In choosing pseudonyms that carry a distinctly Chinese identity yet are manageable in English type, I’ve opted for a more formal idiom in four translations of Chinese names recorded by a Presbyterian missionary to the NZ Chinese 130 years ago,180 Blossoming Wisdom identifies the one woman Chinese participant and the three men are Illustrious Energy, Splendid Dignity, and Noble Son, or in shortened form, Blossom, Illustrious, Splendid and Noble. As well as these criteria the Participant Table overleaf records as a matter of interest detail on gender, age range, NZ generation, ethnic heritage and language fluency.

---

180 The Presbyterian Synod of Otago and Southland appointed the Rev Alexander Don as Missionary to the NZ Chinese in 1879. His journals record Chinese names with his literal English translations, four of which are found at <http://www.archives.presbyterian.org.nz/missions/nzchinesehistory.htm> (5 June 2014).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>NZ generation</th>
<th>Parents’ ethnicity</th>
<th>Ethnic Language</th>
<th>Church Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kahurangi</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>41-60</td>
<td>Ngati Porou</td>
<td>Indigenous</td>
<td>Ngati porou</td>
<td>Fluency as an adult and in Kaikaranga</td>
<td>Anglican, TM&lt;sup&gt;181&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manawa</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>41-60</td>
<td>Ngapuhi Maori</td>
<td>Indigenous</td>
<td>Ngapuhi</td>
<td>Fluency as an adult, oratory.</td>
<td>Anglican, TM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whakaao</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>41-60</td>
<td>Ngapuhi Ngati Porou</td>
<td>Indigenous</td>
<td>Ngapuhi British, Ngati porou French</td>
<td>Understands some.</td>
<td>Anglican, ME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waiti</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>41-60</td>
<td>Maori Pakeha</td>
<td>Indigenous</td>
<td>Ngati Porou Rongo whaakata European, Ngati whatua Raratongan</td>
<td>Fluent &lt;5yrs Re-learning as an adult.</td>
<td>Anglican, TM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>41-60</td>
<td>Pakeha</td>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; or 4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Pakeha</td>
<td>English only</td>
<td>Anglican, ME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isobel</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>41-60</td>
<td>Pakeha</td>
<td>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; / 5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Pakeha</td>
<td>English only</td>
<td>Anglican, ME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruby</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>41-60</td>
<td>Pakeha</td>
<td>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; / 5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>English, Pakeha</td>
<td>English only</td>
<td>Pentecostal, ME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>25-40</td>
<td>Pakeha</td>
<td>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; / 5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Pakeha</td>
<td>English only</td>
<td>Anglican, ME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illustrious Energy</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>61-80</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>NZ Chinese</td>
<td>Fluent &lt;5yrs A little</td>
<td>Presbyterian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Splendid Dignity</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>61-80</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>NZ Chinese</td>
<td>Learning</td>
<td>Chinese Presbyterian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noble Son</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>41-60</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>NZ Chinese</td>
<td>A little</td>
<td>Pentecostal, ME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blossoming Wisdom</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>25-40</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Malay Chinese</td>
<td>A little</td>
<td>Anglican, ME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alipate</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>25-40</td>
<td>Samoan</td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Samoan Niuean, Samoan Chinese</td>
<td>Understands some</td>
<td>Anglican, ME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alika</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>25-40</td>
<td>Samoan</td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Samoan, English</td>
<td>Fluency as an adult, oratory.</td>
<td>Anglican, ME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aveolela</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>25-40</td>
<td>Samoan</td>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; / Indigenous</td>
<td>Samoan, Indigenous</td>
<td>A little</td>
<td>Pentecostal ME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lanuola</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>41-60</td>
<td>Samoan</td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Samoan, 1.5 Samoan NZer</td>
<td>Fluent</td>
<td>Seventh Day Adventist / ME</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>181</sup> TM stands for Tikanga Maori, part of the Anglican Church, and ME stands for Multi-Ethnic Congregation with multi-ethnic congregations are defined as having no more than 80% of one racial group.
It’s notable that finding enough participants who matched the criteria proved more challenging than I expected, with the language criterion being the most difficult to meet. This is due in part to the fact that until recent decades, NZ had an English language only based education system. An additional factor is probably the lack of confidence or valuing by parents of their own language and/or the particular skills required to teach children to be bilingual in such an environment. Identifying Chinese participants who met all the criteria proved the most difficult, with initial contacts having either the church affiliation or the language criteria, but not both. This has meant that one of the Chinese participants has not been part of a church congregation for at least a decade and did not answer the questions on a current hospitality event. Another Chinese participant has some current involvement but looser connections than the rest of the participants. I did not include specific measures in the criterion of church involvement but left it for the participants to self-select.

Unexpected but not inexplicable was the struggle all participants had when considering the welcome protocols. This question was met with some confusion and blank stares, partly because the phrase “welcome protocols” is not used much; in looking for a context, several non-Maori participants mentioned the powhiri or Maori welcome ceremony as an example of difference in welcome protocols, “we don’t have that,” in the semi-formal hospitality settings under discussion. Another reason for confusion here is the “taken-for-granted” nature of the ways our family and cultures welcome; welcome protocols are those actions that so automatically follow the arrival of a guest they’re not noticed, unless of course, they’re not done. The most unanimous response across participants came in the answers to the question around withholding welcome to an invited guest. While the reasons may have varied, it was unthinkable to not receive an invited guest in the usual manner; if you’ve invited them then you welcome them, such is the strength of social
protocols across all four cultures, and this can apply in some circumstances even to uninvited guests who claim relationship and seniority.

Another surprise early on was the multi-ethnic make-up of my own church community, a feature that I hadn’t noticed until I began the participant search there, reflecting the blindness of my cultural lens. As detailed in the Church Affiliation Table below, of the 12 participants from ethnic minorities, 7 have chosen to be part of multi-ethnic churches and of the remaining 5, three are in Tikanga Maori congregations, with one Chinese loosely connected to a Presbyterian church with more than 80% NZ European and one Chinese not currently attending. None are in Chinese or Samoan speaking congregations.

### CHURCH AFFILIATION - ETHNIC OR MULTI-ETHNIC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Mix – Church Ethnicity</th>
<th>Church Maori</th>
<th>Church Pakeha</th>
<th>Church Chinese</th>
<th>Church Samoan</th>
<th>Church Multi-Ethnic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maori</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakeha</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family attributes</th>
<th>Family includes in-laws, cousins</th>
<th>Household includes in-laws, cousins, 3 generations</th>
<th>Family Size 100+</th>
<th>Family Size 20 - 50</th>
<th>Family Size 10 - 20</th>
<th>Family Size less than 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>Family attributes</td>
<td>Household attributes</td>
<td>Family Size</td>
<td>Family Size</td>
<td>Family Size</td>
<td>Family Size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maori</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakeha</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoan</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Family Size Table highlights 3 simple easily measured attributes of family as offered by participants: whether family includes more than parents and siblings, whether household includes more than parents and siblings, and the number of relatives included in the family. I had anticipated that the three collectivist cultures would have distinct values
around strong extended family relations, this was true to varying degrees for 10 of the 12 minority ethnic participants, as Aveolela affirmed when she declared “family is everything.” She was one of the majority of collectivist participants whose families focused on spending time with extended family; life was full of time with family, either giving or receiving hospitality, with the result that there was little connection with people outside these networks.

The strength of this loyalty emphasised the sense of distance and isolation from family that I found in two families from these collectivist groups. One Maori and one Samoan participant grew up in households where there was limited contact with extended family due to disapproval of the marriage outside their iwi or ethnic group. These participants defined family as parents and siblings only. For Whakaaio, this separation from family did not impact the central place given to hospitality but unlike the rest of her ethnic group, the recipients of their hospitality were predominantly non-family. One illustration in the size of family for Maori, Samoan and Chinese can be seen in their lists of wedding guests, described by most of these three ethnicities as numbering between 300 to 600 due to the expectation that extended family, including all children, be invited to a wedding. While these obligatory guest lists were described with an occasional wry frustration at the sheer size, they were accompanied by a sense of the “taken-for-grantedness” of this cultural custom and a desire to fulfil it. In contrast to the collectivist family size, the youngest Pakeha, whose parents separated before he was 10, gave his definition of family as, “My mum and brother. My father lived in a different house, so I didn’t really consider him family, he was like an annex to the family.”

Peter, Isobel and Ruby all define family to include grandparents, aunts, uncles and cousins (extended family). This was a wider definition and more collectivist than I’d anticipated, reflecting possible acculturation between Maori and Pakeha cultures in the relative isolation of these islands while also suggesting a need
for more detailed research that clarifies language and values. Further exploration of this more collectivist vision of family among Peter, Isobel and Ruby reveals differences from the definitions of family offered by the majority of the collectivist participants. While these three Pakeha included extended family in their definitions of family and remember regular contact with them, the contact is not as all-encompassing as the daily or weekly social connection with multiple extended family members and clan that most of the Maori, Chinese and Samoan participants recall, nor does it include the shared accommodation with in-laws and grandparents taken for granted in these three more collectivist groups. Both Ruby and Isobel were aware of this distinction in how cultures see family, with Ruby reflecting on contact with local Maori, “I was very conscious that they had a much broader definition of family then we did – they always refer to the tribe, and iwi.” Sam, the youngest Pakeha participant, defined family as his mother and his brother and is also the only one of this group to have had childhood playmates of different ethnic groups. Asked if he noticed differences in “family” across cultures he comments:

My friend lived down the road, and he was Samoan, and his house was smaller than mine, and there were probably 3 times as many people. So I remember thinking, “his family’s different.” But I never - as a kid, I didn’t ever really process that, I just remember thinking there’s a sense of difference. But it didn’t mean that my family was any less, or his was any more, or anything like that, it was just different.

Sam’s mother worked two jobs making opportunities for hospitality more limited and often pot luck (shared meals). He remembers, “So hospitality meant she was having some of her girlfriends around. She would spend – like on a Saturday – the afternoon baking ridiculous large desserts, because she always seemed to be on desserts.” Common to the four Pakeha participants, the special meals of their childhood were a roast meat and vegetables, a menu they took for granted. All the Maori, Chinese and Samoan participants easily identified this menu as Pakeha, distinguishing it from the food they grew up with, with only a few including “roast
meat and vegetables” and “cakes” as a regular variation in their childhood homes. While hospitality for Pakeha participants also included occasionally providing a bed for visiting family and friends, this pattern is distinct from Maori and Samoan participants’ definitions of hospitality as providing accommodation and food to family and friends, often at a moment’s notice for periods from one day to a year.

These examples illustrate the distinction between Pakeha individualist culture and the collectivist cultures of Maori, Chinese and Samoan. This distinction continues as we consider the many different ways that honour is expressed and their multiple connections to honour in more detail.
CHAPTER 5: HONOUR AND WELCOME

The fundamental question this thesis set out to explore is what does honour look like in the NZ Christian community. Acknowledging the multiple ethnic groups that make up the NZ church and the breadth of this question, the research has focused on honour in a hospitality setting in four ethnic groups. Exploratory and comparative in nature, the questions were framed around Jesus’ meal with Simon the Pharisee, asking about definitions of host, honoured guest, welcome protocols given or withheld, and the practice of speaking the truth in love.

What emerged is a clear distinction between the three groups from collectivist cultures which retain some hierarchical structures and which connect honour with identity, and those from the Pakeha or non-hierarchical individualist group who had not previously given much thought to honour nor considered it in relation to their identity.

What determines honour – measurements of worth?

Having selected a special meal with an honoured guest, the participants explored the attributes of the host, honoured guest and guests that determined the level of honour they were given. The aim was to identify what cultural values were honoured and how those values related to measures of identity and worth on the premise that who an individual or group honour reflects what they value and indicates what they look to for identity, in other words, the measures they use to define their own worth and identity. Results showed that while there were variations in the details, and some significant qualifications and exceptions, the Maori, Chinese and Samoan participants gave more honour to those higher up an accepted hierarchy, those with status and position in the family or community. They
valued lineage and gave status to certain positions and achievements in ways that identified them as more collectivist cultures.

A majority of Maori, Chinese and Samoan participants, either directly or in their assumption of shared responsibilities for hospitality, described the host as the extended family which could include the whole clan, marae or church family. Participants described how roles were modelled from an early age and organisation was taken for granted, doing away with the need to organise food ascribed to a Pakeha family earlier. Representative of a majority of Samoan and Maori participants, Lanuola and Manawa both mention the clearly defined roles and responsibilities for all ages that formed an organisational backbone to the hospitality their families and marae offered, from the meal preparation, welcome protocols and receiving of guests to the drinks, conversation and cleaning up. Lanuola explains how cooking was a “communal thing” and that “you knew your place, or position. If you were like, a 13 year old boy, you’d be outside doing the *umu* (earth oven). It was just what you grew up knowing.” She remembers the meal her extended family hosted for friends and church visitors, and how her father went early to the markets every Sunday to buy the fish for the boys to cook in an *umu* (earth oven).

> It was good cooking, easy. And again it was a communal thing ... the young boys would go outside, prepare the taro, prepare the fish. All that stuff was done outside. And it was good, because you had your tables, you didn’t have to have a big kitchen... as long as you had shelter... similar to Samoa. You know, you had an outside area for cooking, and then you had an inside area for doing your salads.

Manawa, whose role now includes welcome speeches, remembers that his job as a young boy was to get wood for the marae hospitality. He describes more of this shared responsibility at a recent *hui* (meeting), “We all had our little bits. Tea. I’m on the tea, I call out tea, go around with the teapot, blah, blah, blah... You made sure

---

182 Bolstad, *Transforming Communication*, 15. He writes of a Maori client’s response to the way his Pakeha partner arranged what food to bring to extended family gatherings, see n. 19 of this paper.
no one was wanting for anything. All that sort of stuff.” Maori and Samoan participants included a security role in this organisational structure, someone responsible to pre-empt potential disturbances.

**Maori – He tangata, he tangata, he tangata. It is the people...**

On considering who was honoured at hospitality events, Kahurangi concludes that the key factor was “whakapapa, how you’re related, the connection, the links - that’s the relationship to the people.” The importance of whanau to their identity is visible in other ways, such as the connections Kahurangi, Manawa and Waiti have with second and third cousins and how they number family in the hundreds. When identifying who her family honoured at hospitality events, Whakaaoi gives similar reasons to Kahurangi; she remembers that they had to show great respect to her mother’s uncle when he visited for a meal mid-week, both because of his age and how he was related to her mother. At these times her father would arrange to be absent but she also remembers how easily her father made guests feel welcome and comfortable at the regular meals after church on Sundays. These Sunday meals were shared with his work colleagues or with families from church, where everyone was treated with honour.

Three participants spoke of recent church hui or ordinations where their honoured guests are respected for the responsibility of spiritual leadership. They gave illustrations of hierarchy in the whanau, position and success being honoured, but the amount of honour was relative to character, relationship and an attitude of humility. It’s in this secure context that Kahurangi easily accepts that the different gender roles in a Pohiri (welcome) are part of the pattern that make up the whole, each with different contributions to make. While hierarchical structures can result in measuring worth according to position, these participants spoke of communities that softened or avoided this form of judgment; the hierarchy didn’t deny dignity or value to any member. Manawa explains, “Everyone that wasn’t from [our hui Amorangi (diocese)] really was our honoured guest. But there’s that - Bishop down
to, sort of like a pecking order, I suppose.” This is very different from the semi-nomadic Greek community of Campbell’s study who did not have the connection that Maori have to their land and tikanga. With no security or safety, these nomadic shepherds were highly suspicious of any who were not closely related, all factors that impacted their ability to offer hospitality and live truthful lives.183

Manawa recalls a time his rural community hosted a hui over land disputes where the honoured guest was a judge respected because of his position, but honoured and welcomed because of his relationship and humility. The judge had attended the same high school, lived in their community and not “in some flash whare (house).” The attributes that Manawa honours are this guest’s humility, ability to listen and commitment to being with the community. “I think that’s a great thing - that he understood ... how people tick.” Manawa uses the same measures in his current church when speaking of visiting clergy; he honours their commitment to a challenging and responsible calling yet expects the humility on their part to preach and teach in ways that honour their elders and not use “university speak” but language that their kuia understand including Te Reo.

NZ SAMOAN – STATUS, RELATIONSHIP

Hierarchy and status played a stronger role for three of the NZ Samoan participants, particularly in their childhood homes, than was evident in the other three ethnic groups. Alipate identifies how honour was given to religious leaders first and then the hierarchical position of chief, later mentioning position in family and wealth as contributing factors to honour. However ministers or priests didn’t feature as honoured guests in Aveolela’s mother’s Catholic family, instead she

identifies her mother’s grandfather and a family member who was both a chief and a sporting celebrity as the honoured guests.

For my great-grandfather…. It would be because he is the elder in the family. And for my mum’s cousin, it would be because of the status that he held. Because he was quite well known, well known – not only in the community, but – in wrestling. He was a famous wrestler. And also he was a chief, so that would make him, give him an honorary – it was their - yeah, their status.

Alika remarks that quantity also impacted honour with the top table at a family wedding seating the wedding party but then the “rest of the table is literally littered with people who - the family feel their presence at the table gives them kudos or mana. There won’t be a parent, or anyone in sight. They’ll all be people of influence.” As a young adult Alika considered this hierarchy “slightly farcical,” joining his friends in predicting that “Fa’a Samoa – the Samoan way … would die off.” Much to his surprise “It’s carrying on, and we’re participating. What the heck!”

Thinking aloud about the views on the honoured guests held by his mother in contrast to his non-Samoan friends, Alika imagines that if the minister of his current multi-ethnic church had come to his 40th party, his mother’s response would have astounded his Pakeha friends because she would have ensured that

> Instantly, there’d be room at the head table. Because they would just go “fooomm.” They’d be waited on hand and foot. They’d be invited up to speak. They’d get an envelope at the end, get gifts showered upon him. And my best friend would be going, “And who is that guy?” There’d just be no comprehension of the mana afforded to religious people in the Samoan culture.

Alika describes the impact of his parents’ presence at his birthday parties. “Because my parents would have the influence over it. I’d almost lose control, it would be their party as opposed to mine.” He described even more contrast for formal events: “Very structured, very, lots of religious aspects, and prayer, and ministers and envelopes and all sorts of stuff going around.”

> At a recent church dinner he attended, Alipate considers that the “honoured guest would be the person sharing their story. That’s what I feel, because the second
person is a person explaining, talking about, the topic – who was Jesus, or whatever was. That’s more teaching, whereas the other person is sharing their story.” In valuing the speaker’s vulnerability and willingness to let people into his or her life, Alipate connects honour with welcome at that intimate level of sharing who we are with one another. He emphasises this by immediately showing the same welcome in his own invitations, “The people there we invited were – because we told them, that this was our journey, and come along with us… And if not, just come for dinner.”

Lanuola remembers that while status did not impact who was invited to those Sunday meals, the protocols were always more formal for guests that were Samoan ministers. Although for Pakeha ministers, “it would be very informal. Yeah, so it was more relaxed with non-Samoan ministers. It was more formal with the Samoan ministers because of that protocol of respect all the time.” Lanuola describes a valuing of each guest that grounded their practice of cultural protocols. In considering her current church meals, hosted by a pastor or other church leaders, all of whom are friends, she carries forward the same valuing of guest and host as well as their different cultures, and in this context everyone is treated with respect and honour and no one is special, “Because it’s a different generation…. from my observation, [without the honour requirements in] treating the ministers that my Dad’s generation grew up with, as opposed to our friends who are ministers.” Today, it’s about relationship, she says, continuing, “Not position. And everyone would eat at the same time. It wasn’t an order of – guest first. Everyone would be - it would be like, a smorgasbord, most times it would be.”
Honour for the Chinese participants primarily focused on family and church relationships with some traces of obligation. Blossom praised the willingness to welcome people into each other’s homes, Illustrious valued a community coming together to celebrate the Lord’s birth, and to use and enjoy their gifts, and Noble described the willingness to input into each other’s lives. Splendid’s childhood memories of hospitality and honoured guests relate a sense of family, economic and social obligation. “As far as a wedding goes, there was always – there was a duty, a social duty for the two wedding families to reciprocate and respect their social obligations.” Blossom’s description of a Tea Ceremony encapsulated her cultural values of family, hospitality, welcome and protocols.

A tea ceremony at a Chinese wedding is for the bride and groom to be welcomed into each other’s families. This is actually when – I’ll just explain what happens. You start off in the boy’s home with his mum and dad and they host first. And then once you’ve done the protocols on that side, you go to the girl’s home, and you do the same ceremony, and you honour the protocols on that side. And it’s very interesting, the parents of the married couple host, they’re the hosts.

In determining the honoured guest as the Moderator of the Presbyterian Church of NZ, Illustrious defaults to position and then he recalls another event where the Pakeha speaker was honoured because of how he was able to connect with the Church; he had been a missionary in China, understood the language and gave humorous examples of what happens when the intonations are incorrect. Both Illustrious and Splendid include Pakeha (Europeans) as honoured guests, Illustrious reflects, “I think local Chinese had a huge respect for Europeans too. Especially as this church would have been kick-started with a lot of help from European Presbyterians in Auckland and the leaders of that.” Splendid echoes this honouring of the welcome and commitment given by the Presbyterian Church to the NZ Chinese community over the last century. Relationship is still important to Illustrious in determining honour but his appreciation of the conductor’s
musicianship and achievements is also high. He is an enthusiastic member of her choir at an annual Church Christmas event that draws performers and guests from across the community of this rural village on the edge of the Auckland region. The choir’s guest conductor is also part of the community, respected for her talent and skills, and he thinks if anyone is an honoured guest it would be her. “She could be, kind’ve, an honoured guest. But again, she wouldn’t play on it. She’d be in the background, talking to a lot of people who want to talk to her in - which is a lot of people.”

Thinking about a dinner held in honour of a visiting English theologian, Blossom wonders aloud at the reasons the guests might have for honouring her. She says, “I suppose, in her capacity as a theologian, and a public figure coming out to … perform a kind’ve official kind’ve role in that way. So she was being honoured for that.” Unusual in any of the participants’ responses to this question of who is the honoured guest, Blossom describes herself and fellow guests as in awe of their honoured guest’s position and achievements. Blossom continues, “For those reasons, honouring her. But also, because she’s coming over as a foreigner, so actually, just inviting someone around to dinner because they’ve come all the way to New Zealand. That’s a major thing.” Noble’s honoured guests, both childhood and current, are primarily relationship based with what could be described as an honour for the spiritual leadership of the godmother to his mother and the responsibilities carried by his friends in ministry because of such leadership.

Pakeha – relationship, position

The first challenge among these four participants in identifying the reasons why a particular guest was honoured relates to how rarely the language and concept of honour is considered. In talking about the older supportive family member being honoured at this meal, Sam says, “Mum would never say that she is a guest of
honour, but the only reason the event would be happening was because [she] was leaving in a couple of days.” Another feature common to these four was that in contrast to the communal sharing of meal preparation responsibilities that is mentioned by participants from the three collectivist cultures, the Pakeha participants reveal that when the family entertained at home it was taken-for-granted that the meal preparation was the mother’s role with support varying between families.

Relationship with the family, ranging from business and Christian ministry networks to family or a combination of both, was the determining factor for all the Pakeha participants for the hospitality extended to the guests. Isobel identifies “position and relationship” as the determining factors for host, honoured guests and other guests in her parents’ home. At a recent meal for church leadership she describes the host as one who holds “a position of authority and a position of power and a position of influence.” This combination of relationship and position is not based on hierarchical status or familial social obligation, so much as business, organisational and personal competencies and achievements, yet they do not connect achievement to position and give it little weight in their recollections of why a guest was honoured. Peter describes an event when his family hosted the international Vice President of a Christian organisation and his wife for a meal. He says, “Yeah, I’m not sure about achievement, but certainly position and relationship. Honoured guest would be position, and that wouldn’t be about relationship.” Peter connects the increased level of formality offered to this guest to his senior leadership position, the difference in cultures, and perhaps also because of the lack of relationship with the honoured guest which was due to the challenges of long-distance networks at the time.

Ruby chose a meal hosted by her grandparents where the guest was a business colleague of her grandfather’s, a friend and the then sitting Governor-
While his presence at the meal was because of his relation to the family, Ruby recalls the heightened preparations that she attributes to.

Simply his role, the fact that he was so successful. Achievement and position. More than relationship.... Well, I guess, when I think about it, it must have been fairly relationship based, because there certainly weren’t a lot of other people invited within which to showcase the guest. There was nothing of that.... And whoever he was with came, and therefore, I’d say that a lot was based on relationship, but certainly the preparation was heightened because of his position.

Peter, considering one of the honoured guests and speakers at a church Passover event explains his reason for honouring him as due to the way God has used this minister. He describes him as, “Someone God has used to speak into my life with some significance, not just to be entertained.” He later repeats this distinction between speakers who only entertain and those who pass on what they themselves receive from God; that honour is given because of the speaker’s availability to be a channel God uses and in this context also because of Peter’s ability to receive the gifts of grace offered. Reflecting on a wedding, Sam responds, “Honoured guests? You know, bride and groom,” recognising a commitment to marriage and family that crosses cultures. His final observation concerning how he recognises the host identifies gratitude as an expression of honour, he says

I suppose for that context, I would say, there’s always that traditional, regardless of who’s paid for the event, and all that sort of stuff, there’s always going to be a little bit of, or a lift on the parents of the bride. Well, they would be the people that we would always go up to and thank at the end of the evening, which we did.

THOUGHTS ON WORTH

Chinese and Pakeha participants both emphasised that relationship was significant to who was honoured, with position relevant in the way it provided a framework for relationship. A majority of the Maori, Chinese and Samoan participants expressed concepts of family and hospitality that were distinct from
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Pakeha definitions in their breadth and strength of connection. Strong relational connections and clearly identified roles and tasks often carried out with hilarity, contribute to effortless organisation as the communities share the responsibilities of hosting. Knowing that you belonged, knowing exactly what was expected of you, having the freedom to laugh and play amidst shared responsibilities, are all powerful antidotes to anxiety, making room for a confident and joy filled welcome.

The attributes that determined the honoured guests were easily identified in these three collectivist groups, all offering elderly members of their family as initial examples, describing a giving of respect where respect is due because of the wisdom that comes with advanced age or the relationship or position of a parent, elder or chief, with a particular emphasis in the Samoan group for the status of the minister. While status as a measurement of worth and honour is strongest for three of the Samoan, it’s also present in the hierarchical structure of the Chinese and Maori participants. For the Maori group, it’s balanced by a solid sense of cultural identity and place, an embodied sense of amplitude that allows status to be an aspect of worth but not its measurement.
In exploring how guests were made welcome and when, if ever welcome was withheld, participants painted a picture of what honour looks like in their families and communities. These examples of welcome offer a valuable platform for further discussion of a biblical understanding of honouring one another. Rather than present their examples by ethnicity, these expressions of honour are revealed by themes; food, deference, language and identity, connections and informality and lead into the impact of truth telling, shame and the withholding of welcome.

When the question of welcome protocols was rephrased to ask what things were done to make the guest feel welcome, Kahurangi responded, “Well, food’s always there.” This immediate connection between food and welcome was almost universal for the Maori, Chinese and Samoan participants. In their accounts “family” seems synonymous to both welcome and acceptance, “welcome” includes acceptance and coming together, while “food” has immediate symbolic connections to family, welcome, acceptance and belonging, and all have connections to how one honours. Kahurangi, Manawa and Waiti were very clear that to feed your guests well is to honour both the guests and your own whanau. Waiti connects food to identity and hospitality, “so you give the finest food you have, so back home, for us, its stuff like crayfish, paua (abalone) … it was all about food because that’s how we roll. If food is plentiful then you’re the best host.” In reflecting on family celebrations, Kahurangi recalls how her father would always have a “boil up” of “choice pork chops boiled with cabbage, and boiled kumara and that, and potatoes…. And so he

would always have that in addition to all this other stuff, just in case extra people
turned up, that was the heart of it, so that there would be enough food.”

In explaining the significance of good _kai_ (food) to a community’s honour,
Manawa recounts how stories of hospitality become part of memory and identity.
His grandfather had travelled some distance to negotiate a bride for his son but the _marae_
treated them with contempt, offering only soup. In response, his grandfather rebuked the
_marae_ for their poor hospitality, an action that has echoes of Jesus’ command to wipe the
dust off your feet as you leave a village that has not welcomed you (Matt 10:14). It reveals
another aspect of honour at work; in naming the host _marae_’s contempt for what it is, this
_kaumātua_ (elder) was honouring a value shared by host and guest and central to their
common ethnic identity, and like Jesus with Simon, reminding them of who they
are. In doing so he was carrying out an aspect of truth telling, calling the host to account
and maintaining his own dignity and worth. The story illustrates a value his
daughter later taught Manawa, “You can only maintain your own _mana_, you can
only be belittled if you let yourself be belittled.” When the conversation shifts to current
church hospitality, connections between food and honour remain constant as Manawa
remarks, “One thing I’ve learnt, people always remember your _marae_ if you give them
a good _kai_. And that’s what happens when they, if you meet them in another setting,
I think what comes up is that people will acknowledge that _marae_, you and your
_marae_, because of stories, ‘I had a good feed there.’” Having been fed well, their
guests feel welcomed, and having been made welcome, they feel honoured and
respond with honour.

Waiti, the only Maori participant to grow up in a city, recognised honour in
her grandmother’s commitment to care for local children. She was part of a team
who searched the streets returning home each night with teenagers who were
treated as family and given food, clothes and beds; “each individual, being the
honoured guest, in our home.... Everyone was treated equally and fairly....
Everyone was treated with honour.” For Waiti, honour includes the way her grandparents also helped these young people learn new skills, contribute to the community and find work.

Alongside regularly accommodating 20 street kids in their garage, Waiti experienced how family, hospitality and honour were bound together as her family would either host or be hosted around Auckland every weekend, staying the night with extended family. Aveolela echoes this type of relaxed and open welcome to meals or overnight stays that “could happen at the drop of a hat.” It was quite different from the much less frequent and arranged hospitality of what she described as her “more reserved” Palagi (Pakeha) friends.

One of the ways Noble honours friends in ministry leadership is to take them out for Yum Cha, friends enjoying each other over good food. Noble connects honour and welcome with serving a plentiful feast of good tasty food, like roast pork, a favourite, and “Not good for you, but we’ll order it anyway. Just a politeness in doing that, which says, you care. You going to want to make sure they’re being well fed. That is part of being the host. You’ll make sure that they have enough to eat … And you want to make them feel welcome.”

Remembering her childhood home, Blossom too, connects showing welcome with food, with plenty and with gratitude, all of which are ways she demonstrates honour. She says, “Chinese people when they make something, it needs to look full to the eye, it’s really important that it look like its overflowing, that it’s plentiful, extravagant in some way.” Thinking of her mother’s explanations, she describes how this

fullness to the eye … was important because it was about plenty, you being a generous person and also the way in which you show that this is an occasion, and the way you also, if you’re going to a party that you - to your host - you show you’re thankful for being invited to that event.
Considering how her family offered welcome, Aveolela begins much like Kahurangi with an immediate connection between food and welcome.

Food was always involved, having special food, and they would be probably at the head of the table, and they would be – there would be people speaking with them all the time. Not just anybody, not just the kids, but it would be the elderly people in my family, like my grandparents…. Their aunties, and uncles, and their children, so – and they would be sitting and talking, yeah, that’s how.

The majority of Maori, Chinese and Samoan participants remarked on their surprise when initially encountering Pakeha hospitality which with its allocated portions measured to cater for anticipated guests was very different from their experiences of overflowing dishes from which everyone helped themselves until satisfied; the idea of not having plenty to feed everyone with more left over was shaming. For Maori and Samoan this extended to unexpected guests, with households prepared to offer food and accommodation at a moment’s notice.

Such strong connections between food, hospitality and welcome as a means of honouring and so communicating value to guests and hosts exist at that taken-for-granted level of culture which easily leads to misunderstanding between cultures. In the context of cross cultural dynamics, there’s a risk that Maori, Chinese and Samoan may misinterpret the Pakeha approach to hospitality as either a lack of valuing and honour or as grounds for contempt while Pakeha may misinterpret the collectivist examples of hospitality as greed, waste or a lack of planning, judgments also rooted in contempt.

Lanuola illustrates an honouring that crosses cultures and time in her childhood and current descriptions of a hospitality that was offered with no judgment of the guest’s value. In her family’s regular Sunday hospitality, Lanuola revealed practices that made room for the family’s life in a multi-ethnic Auckland community, their worship at a Samoan speaking church, and a continuation of that
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worship in a communal meal at her home. If the invited guests had no transport, her father would bring them home in the car while the children walked. Guests would be welcomed in, offered a coconut drink, alcohol or her mother’s special banana poi drink. Lanuola concludes her description of how the guests were made welcome, “And then... before you have the main meal, Dad would invite them to have a prayer, have a blessing.” A similar ease and welcome, though with less formality, are evident in her descriptions of shared meals in homes of church friends today.

LANGUAGE AND IDENTITY

For the Maori participants, language featured as a significant factor in their sense of ethnic identity. A Maori proverb captures one way honour is expressed in this culture, “Kia mau ki to Maoritanga” which translates to: Hold fast to your culture ... in this context ... ‘hold fast’ - i.e. stick with, honour, believe in.... hold on to these precious beliefs as you would hold on to your very being for they are your mana!!”

To hold fast to one’s language is to stay connected to one’s culture and this is to honour one’s own identity and heritage. Like the other three participants, Waiti grew up hearing the language but unlike the others, she reports, “I couldn’t speak a word of English until I was 5, because Nan always spoke Maori, no matter what.” She describes herself as a “marae baby ... one of those babies that would go everywhere with Nan.” The dominance of the English language in NZ schools where many of their parents had been punished for speaking Maori ensured that few Maori growing up in the decades following WW2 were encouraged by school or whanau to speak their own language. Some of the participants’ relatives understood the central place language holds within a culture and that speaking the language is fundamental to a cultural identity, confidence and mana. Whakaaio

recalls that her mother’s uncle would chastise her mother for not doing more to make her children speak Maori. And he would say to my mum in Maori, “They still don’t know how to speak Maori.”

And she’d say, “No, but they can understand it.”
“You should be teaching them how to speak Maori, why are they doing it in English?” ... But my mum used to say, “They’re alright, they can understand it.”
He said, “No, that’s not right, they should be speaking it.” But we did understand it, and sometimes ... we used to ask ... them to teach us... but they used to say, “It’s better to know English first, and then you will pick it up.” But it doesn’t happen if you’re not in it all the time.

Whakaaio closes this account with a recognition that children require more than being around a language if they are to learn to speak it fluently. In speaking only Maori to her mokopuna (grandchild) Waiti’s kuia (grandmother) gave her an early verbal fluency exceptional in her generation. In contrast to the other three participants’ experience, Manawa reports that Maori language classes were compulsory at his intermediate school although the teaching style did not inspire him to continue with the language at that point. It is as an adult that Manawa connects language to how he both honours others and worships God.

I honour my mother, when I speak Maori. Why didn’t I speak it when she was alive? Because all the words and the phrases that I use come from her, then I took these Te Reo classes and I realised that it was already inside me.... But that’s how I honour my mother by speaking the language that she sorta sown in me. That language is mentioned in Acts 2, when everyone is speaking in their own languages, oh yeah, sweet as. So, we didn’t just make it up.

Manawa recognises that by enabling believers to worship in their own language, God celebrates the richness of each ethnic group, honouring them and inviting all to honour God in response. This theme is continued in Acts 10 which describes the encounters between God, Peter and Cornelius, and where again, the Holy Spirit comes through language and worship (vv44-48). Similar to Manawa’s focus on his culture, Kahurangi and Waiti are also learning or re-learning to speak Maori as adults and giving Maoritanga a significant role in their current vocations
and worshipping communities; all three are in Tikanga Maori. In embracing the strengths of their culture and finding that achieved ethnic identity, these participants communicate gratitude, an aspect of honour, to God as Creator for placing them in their particular whanau and culture while their commitment to seek first the kingdom of God provides a place for yielding their various perspectives to the light of Christ and so, to apply Phinney’s Ethnic Identity Theory a little further, achieve a sense of identity as a citizen of God’s kingdom.

English is the first language for all four Pakeha participants in this group. As members of a majority culture there was no external requirement to learn a language separate from their ethnicity nor are any in this group bilingual. The low sense of ethnic awareness in majority ethnic groups described by Willis is evident in the assumption of normality and consequent surprise at being asked to describe the food of their childhood. After a pause, Peter replied, “just pretty normal,” and Isobel, “Kiwi … kiwi … kiwi stuff,” with Sam describing normal hospitality, “I guess because it was the ‘80s, there was lots of potluck.” In contrast, Ruby, the fourth member of this group noticed early on that having one parent who was English meant that some cultural practices in her home were different to those of children with two Pakeha parents. Willis in her article on cultural assumptions in caregiving discusses the theory of ethnic identity. “Developing Phinney’s work, Syed and Azmitia (2008) argued that young adults move through the three statuses [unexamined, moratorium, achieved] as a result of their experiences and the people
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they come into contact with.”193 Ruby’s childhood experience of different food cultures due to her parents’ British and Royal Naval backgrounds resulted in her response to this question being more like those of the minority ethnic participants, who easily identified Pakeha food culture as separate from their own, moving her beyond the unexamined stage of ethnic identity development.

**Deference**

Maori, Chinese and Samoan groups articulated that honouring included listening and respecting their elders’ opinions. Kahurangi describes why she honours elders:

> The elders have status because of their age. When I see an elder, my respect for them is great simply because of their age; they’ve come through life with all its challenges, joys.... They’ve lived through generations, seen, heard and experienced so much more. They’re also not as able as they used to be, more frail - vulnerable and so people will readily help them, serve them or whatever. They are usually rich with children and grandchildren. With the value Maori place on *whakapapa*, the elders usually knew people from older generations that we didn’t know, therefore they are our link to those ancestors and those times.

Another aspect of honour shared by all 12 from the collectivist groups is the importance of honouring one’s elders and those in authority through acts of service, deference and obedience. Alipate draws a vivid picture of the younger generation rushing to the service of an honoured elderly guest, helping him out of the car and carrying his bags. And once inside, “Everyone would stop what they were doing and greet him and give him a kiss even if they didn’t know who he was... he was that guy. Even if you didn’t know who he was you’d know he was the main person because of the way he was treated.” Blossom tells how deference to one’s “elders and people in authority” includes the responsibility to call everyone “by their proper names, or just call them aunty or show respect.” Such greetings were followed by
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“automatically fetching them tea, or serving. It was really important to -- as a young person to serve. I don’t think that’s specific to Chinese culture.”

Aveolela describes the sort of willingness to serve guests and the elderly that Blossom mentions and they both connect these many small acts of kindness and service with welcome and honouring the guest.

And then there’d be a special place where they sat down, and there’d be someone there fanning them if it was hot, and someone getting them cups of teas, and it’d often be one of the young girls, getting them cups of teas, and always offering them something to eat. This is before the main meal. And then them coming to sit at the table. And after that, they go straight to the main couch... while the girls are cleaning up the table. And they’re conversing with the older people.

Manawa, Waiti and Kahurangi described honour being expressed in particular forms of greeting and a place at the top table for those in leadership or authority. Alika notes how his mother would welcome a minister very differently from his best friend. The status of one required deferential and formal honouring while she treated the latter as a member of the family. He remembers, “One of my very good friends ended up living at our place for four months because there was dissent in his household, mum and dad split up and so forth, [so mum said], ‘Tell him to come and live in our place.’”

For all the Samoan participants, honour is expressed in showing deference, with occasional indications that external acts of deference were not always equated to underlying attitudes of respect. When asked about how the guests were made welcome at the wedding, Alika connected welcome with food only to vent a little frustration. He remembered how food was brought to the tables to then sit for two hours of mostly impromptu speeches authorised by protocols that also required each speaker receive envelopes of cash gifts, while family members spent the wedding reception “humping drinks, or serving food, or waiting, clearing tables.” He struggled to identify what sorts of things were done to make guests feel welcome,
concluding that, “Weddings are possibly not the best example to illustrate that. We don’t have a ritual such as Maori onto a marae with a powhiri.” Then his thoughts turn to the welcome his mother receives on her return visits to their village in Samoa, and while the protocols sound similar, and his role just as demanding he appears to connect them more to a sense of welcome and honouring. In his recounting of Samoan traditions in the NZ context where they are separated from their origin by two generations, by geography, architecture and community structures, he has expressed a tension that these protocols seem out of place or performed in an honouring of ritual with little connection to the heart of welcome and acceptance that is truly honouring. Remembering these summer holiday visits to their island village, he describes the abundant gifts of food, the nightly discussions in a fale (building with open windows), “and then it’ll be communal feeding, where the younger – and I would probably fit into that – generation will serve all these elder people. So there’s that type of welcoming arrangement, where the elders are honoured, and the next generation serves.”

In thinking of a current hospitality event where she was made to feel welcome, Aveolela’s thoughts turned to the wedding of a friend’s daughter. The family are new immigrants, originally from South Africa, and the protocols she describes differ from the Samoan wedding protocols and status based gift-giving that Alika described. Aveolela finds a delightful welcome and a sense of being honoured in the generosity of every guest receiving “little gifts and a piece of the cake” as they left, and in “the way that we were seated, we were able to talk to the person across from us. It was quite a lovely event, it was quite a lovely wedding. Yes, it was really lovely.” Asked if she could expand on how she was welcomed, she describes being greeted and escorted to her seat, and how “the bride came and spoke to us and said thank you for coming, and chatted, it was quite nice. And you got to know other people at the wedding as well, the reception.” Aveolela recognises welcome in the small courtesies, the attention given to put her at ease and make
room for the guests to connect with others through conversation and food, all of which have parallels to the ways she remembers her great-grandfather being welcomed but are quite different from the sense of disconnection and lack of welcome Alika found in his experience of Samoan wedding protocols.

Reflecting on the welcome offered at the church course and meal Alipate acknowledges how much he values the many warm greetings and the way the hosts take time to get to know him. Speaking about the hosts, he says, “They are quite welcoming, aren’t they? You don’t have to do anything, just turn up. You don’t even have to pay.” At the same time he communicates a sense of being almost overwhelmed with welcome. He describes how his friends somehow slip in quietly, find their table and sit down, while he finds that people are “always greeting you. Before I find my table, I always try to hide, so don’t talk to anyone before I sit down, but someone always gets me…. It’s still cool, but like, I want to sit down first. And I’ll see you afterwards.” Wanting to join his friends, he wonders if he gets stopped by everybody because they’re thinking, “Who is this different person who looks Chinese?! It’s like I get mobbed, this person…. And then this person…” But he also wonders if his friends avoid the welcome because they “avoid eye contact,” a gesture of welcome which he values. He reflects on talking with one friend about how she doesn’t see people “because she looks down, she doesn’t look someone in the eyes.” In a similar manner to the way Kahurangi connected honour with acknowledgement and to his own childhood memories of welcome full of acknowledgement, Alipate says,

Me, when I walk past, I always see someone, and acknowledge them. Anybody. That’s probably me... For me it’s just, I always see people and – especially if I see them all the time, you make eye contact, or just acknowledge them, or just say (indicates Hi). For me, the greeting is the main thing... to me, say hi.
An aspect of honour that is present, though expressed differently across Maori, Chinese and Samoan cultures, relates to the broader sense of identity in collectivist cultures. For Maori, because identity includes *whakapapa* (genealogy), honouring means taking the time to acknowledge not just the individual, but who they’re connected to and represent. Maori also describe a parallel honouring of *kaupapa* (purpose), it’s important to acknowledge and so honour the reason (if there is one) for gathering. The primary example that begins with the welcome ritual preceding the meal is a *powhiri* or *pohiri* (*marae* welcome ceremony). This ritual has elements of welcome that belong to both marae and less formal gatherings.

In talking about family weddings, Kahurangi remarks that even when, for example, the guests are local so a *powhiri* isn’t necessary, an elder will still give a “speech of welcome.” She notes how this is different from the typical speech of welcome at a Pakeha gathering, that brief “welcome you here today, thank you for coming.” The speech of welcome Kahurangi refers to is one where the elder takes the time needed to ensure that he’s including all.... and mentioning the groups that have come for the bride and the groom and from which communities they’ve come from and which tribes. Acknowledging - there’s a real thing to acknowledge people and I guess it’s an honouring.... And it’s not just them there, it’s all the others behind them that are not there.... So while you might just have a handful of people that have come from another tribe ... they’ll be spoken to as representing that tribe, even though there’s only four or five, and that tribe might be 60,000 people or something ... there’s always an acknowledgement of those people.

In examining welcome protocols at a semi-formal hospitality event, three participants referred to a formal or semi-formal speech-making protocol that acknowledged and welcomed the guests, those the guests represented, the things that connected the guests and hosts to one another, and their purpose for gathering. Manawa summarises with: “Those are the key things: to tie us, to unite us in how we can achieve the goal, or I suppose, achieve anything.” When Manawa describes
how their Pakeha guest of honour is made welcome at the hui, he describes the desire
to acknowledge and honour the guest, who he represents, his connections to those
present and how they can achieve their common goal.

Definitely you have to get up to do a whaikorero (formal speech making) to him -
for his title, remembering his parents and grandparents, and remembering his
schooling, all those things that tie him to us. And his position, and to acknowledge
that he’s climbed up that tree of Matauranga (knowledge), so he’s able to get a
broader view of what’s happening, the higher you go, the wider your view.

When followed correctly, these protocols identify the parties clearly, their
kaupapa or common purpose for gathering, and their peaceful intentions to each
other, including space for conflicts to be heard and resolutions sought\(^{194}\) until the
point is reached where guests become one with hosts over hongi or hariru and food.
And whether formal or informal all participants identified with Waiti’s description
of a normal greeting as “a hariru, so that’s a kiss, handshake and kiss.”

Together with honouring the order or tikanga, both Kahurangi and Manawa
describe how the purpose or kaupapa of a meeting is honoured. The participants
differentiated a visit by friends from a visit with a particular purpose where the
kaupapa would also be formally acknowledged during a speech of welcome. This is
part of powhiri in marae protocols but it is also part of less formal gatherings, like a
special birthday celebration or as Kahurangi describes, the first discussion of a
wedding between future in-laws:

So when my brother-in-law’s parents came to see my parents when the two had
decided to get married they came to discuss that wedding so my father would have
given a speech to welcome them. It’s an important Kaupapa, it’s an important
reason for gathering. This is the reason for it. It’s acknowledging the fact that we’ve
got something to talk about here, it’s not just a visit, to say “Hello, we’re just
popping in to say Hi!” They’re gathering for a specific reason.... This is what we’re
gathering for, acknowledging them for coming, and I guess.... They all know what
they’re gathering for, it might just be four people, mum and dad and [his] parents,

\(^{194}\) Part of the welcome includes room for a form of truth telling. These often concern any corrections that
may be needed to ensure whakapapa is clearly understood, but there is room for any other concerns that
need to be heard. While protocols require courtesy and respect, they allow for disagreement and criticism.
but there’ll still be a “Nau mai haere mai, Welcome, welcome” in the context of what we’re meeting for.

Non-Maori who encounter these welcome rituals without awareness of their meaning may treat them much like many who have discarded church liturgies as meaningless repetition, an empty form that some institutions require they follow, preferring instead to omit protocols that seem too formal or unnecessary. Pakeha might also struggle with the differing values shown in the time taken to acknowledge the connections and purpose as against valuing getting a task done or a point communicated as efficiently as possible.

Inherent in the form of welcome described by these participants is an honouring expressed through acknowledgement and gratitude; taking the time to acknowledge that we need one another, that we stand on the shoulders of those who have gone before us, and have a responsibility to those who come after us, reminds us of a sense of place, belonging and purpose. In this honouring of tikanga and kaupapa, of order and purpose, those gathered are acknowledging that they are part of a larger and common purpose, displaying both gratitude and humility; attitudes that are vital factors in creating safe places for ongoing growth and healthy decision making, and of course, honouring one another.

Echoing these descriptions of the foundational values of tikanga in protocols of welcome, Blossom offers a glimpse of Chinese welcome protocols that are foundational to the structure of both family and community, and therefore powerful and honoured. In the first part of the Tea Ceremony, the bride and groom serve those elder than them greeting each by their proper names and offering them tea.

So you might say, dà āyī, yum cha, which would mean, eldest aunty on my father’s side, drink tea. It’s a very specific term, so you name people, and they accept your tea, if they accept you. And if they really accept you, they drink the tea to the last drop. And then they will give you something, which is usually money, or if it’s for the woman, jewellery. So these are the sort of protocols. And then, once you’ve done all the older people, the married couple sit down, and starting from the oldest child down to the youngest, they will come and serve you tea, and then you will
drink, and then you will give them something, and they will call you by their name for you, not the other way around. It’s all very interesting. It’s actually very, very meaningful, because this is the point we’re accepted into the family. And this should be the first time you use those terms, the family names.

FROM FORMAL TO INFORMAL

The Pakeha participants all described welcome as being conveyed in simple greetings, offers of drink, food and conversation, their non-hierarchical values recognising a connection between acknowledgment and honouring on an individual level, but with little awareness of the collectivist value of acknowledging broader connections. Pakeha greetings and expressions of welcome did not show a connection to wide extended family and their connections to the church are present but are assumed rather than overtly acknowledged, reflecting Berger’s comments that identity in Western individualist societies is no longer rooted in societal institutions. When this is compared with Kahurangi’s earlier observation on the lack of acknowledgement of connection in Pakeha greetings, what becomes apparent is that the individual way these four Pakeha define their identity influences how they understand and express welcome, and therefore honour. Kahurangi’s observation is also an example of how words like “welcome” and “honour” are used by both Pakeha and Maori while many, unlike Kahurangi, do not realise that the meaning and values symbolised are poles apart.

Distinct from their current focus on informality, Pakeha participants all associated honour and welcome in their childhood with an increased level of formality. Isobel remembers,

It would be really important that as kids we were there, I think, inclusive. We would all be well dressed. My mother would have made sure she’d had her hair done for the day... having a “do.” And she will have gone to a lot of trouble over preparing the meal and having thought about that and prepared the table for that.... There’d be welcome, there’d be handshakes, there’d be offering of drinks, that’s usually the first thing, “Would you like a drink?”
Ruby noticed how her family honoured guests with an increase of tradition and formality. She says, “Quite formal, in one sense…Not formal, as in over the top, but just - traditional, maybe that would be a better word for it.” Sam remembers his mother practicing a level of formality that contrasted to their household meals then as well as how he would host guests in his home today. He recounts a meal prepared by his mother to thank a family member for her care of the children over a holiday period. While “Mum would have much – naturally preferred to take us all out to a cheap Mexican meal, which we did for all of our birthdays,” this expression of gratitude was more than the gift of a meal, but a meal that would satisfy an older sister’s more traditional expectations. Although Sam was aware that his mother felt a certain obligation that shaped the style of the meal, what he describes contains a desire on her part to honour her sister.

In identifying welcome protocols, Peter articulates one of the challenges of communicating with others which is common within a culture and even more likely to arise across cultures, the difference between a person’s intentions and how a message is received. In Peter’s example, the host is Pakeha and the honoured guests are from North America.

Well I think the things that were done, whether they made him feel welcome, but they were done in the presumption that they would make him feel welcome is that everyone was dressed in their Sunday best, and that probably meant that even as a child I probably wore a tie, so it was quite formal, in terms of the outward appearance, that is.

Splendid is more formal in his descriptions of both past and present protocols than other participants. As an adult he is among those NZ Chinese who has explored his Chinese heritage and learned the language and protocols. He describes how wedding guests would be “welcomed by the host families, everyone being seated later on. Formal speeches. After the formal speeches, then the eating. But after the eating, there would be dancing. And they would have - normally the
Chinese band.” As a child, he remembers struggling with “these long interminable speeches” in a language he didn’t understand, yet as an adult he honours his heritage, and his cultures’ honouring of the written word. Unlike Splendid, Noble had little contact with white people growing up, and he remembers the strangeness of his first encounters with Pakeha greetings as his mother taught them how to welcome her Pakeha godmother.

Well, you had to do things you haven’t usually done before or - like shake her hand and say, “How do you do?” What does that mean? What did that mean? You kind’ve offer your hand and shake.... It was quite unusual for us to encounter that kind of person, we just wouldn’t do it. You wouldn’t have those acquaintances, yet somehow she was my mother’s godmother. And she wanted to show that her children had been brought up right. And we had to behave.

In contrast to Splendid, Illustrious describes simple expressions of welcome. For the church opening in the 1950s he says the welcome was a, “short speech, it wasn’t like a Maori [powhiri]. Pretty laid back.... I think just with two or three elders, and a minister and his wife, again just with respect and genuine.” His valuing of informality and relationship continues as he describes a recent choral event. In this situation the church is host to the community led by a minister whose warmth and personality are key factors in making all comers feel welcome. In describing the welcome given at this event, Illustrious focuses on this leader’s welcome, “Sometimes a hug. He’s a tallish fellow, just a permanent welcome smile on his face, a lovely nature. Which is one of the reasons I go there.” He sees other aspects of welcome in the festive nature of the season, the joy of welcoming the Saviour’s birth and the pleasure found by performers and guests in coming together to celebrate with gifts of music. Illustrious identifies an honouring and welcome in the singers’ joy when:

expressing themselves. I mean it - for me - at that time of the year - it’s a wonderful season. And I just love to be part of that. Expressing, being a bit of a performer, I
guess. For me personally, it’s just a chance to be part of a body of talented people. Kind’ve like a ministry of song, if you like. A ministry of music, if you like.

In response to the question, “What things were done to make the guest feel welcome?” Isobel talks of actions that “make the person feel at home,” a definition echoed by Ruby and Blossom. Ruby, thinking of the family meal with the Governor-General, understood welcome as not being treated differently because of status or position. She says, “Because it was a family home, I think he was actually treated like anyone else, he was just welcomed in, and immediately served a drink.”

When Blossom shifts from the formality of her Chinese hospitality protocols to a recent dinner hosted by church leaders in their home, she identifies “that kind of Kiwi relaxedness” and “a really amazing meal” as part of the way guests are made welcome but describes that on this occasion, this group of intimate friends welcome each other warmly and then stumble a little in their attempt to make a foreign and distinguished guest feel welcome.

So here’s an example of awkwardness, we turn up to this dinner, and of course we all know one another really well, and you want to go round and hug everybody. And you come to [the new guest], and you’re thinking, “I can’t hug you,” or, “I don’t even know you, and you’re British.” So you just stand there, and it was so awkward, because you kinda hug one another and you get to the guest and you do nothing.

The honoured guest and English Christian leader responded to their traces of awkwardness during the evening by “trying to tell us to be ourselves, to relax and be ourselves.” In reflecting on that evening, on welcome and honour, Blossom describes welcome as being treated as part of the family. She develops her theme by saying that it’s important

to be as you are, around them, so not doing anything different. So there is a sense of - if you’re honouring someone in the Christian community, that you will treat them immediately as being part of the family. And I think that’s what [she] was actually asking us to do, even though we were not doing that so well. I think that’s what she was actually asking us to do.
Ruby makes connections between her family’s Judeo-Christian ethic and the refusal to show greater honour or preferential treatment based on status, an approach to honour that contrasts with the Samoan participants’ childhood valuing on status but may also have links with the NZ cultural values of Fairness and Informality identified by Falconer and associates.\textsuperscript{195} While other cultures may encounter it as Hyper-democratic and Disrespectful, these participants describe an intent to make someone feel at home as an expression of welcome grounded in a desire to honour all. Blossom brings another aspect of this approach to welcome into focus as she links concepts of authenticity and the true self with the welcome of family.

\textbf{Welcome Withheld}

When asked to look for examples of Simon the Pharisee’s omission of welcome protocols, none of the Maori participants could recall seeing welcome withheld from an invited guest, though they recognise it can occur and some have protocols to protect guests and hosts. Waiti recognised that a barrier between people may cause the door to be shut, “If you’re going to withhold that type of protocol, that person’s obviously not welcome in the home. And I, you know, the door won’t be open, the door will remain closed. But I’ve never witnessed it, myself.” Manawa remarks that his marae would know if anyone was that angry and that protocols provided a space after the welcome “where you air your stuff,” so if anyone attempted to “have a dig” during the welcome, “usually the women will shut them down by singing straight away so that they’re cut off.” Kahurangi, after pondering, shook her head to indicate “No,” but later remembered one occasion where she

\textsuperscript{195} Values capitalised in original text of Falconer’s interview with Schaer, “She’s Right, Mate,” Earthy versus (v.) Unsophisticated, Modesty v. Unintentionally misleading, Restraint v. Overcautious, Fairness v. Hyper-democratic, Ingenuity v. Close enough is good enough, and Informality v. Disrespectful.
herself asked an uninvited guest to leave in order to protect a young relative from an emotionally charged situation.

In this context of welcome, three Maori participants described the strength of connection for all whanau to one another and to their marae. When asked if there were any lifestyle or behavioural choices that would result in welcome being refused the answer was unanimous; provided protocols were followed, protocols that protected the safety and sanctity of the marae/whanau, no whanau member could be turned away. The acceptance and welcome was absolute. No member could be shut out irrespective of lifestyle choices or past actions provided tikanga was honoured (italics mine). For example, this allows a marae to welcome whanau who are gang members provided they leave their patches at the gate; as whanau they were always welcome onto the marae, but not if they wished to maintain a contrary allegiance. In Kahurangi’s words, “They’re distancing themselves from the culture of what they represent by taking their jacket off, so they’re not coming as the Mob, they’re coming as whanau, and that’s who the Marae wants them as, whanau. Not as members of a Mob that have a different tikanga, and a different way of doing things.” This requirement that whanau honour tikanga, in itself an honouring of all who have gone before as well as those present and future, is an element of truth telling.

Lanuola could not recall it happening but imagined that her father might withdraw welcome where a guest does not treat host or guests with the respect due to them as human beings. She describes welcome and respect as “reciprocal, there was always that respect factor - for who they were, there were in his home, you’re welcomed. Yeah. There was nothing about your background.” Thinking about how her father protected that environment of welcome she recalls a family event at his home with grown children and in-laws now present. A visiting in-law, not familiar with the frankness or humour of some family members took offence at a line of discussion. Lanuola remembers how her father stepped in to say to all involved that
“this is his home, do not be disrespectful, and that [the relative] was a guest.” Her current situation has similar restraints where welcome is not dependent on a person’s historical behaviour so much as their willingness to respect the safety of those around them.

Alika, like other participants from the four ethnic groups when speaking of weddings, notes that fraught relational histories are the most likely cause of tension, he says, “If an ex-boyfriend turned up to someone’s wedding, that would be a perfect example of why welcome protocols might be overlooked. In fact, he might even get thrown out of the situation, so that’s an example in the Caucasian world where it could easily happen.” He also notes that, “If someone was to cause trouble at an event, get too drunk, be loud, obnoxious - they might get asked to leave.” In describing how he’s made to feel welcome at a church dinner, Alipate notes the MC’s friendly greetings but when asked if there’s any situation where welcome is withheld, his thoughts turn to how strange it is that this host often walks away mid-conversation.

Would it be when [the MC] just walks off? ... My mum came. And she did that to my mum. And mum told me, and I thought... She did that to my mum. And my mum doesn’t go to their church. And we asked her to come. And the first thing my mum says, was, “She’s rude.” So you know? I don’t think she does it intentionally... I think she’s oblivious to the fact that she’s doing it... but, yeah, she did it to me twice yesterday, I think.

This is the only description of welcome withdrawn for no apparent reason, and it’s likely that this host was oblivious to the lack of welcome she communicated. Alipate does not take offence, commenting instead that he cannot imagine any lifestyle or behaviour that would exclude anyone from attending this event, whether atheists, agnostics, street-workers or bums, “Oh, I think, not roll out the red carpet, but I think they’d be really welcoming. They’d make them feel really comfortable. Especially with this church. They’re really friendly people.”
Turning to what sort of behaviour might disqualify someone from being invited, Alipate asks, “My Dad being disqualified, does that count? He married the wrong person plus he was poor.” Aveolela, Alika and Alipate spoke of a coolness in the way family could respond; Alika’s mother was polite but cool to non-Samoan girlfriends and his village in Samoa had “strict, almost village rules” which if broken resulted in relative degrees of village discipline. Aveolela says that her Samoan family would “Not welcome [family members] if they had brought shame on the family. This Samoan family wouldn’t open the door to them.” Speaking generally at first, she says,

If they’d just done something that’s ... not accepted in the family.... It might be, like being, unfaithful or something like that. Not being caring to their family... doing things that are not acceptable. Just doing things in an uncaring way towards their family.... I don’t know about any other Samoan family, but this family wouldn’t open up the door.... They just wouldn’t let them in, and they’d let you know that you brought shame on our family, and you’re not worth – oh, they really let you have it. That’s probably it, I can’t really go into much about that. It’s quite chilly sometimes, when you think about things.

None of the Pakeha participants could identify any reason in their past or present situations where welcome would be withheld from an invited guest. Although they acknowledged that family or relationship history might mean some relationships are tense with people working hard to keep the individuals concerned apart, but as Sam says “if you’re invited, you’re invited. I suppose, there’s a certain level of duty, sometimes to invite people. But I don’t know that you would withhold, I don’t know that anyone would withhold any of those protocols from them, purposely.” Ruby remarks, “They wouldn’t [withhold welcome]. The aim is make people feel welcome. Absolutely.”

Similarly the Chinese participants struggle to find examples of welcome withheld. For Noble’s childhood setting, “it’s a face thing” meaning that no invited guest would not receive due welcome protocols, though the warmth of these
protocols may vary. For him, that requirement to extend welcome includes uninvited guests where they claim distant relationship and are elderly. Blossom responds, “Why would you invite someone who was unwelcome in the first place?” And Noble replies, “Can’t think of any. No.” While Splendid agrees that he cannot imagine a situation where welcome protocols would not be followed for any invited guest, he knows of a rare occasion where an invitation was withdrawn; he describes how shortly before a Chinese community event one of the invited guests publicly criticised their community and the offence was so great that the invitation was officially withdrawn.

Ruby is firm on the foundational values of the welcome she and her family offered. In contrast to her NZ Chinese husband’s comments on the motivational power of face and Confucian based respect for elders in his Chinese cultural heritage, she says,

From my family’s point of view, I think it’s more birthed in the Judeo Christian ethic that Jesus says, even as you do as much to the least of these. So no matter who walks in the door, it’s not like it’s an overtly Christian principle, but I think it comes from a different foundation of honouring the person, that we’re all equal in the sight of God, that God’s created us unique. So far more from that perspective. Why would you [not welcome]? … yes, quite definitely, you definitely don’t - wouldn’t treat someone any differently.

Ruby’s description of honour as rooted in humanity’s value and equality in God’s sight reflects the recognition of human dignity that drove England’s abolition of the slave trade and motivated missionaries and legislators behind the Treaty of Waitangi.

When approaching the aspect of welcome by considering whether an invitation would be denied because of any lifestyle or behaviour, Ruby can’t conceive of the situation arising in her childhood home and her reply for her home group is even more encompassing: “Nothing that would disqualify anyone. Nothing. They would be welcome. With that, in principle. We haven’t had a
situation where it’s (been an issue).” For Peter, Isobel and Sam, while they cite drunken, lewd or coarse behaviour as the sort of conduct that would result in invitations being withheld, they considered it unlikely to arise in their environments. Isobel is thinking about a dinner for a church’s senior leadership team when she responds that “lifestyle choices that sit right outside the belief structure, maybe, might be sufficient. Or if I was, if I as a person was rude, obnoxious, drunk, if my behaviour was outside social norms.” The assumption supporting her response that is taken for granted has some similarities with the Maori participants’ description of an honouring of Tikanga; there’s a desire, need and entitlement to honour the values and customs that define this community by protecting them.

Sam is the only participant in this group to clearly identify unwelcome guests and yet there is evidence of honouring in this withholding of welcome. He recognises how one of his mother’s friends “who is brilliant, and actually hugely intelligent,” was never invited to meet this visiting relative because “it’d be oil and water.” Again there are traces of honour in the way his mother protected her relative and her friend from each other.

[My aunt] would have absolutely no capacity to – she would’ve just found [her] abhorrent. It’s not like she – it’s not short skirts and stuff - it’s just more like she’d had three husbands, and she’s a bit loose with her tongue. If someone’s a bitch, she’ll call them a bitch. You know, whereas Margaret would stew on it for ten years and hold a grudge, but never say anything…. She’s completely emotionally crippled.

Sam is candid about his own struggle to extend welcome to people “who are not as socially adjusted as some of the other people…. And when I talk about social adjustment, I’m talking about – they put inappropriate things on Instagram, or they have uncomfortable conversations with me,” conversations where they thoughtlessly dishonour Sam’s profession and colleagues. While Sam describes this as his own lack of welcome, it may be better identified as a lack in the area of truth telling. For Sam to honour himself, his colleagues and the critics, he needs
permission, structure and a safe place in his community to correct wrongs and like
the loving father of Luke 15: 25-32, the skills to do so with honour, grace and humility. 
What’s absent is a framework for speaking the truth in love, such as Maori 
participants described in their marae protocols, though they also note how this 
robust and humble search for truth is rare in their observations of personal relations.

While the majority of participants take it for granted that if someone was 
invited they would be welcomed, it’s worth noting that those from individualist 
cultures like Pakeha had more control on who they invited, reducing the risk of 
facing unwanted guests, offering more freedom to withdraw from relations making 
for a kind of peace, but one without resolution. Maori, Chinese, Samoan participants 
with their collectivist sense of identity and kinship requirements may be faced with 
less choice in who they invite, but no participants showed resentment at this, and 
several were grateful for the security their family provided. Aveolela and Aika, as 
well as Sam, Splendid and Noble, noted that while welcome would not be withheld, 
it could be cooler. Kahurangi distinguished between the marae, where all whanau 
are entitled to be present but there is space to maintain distance if needed, and her 
much smaller home, where she had more control over who entered. She and Waiti 
both reflected on a common practice of appearing at peace with others, or “ka pai” 
(good, great), while never resolving offences or conflict.

THOUGHTS ON HONOUR

Maori, Chinese and Samoan participants’ use of the separate English 
language words of family, welcome and acceptance (and food) give an impression 
of being almost multiple facets of a single concept, with honour like a cord binding 
them to one another. This connects on two levels to language and identity. For Maori 
participants, te Reo was a lifeline to their culture, identity and honour, enabling those 
who pursue it to recover confidence and a secure place from which to offer welcome;
language is a key to culture and therefore understanding, making the effort to learn a person’s ethnic language an expression of honour and a bridge to relationship with him or her.196

Collectivist participants shared a fundamental agreement that respecting parents and elders was conveyed through deference and acts of service, establishing deference as a primary form of showing honour and love. They understood it as a way of acknowledging relationship and of honouring one’s own and the other’s mana, not a subservient act rooted in powerlessness that denies a person’s identity. Grounded in relationship, it offers strength and grace to a community’s life, building rather than weakening those communities willing to explore it.

The shift from formal honouring to informal hospitality where honouring guests focused on enabling them to feel at home was a prevalent theme among the Pakeha participants with Blossom also valuing this definition of welcome. Building on Blossom’s words that welcome is to make someone feel at home and “to be as you are,” then to honour guests is to provide a place of safety and freedom to be as they truly are. This expression of honouring as welcome and acceptance of “who you are” was evident among all of the Maori participants with three Maori participants also speaking of Tikanga (protocols/custom) as a body of wisdom they honoured, and which defined the group, grounding their acceptance in the whanau, demanding loyalty and protection, and so treasured that protocols exist to protect it through robust dialogue – identifying truth telling as part of showing honour.

When Jesus confronted Simon the Pharisee, he spoke as a father correcting a much loved son, challenging his identity, that is, his understanding of what it meant to be a child of God. In doing so, he connected truth-telling to honour and dignity. Participants’ reflections revealed a lack of experience in the sort of truth telling that corrects and encourages towards the maturity Paul speaks of in Ephesians 4.

None of the 16 participants were familiar with the language of a Christian Practice of Truth Telling, nor were any conversant with the breadth of meaning and practices under its umbrella. After initial responses (15 of the 16 understood the question as exploring honesty, the 16th denied any knowledge of “truth”), we discussed Jesus’ conversation with Simon the Pharisee as an example of this form of correction. As they explored the questions, the same 15 participants concluded that speaking the truth in love was integral to showing honour, and that honour was integral to speaking the truth in love. A majority recognised that the ability to do this well would contribute to relational wellbeing, several expressed a desire that they, their families and communities appropriate the practice and one described it as a practice some members of her family carried out successfully because of their own character and skills and because the people involved knew one another well.

A few of the participants identified the existence of an aspect of truth telling in a marae setting; the right to publically correct tikanga was undisputed by the Maori participants and provided it was carried out with respect and humility, it could engage the parties in a dialogue of sometimes fiery persuasion. Alika and Lanuola also describe this public right of correction in Samoan communities when protocols of some type were broken, with examples of senior religious figures preempting celebrations to give a sermon or debate that corrects unchristian behaviour.
on the part of the host. Moving from these semi-public community settings, Aveolela reflected on the puzzle that despite her mother’s Samoan family not carrying out the practice as described, members of the extended family always knew where they stood if behaviour codes had been broken. Splendid discussed strong face saving protocols within a hierarchical structure where conflict was dealt with indirectly and mostly in private, while Blossom spoke of a freedom to speak one’s mind within her immediate family only.

MAORI

A part of the welcome protocols that many non-Maori are unaware of is the space given for a truth telling practice. While protocols require courtesy and respect, they allow for disagreement and criticism. This usually relates to any corrections essential to ensure whakapapa (genealogy) is clearly understood but the space also allows for voicing other concerns. Kahurangi explains that during a pohiri depending on the reason they’ve gathered for, they can bring up all kinds of things, what’s happening in the country, current affairs, even after acknowledging everyone, even if you’ve come for a wedding, and if there’s, you know, like the Len Brown incident. Say if Len Brown was from a particular tribe they could talk about that, you can hang your dirty linen. If there’s been some, some past conflict, they can bring that up again, and – everything’s to be talked through out there.

Once the matters have been aired to everyone’s satisfaction, hosts and guests have the “hariru, the shake hands, and you come together as one.” Once inside the wharenui (meeting house), “it’s a place of peace, so all the arguing and that should have been done out in the front, but once you’re inside - you walk in together.” This coming together is celebrated in kai,” and where the parties are gathering for a “wānanga or a – to discuss a particular topic or issue…. it should be all ngaweri or calm [inside], but you can still be honest in your korero (speech).” Kahurangi

communicates a sense that this disagreement can be robust but without condemnation or personal judgments, and remarks that the public nature of communal life within and across *iwi* leaves little room for lies, making space for the integrity that is part of *mana*.198

Manawa recounts how during any formal part of the *powhiri* a community will act together to shut down disrespectful behaviour as they recognise it sometimes singing to cover over disrespect so the person can’t speak or be heard. This marae-led form of gentle discipline designed to protect itself as well as the offender is another picture of honouring both individual and community; like any community practice it is open to abuse but when done well it is an example of how a collectivist community practices the love that covers a multitude of sins. Manawa also illustrates the use of truth telling as a form of correction and growth into maturity, where the community, led by the old man, is coached in how to disagree with respect, grace and honour, to let “*whakamaa* do its work” as he gently corrects the younger man who:

got up and had a big rant and rave. And you could see that the people of the marae, of the *taumata* (orators’ bench), were getting angry. Anyway that guy sat down, and this old gentleman got up and he slapped him with love, if I can put it that way. And I think the words got to the guy that was angry and he broke down and cried. Because that guy never ranted and raved, that old man, he just spoke to him, called him a *rangatira* (chief), called him all those – [to] uplift him, and then pulled him right down gently and everyone was just nodding. It was beautiful.

Both Kahurangi and Manawa described incidents on the marae where the community responded to angry outbursts by many of their own by holding their heads in shame. In Manawa’s account the power of his community’s silent bowed heads caused a speaker to falter and then sit down, himself silenced.
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Such honouring of tikanga extends beyond the powhiri with protocols defining acceptable behaviour during all parts of the hui and arrangements in place to ensure the safety and comfort of guests and to protect the dignity of the marae. When considering the host’s response to disrespectful behaviour, Manawa comments that on his marae “we have someone who takes care of that stuff. That’s his job. He’s very diplomatic, but he’s also very strong. He takes them aside and gives them a stern talking to.” As well as supporting a safe environment for the host marae and their guests, this disciplinary action has an educational element with parallels to the prodigal’s father correcting the elder son.

When discussion on speaking the truth in love moves from the marae setting to the home and interpersonal relations the same clear protocols don’t appear to be in place. While three Samoan participants Alika, Lanuola and Aveolela, were the only non-Maori to mention varying degrees of contact with school friends or family who were Maori, none remember seeing any conflict. Manawa observes that he grew up in a household and generation where you respected your elders and did what you were told; there was no arguing in the home, which he thinks may have been a contributing factor for his older siblings leaving home as soon as possible in search of freedom. His definition of conflict appears to begin with his move to the city and exposure to legal structures of conflict management, but does not include the heated discussions in the marae setting which were mostly about land or bodies (burial rights), both of which are semi-formal and again, outside the home or personal relations. Whakaaio also describes her childhood home as one of strict discipline where children were seen and not heard.

Neither Waiti nor Kahurangi comment on this aspect of discipline, but both discuss the practice of truth telling in inter-personal relations. Waiti cautions that for the practice to be done well within the church it needs “maturity, grace, and empathy.” She continues:
So I think we have to be quite careful as to how our behaviour is perceived with each other and how we are actually the host welcoming our guests into our home and into our church and into our faith. I believe that. It’s something that we as humans need to understand and need to be better Christians.

Kahurangi voiced concern at her people’s struggle to resolve hurt and conflict in healthy ways, recognising a lack of ability in “communicating truth and people’s feelings”.

There’s a lot of, very forgiving but sometimes it’s this kind of forgiving behaviour but without speaking a truth, [without] revealing, “Well this is what you’ve done, and it’s unacceptable,” that exists. [Instead its] “Oh well, kei te pai (it’s fine), oh well,” and then you make excuses and the next minute you’re back in relationship, if you’ve had a fall out but without getting to the nitty gritty.

Reflecting on this struggle, she wonders whether there’s any correlation between the high rate of physical violence among Maori and a lack of training among her people on the interpersonal skills required to manage anger and speak the truth in love, both of which are necessary for growth in emotional and relational maturity. While beyond the scope of this material, this contrast in how conflict is defined and managed in the marae and home settings suggests potential for future research, in particular whether there are ways the existing honour based approaches to communicating truth and covering one another in love in the public arena of the marae could be duplicated in personal relations.

CHINESE

While the language around truth telling linked first to honesty for three of these participants and did not immediately reference different ways of speaking the truth in love or of naming harmful behaviour as part of, for example, parents growing their children up into maturity, these four participants agreed that they had somehow learned to discern appropriate behaviours. Illustrious thinks that for his Dad it “would have been a fairly subtle sort of pointing out. It wouldn’t have been a lecture, or anything like that.” Noble’s father also modelled an indirect form of correction that honoured his children, “My father has a strange sense of humour that, he will…. tell them off without telling them off. Like, you shouldn’t do that because - he was lifting that person as opposed to putting them down.” Splendid’s
response when asked about his family’s practice of truth telling was, “Truth as such didn’t really exist. You just told things as it was.” It’s possible that what he’s describing is a family life without guile, a collectivist culture that doesn’t articulate concepts of honesty and truth but simply lives them, or perhaps a culture where face is of more value than honesty.\textsuperscript{199}

Against the indirect communication styles described by the three 3\textsuperscript{rd} and 4\textsuperscript{th} generation male participants, Blossom describes the women in her family as both supportive and “feisty” so that within her immediate family she always knew where she stood. She remembers times when her mother would take her aside to correct a behaviour and say, “I’m telling you the truth because I am your mother.” This atmosphere of forthright communication did not apply to the extended family or beyond as, “there are still these, save face. Still a little bit of face.”

While none of the Chinese participants discussed the existence of a community framework that paralleled the public correction of wrongs mentioned by Maori participants, Blossom gives two examples of situations where protocols are breached and family members have permission to correct them. The first refers to the uninvited guests where she describes the host as being “perfectly within his scope” in asking the guests to leave. In the second, also at the Tea Ceremony, Blossom identifies the presence of “an aunty who knows the protocol…[and] if you did something wrong, like if you went in the wrong order, and you were trying to serve tea in the wrong order to somebody, they would correct you. These are happy occasions, these tea ceremonies, so it would be pretty light. It can be quite gentle.” In her account, Blossom honours an expert for coaching the new generation not to break “with what’s proper,” both generations treasuring and honouring traditional

\textsuperscript{199} For example, Strutton et al. discuss the contrast between American business assumptions of a common valuing of fair play and honesty with how “The ability to mislead opponents has long been admired by the Chinese, who have mastered the tradition,” p.569 in Strutton et al., “Fighting Dragons with Dragons,” 566, 569-570.
protocols. In situations like these, correction for growth in what’s proper is given and accepted without rancour because these ways of doing and being are treasured by all involved. A similar honouring is displayed in the desire to learn among Blossom and her dinner companions and the gentle form of truth telling as their guest of honour encouraged them to relax and be themselves.

This ability to teach with kindness and the desire to learn are also present for choir members and conductor taking part in the Christmas choral event that Illustrious loves to participate in. He quickly agrees that the choral conductor would have the authority, presence and support to publicly correct someone if needed, but when asked for more detail, he can’t imagine the situation arising at the performances; like the tea ceremonies, these are happy occasions and mistakes would be unintentional. In considering how truth telling might look during Yum Cha with Christian friends, Noble acknowledges that guests and host have given each other some permission to share wisdom regarding life decisions as one form of encouraging one another in their faith.

SAMOAN

While Alipate, Alika and Lanuola, immediately identified the presence of truth telling in a requirement for honesty in their childhood homes, Aveolela didn’t hesitate to identify a certain disregard for the truth in both her Samoan mother’s family and her Maori father, but not in his family. She remembers, “Telling the truth was important. I’m not saying that we grew up quite wild, but all I’m saying is that the truth got a bit – a bit – well, if the truth doesn’t suit us we can just kind of cover, sugar-coat over a few things. But it’s still the truth. You know what I mean? In a way it’s still the truth, yeah.” She connected this in her father with his struggle with alcohol also commenting that her grandparents had given her father’s siblings firm boundaries but had been more relaxed in her father’s upbringing. In an earlier interview, Alika had surprised me when he explained
that “Part of the Samoan way is face,” using what I had thought was an Asian concept to summarise the culture’s respect for religious hierarchy and the protocols around gift-giving. With this in mind I asked Aveolela about possible connections between saving face and telling the whole truth. She nodded straight away, replying, “Yes, you’ve hit it right on the nail.”

Reflecting on the low valuing of honesty in her childhood home alongside the practice of truthful living necessary to grow one another in character and maturity, she described the non-verbal communication styles of her collectivist culture, remarking,

You know, although I said there was a lot of bending the truth before, I think, we were brought up in a way that you did the right thing.... That you - that you were - that was the right thing to do.... There was a right way to behave. And you just knew that it was. Nothing was actually said. But you just knew that that’s how you behaved, what was accepted, and what was not accepted.... [Can you think of how it was communicated, if it wasn’t said?] It was a look. It was a look.

Aveolela and Alika both describe family cultures where in Aveolela’s words, “with my mother’s family, if there was something going on, everybody knew about it,” although she remembers that “it was always a peaceful environment around my father’s family.”

Alika understood truth telling as honesty based in the religious side of the culture, a moral code which everyone abides by and which goes without saying, while also “as a young kid, you often tell fibs, and stuff, and pay the consequences for it.” His memory is of “a black and white scenario” where honesty was enforced emphatically. When considering semi-formal hospitality events, Alika takes it for granted that there is someone responsible to keep an eye out for behaviour that may cause conflict, ready to step in with a quiet word stating the line is about to be crossed, supported by a show of strength if needed. When asked about whether a guest of honour would ever correct a host at one of these events, Alika returns to the place of hierarchy in Samoan culture; if the guest of honour is high enough and the host doesn’t meet protocols, or is not hospitable enough or not Christian enough,
the host would be rebuked in a manner that could turn into a sermon and be quite formal.

Alipate is clear that for catered events, turning up uninvited is a breach of social protocols. He remembers this happening at birthdays and even one relative arriving at his sister’s wedding reception with 10 extra friends and one gift between them. His family did not turn anyone away or confront their thoughtless breach of etiquette, but nor would they invite the relative responsible again. While this story recounts the cooler welcome offered to unwelcome guests where face restrains some hosts from shutting the door, it illustrates the relation of welcome or its lack to truth telling and honour. He describes a non-confrontational approach that mirrors the pattern of his childhood home. When talking about hospitality breaches by his extended family against them, he concluded, “It wasn’t okay but no one said anything. It was expected that that’s what people do. [We’d] complain about it when they leave, but don’t complain about it then.” Similar to the environments that Whakaaio, Manawa and Ruby described, Alipate was not allowed to voice disagreement with his parents and the consequences for dishonesty were serious enough to ensure he told the truth. He depicts honour as hierarchical, rule and even fear based, where disagreement with others to their face, particularly with one’s elders, is dishonouring.

Aveolela’s description of her Samoan family hinted at a similar practice where disagreement is interpreted as dishonour; it’s a practice that risks the sort of split between outward appearances and heart attitudes that Jesus warns against. In defining honour hierarchically, Ruby’s presence in this group reflects the influences on her family culture of the navy and the legal profession, both hierarchical institutions that according to Berger and others are some of the last bastions of codes of honour in Western cultures. Having safe places where we can disagree, voice what we are really thinking, be heard and receive acceptance, correction and encouragement is vital to learning to live truth filled lives.
Alipate identifies that within his immediate family, factors like island custom and his gender have impacted on his ability to be emotionally articulate. He describes the non-verbal communication style of his childhood home where he remembers his family was both ostracised and bullied by the extended families.

In our family we didn’t really talk, about anything. I think it was just our culture... Oh, probably our conversation here would probably be the amount of words I’ve spoken with Dad from 0-15. It’s just something we didn’t do, is sit and talk. We said hi and had fun and played and stuff but we didn’t have proper conversations about stuff and feelings, and what’s going on. A lot of stuff I knew, was because I heard in the background or I asked him why, why we don’t see your cousins or something... that’s how I picked up all these things - a short answer and then I’d see something, oh yeah, that make sense, that’s why we’re not included. I think it’s just island custom, plus being a guy...

His comments regarding not “proper conversations about stuff and feelings” find echoes in Kahurangi’s observations that a low awareness of truth telling skills may have connections to domestic violence. Both Alipate and Kahurangi come from cultures that are traditionally less verbal than, for example many Pakeha, and while the Pakeha male participants are both emotionally articulate, Pakeha culture also reflects a need for growth in these relational skills.

As Adeney, in his book *Strange Virtues*, illustrated in his story of the Americans’ disagreement with their land lady, opposite cultural styles of responding to conflict are not wrong in themselves. Both the North American style of direct confrontation and the Middle Eastern response of returning to the base line of relating comfortably with one another after a conflict that is considered an ordinary or minor event can both be valid ways of responding, provided the parties are committed to one another and to truth-filled living. One response belongs to a culture where open communication requires words, the other is non-verbal and firmly grounded with the assurance of belonging, where actions of continued
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acceptance speak more clearly than words, especially ones that cause a loss of face by forcing “unnecessary” verbal apologies.

Unlike Alipate, Lanuola’s father was not ostracised or bullied by his family, and she describes a mix of verbal and non-verbal styles in her childhood home, yet she echoes a little of the same lack of permission to disagree that Alipate described. She remembers some tension as tertiary education resulted in family debates on cultural values. Her conclusion was that there were some areas of conversation that it was better not to mention, “What you learned outside of the house, in some respects, would be kept outside. Education wise.”

Her present context in the Seventh Day Adventist movement is a church environment that many outside it may struggle to understand. Unlike much of the Christian church in NZ, the SDAs place a high value on Saturday as the Sabbath with guidelines on both Sabbath keeping and diet and, as in other parts of the body of Christ, some members practice church guidelines more strictly than others. While Lanuola and her husband value the welcome they’ve received within this part of Christ’s body, and respect their friends’ beliefs, worship practices and lifestyle choices, they expect that respect to be mutual; by simply being themselves they asked for and were given room to voice their questions and differences in practice. She says, “We would have these conversations, but, it was still respectful. So, to me, that was a healthy … that’s how you got to know people…. That would be my aspect of – conflict. It would never be [intended as an] insult.” Strict food guidelines can make hospitality challenging. Lanuola describes both her own desire to respect her friends’ practices and the open welcome she and her family have received from vegetarian friends who make space for her non-vegetarian family to share around a table with them. She also observes that her husband’s forthright and often humorous observation of any inconsistency in practices, observations that stem from his
curiosity and with no intent to judge or offend, have led to some interesting discussions. Both husband and wife display a desire to learn and the lack of judgment combined with that discernment that Jesus speaks of in Matthew 7.

Pakeha

While none of the Pakeha participants had come across material describing the Christian Practice of Truth Telling and all four interpreted the question about truth telling initially as not telling lies, three immediately demonstrated awareness of a distinction between not telling lies and a lifestyle of truthfulness. Each participant describes different ways that honesty was important in their childhood and yet truthful living was compromised. Peter says, “You’d tell the truth rather than tell a lie, but you wouldn’t tell the whole story as to what was really going on. So there’s a sense in which I’d say, yes it was important and another sense in which I’d say it was pretty surface stuff.” Isobel agrees with Peter’s summary and acknowledges frustration at the impact of her parents’ inability to practice the sort of truth telling that identifies wrong behaviours clearly and yet affirms a child’s sense of safety and belonging. She says, “it just didn’t happen, and it’s part of having to second guess half my life as to what was it [that] I’d done or hadn’t done because the issues were not specifically named … so [I] was left unsure about what was the [right] behaviour. Sam describes how, “officially - lying - not okay, unofficially there are times when we would just go around that, and not put anybody on the spot.” In her response, Ruby views honesty as a primary value and yet recalls a lack of safety to disagree. She says, “There was never any real room for - to voice disagreement, to voice disagreement safely. It wasn’t encouraged, and I think it would have been great if it was.”

In reflecting on Jesus’ response to Simon as one of bringing truth with honour in the Luke 7 passage, Ruby comments on how rare it is to see that practiced
today and she suggests that often “the face kind of honour thing comes in before the truth. It’s like, that you don’t want to upset them all.” She concludes that when honour and this type of truth telling go together, then, “I think it can be heard. And I actually feel, in our Home Group situation, we actually don’t know each other well enough to really do that, effectively. Whereas, in a family, in both our families, we do.” Ruby describes a framework for honour and truth telling that is dependent on the intimacy of relationships. While the level of relational intimacy impacts both our need and ability to speak the truth in love and so call one another forward into maturity, what is also needed is an understanding of a framework supporting the practice of truth telling, and a community that models this type of discernment and affirmation.

**Thoughts on Truth Telling**

In Luke 7:36-50, Jesus models a practice of speaking the truth in love as he demonstrates the welcome of God and reminds Simon of his identity as a son of God, calling Simon to enlarge his capacity for welcome as an expression of honour. Using a similar pattern, Maori participants spoke of protocols that exist to protect *tikanga*, to remind the people of who they are – of their *whakapapa*. *Tikanga* is so valued that robust dialogue was an acceptable and expected form of truth telling, with all members entitled to speak, and to remind others of where they come from and who they are, in themselves reminders of a wide hospitality and welcome. This aspect of marae protocols was new to me, and I wondered whether this framework and the associated skills it offered for speaking the truth in love could be drawn on by pastoral leadership to strengthen affirmation and truth telling in inter-personal relations within Maori communities.

In contrast to Maori *tikanga*, the Pakeha participants did not identify a defined body of wisdom and protocols to which all belong and adhere.
Consequently there was no central clearly identifiable shape to a community life nor the related robust framework for correction or speaking the truth in love, although individual families may have such frameworks. This individualist culture took the importance of family for granted, yet identified it as much smaller in number with a lesser role in social functions and not so central to defining identity. They also assumed more individual control on decisions around who belongs and could be invited, none of those interviewed including 2nd and 3rd cousins. This ease of separation and distance in Pakeha culture makes a space to avoid difficult relationships, diminishing the motivation to communicate with grace and truth. Avoidance is possible in different ways in collectivist cultures because of the large numbers of people or because face may require a non-confrontational response, denying a healthy resolution or the sort of affirmation described earlier by Payne. In the paragraphs on welcome withheld, Alipate’s family was confronted with uninvited and unwelcome guests, yet unlike Blossom’s description of a courteous refusal of entry, this Samoan family struggled to do likewise. There was no room to call “foolishness by its real name,” to use Payne’s turn of phrase. In quoting from Payne, I’m drawing on a verbal cultural response to offence, what is open for further exploration is how this type of correction and affirmation might be translated into collectivist and less verbal cultures as a means of growing in maturity within the body of Christ.

Final thoughts on honour

As the interviews approached a close, participants shared some thoughts on honour and how they understood what it means to treat one another with honour. Isobel remarks how their church leader not only expressed gratitude and honour
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through hosting the meal for his leadership team and their spouses, but that he consciously honoured his guests.

My feeling from that evening was that [he] was honouring the members of the executive, he was honouring them, he wasn’t just thanking them, he said something about each one…. in his wrap up. This is what you bring and thank you for that and this is what you bring as an individual thank you for that, so definitely honouring, and he was the host.

Isobel gives other examples of honour as intentional verbal encouragement both in private and in semi-public settings. She says, “When people give speeches at dinners and functions, often that’s edifying, a wedding or a 21st, whatever, that’s honouring the individuals by talking about who they are, and the things that make them and their values and their gifts.” She sees this too, in the way her husband honours his children during their family Christmas celebrations. Ruby describes how when hosting a family meal she values her husband’s ability to restore balance when extended family dynamics “are going slightly wobbly…. he is very good at just speaking into the situation and bringing it back on to safer ground. And that’s respecting both the people, but also, I think being truthful and honouring in what he says. It’s not a face thing, it’s a truth thing.”

Illustrious responds to this open question on honour by reflecting on a friend whose religious beliefs are so legalistic that he struggles to see signs of love in her expressions of her faith. He wonders at the relation between honour and tolerance.

Right or wrong, the point is there will be eternity and there should be tolerance for other people’s thinking. So whether the tolerance and honour are the same thing – that’s the closest I can think – is tolerance, and having all this head knowledge. And sometimes I’m tempted to say, I don’t see a lot of love coming out of here….

Searching his memory for another example Illustrious recalls being asked by the grieving son of a recently deceased friend to share stories and photos with the son and grandchildren. He is quick to respond, “And so I want to do that. Just bring him
my memories of his wonderful mother. So that’s a kind of Christian connect. And honouring. Of Jean who passed away and this man who so misses his mum so much.”

Arika defined honour as a willingness to listen to others, especially elders, to receive their wisdom and input into life decisions. While taking honour as a given within Samoan culture and aware that Pakeha viewed it differently he was surprised at how different the concepts and practices of honour were.

Reflecting on whether she sees honour in the Christian community, Aveolela responds “In the Christian community? Yes I do, and no I don’t.” She sees honour in the way “people … are befriending other people - I see that. And doing things for people that are in need, and just being a friend. I see that. You don’t want me to go into the negative side, do you?”

Lanuola struggled with how my questions around honour were limited to the Christian community. She says, “So… I wouldn’t treat anyone any differently because it goes right against my own faith…. How can you treat people differently without knowing them? And part of being a Jesus’ follower, is that you want to be treated as you treat other people.” She gives an example of her daughter’s friendship with classmate, Angie, despite Angie’s parents not wanting her “to have friends who weren’t white.” When dropping Angie home on one occasion, Lanuola remembers feeling sorry for the parents’ discomfort at a 4WD vehicle in their driveway with this mixed ethnicity family, including her own father who, in his dementia, was sitting in the front passenger seat chatting away in Samoan to this startled white couple with Angie embarrassed at her parents’ attitudes. Lanuola attempts to make the family more comfortable by sending her Pakeha husband to greet them and her daughter reassures her school friend with the words, “Don’t worry, my parents are quite out there, they don’t worry about anything … they’ll just treat your parents like people,” and in so doing offers a simple summary of what it means to honour.
CHAPTER 8: CONCLUSIONS

How would you keep the faith?
For my dad, it was not being Methodist, it was more about keeping the faith. That was it. *The cultural things could change* ... but it’s always have you kept the faith?
So my dad would always say to us as we were growing up, I don’t care if you’re Catholic, Presbyterian ... so long as you keep God at the centre of your life.

Interview with Lanuola, Auckland, May 2014

Lanuola captures the essence of honour in the face of difference.

Difference is an underlying theme of this research, and honour is our best response. Pakeha have much to learn about ways honour can be expressed as well as articulating their own cultural identity, and Maori, Chinese and Samoan ethnicities have much to offer to this conversation. In closing I offer some thoughts on what honour looks like in the NZ Church today.

FAMILY

One difference was around the concept of family. In the first few interviews, participants from collectivist Samoan and Maori ethnic groups gave narrow definitions of their families, listing immediate family only, while three Pakeha listed extended family including grandparents, cousins, aunts and uncles. These initial results indicated that a few of the participants I had expected to be collectivist in their definition of family were more individualist, while a majority of those I had expected to use individualist definitions of family were more collectivist. Only when I looked more closely at what each participant meant by family was it evident that while the three apparently “collectivist” Pakeha were indeed less individualist and more collectivist than I had expected, their broader concepts of family were still much narrower than those offered by the majority of the Maori, Chinese and Samoan participants.
Of the two who were more “individualist” than I had anticipated, the Maori participant described a household that had retained many collectivist values, including a wide hospitality, replacing the absentee whanau with their church family. This re-definition of family offered the children some protection from the isolation caused by the withdrawal of their whanau. Whakaaio did not report scenes where she or her family suffered the sort of bullying from wider family described by Alipate, and her great-uncle’s expression of contempt towards her father diminished the old man in the child’s eyes rather than the child or her father, illustrating the maxim mentioned earlier, “You can only maintain your own mana, you can only be belittled if you let yourself be belittled.” Alipate also described a household that held on to its collectivist values, his family maintained contact, dwelling on the fringe of their wider family, acknowledged by them, involved in some hospitality but excluded from other events, and Alipate understood this exclusion was because the extended family considered his own was beneath them. Even at those times of shared hospitality, the extended family broke protocols, treating his father with contempt, not respect. In his recounting of their judgment and condemnation of his father, Alipate doesn’t appear to make judgments about them or his own worth.

My initial confusion over the language used by both the individualist and collectivist groups just mentioned illustrates the complexity of communication between multiple cultures who assume that because the words used are the same, the meaning must also be the same. Where words like “family” and “hospitality” represent significant cultural values and practices, and especially where those values are taken for granted by one or more parties, the door is open to misunderstanding and conflict rather than clear communication.

Finding creative ways to facilitate conversations that explore together significant cultural concepts such as family and hospitality in multi-ethnic church
communities and relationships is one thread pastoral leaders could use to strengthen those relations and enable growth in maturity, essential to the richly diverse body who are the church discovering unity as Jesus prayed.

**Making Room for the Stranger**

As I explored the stories of the families divided by disapproval of cross-cultural marriages, the surprise at their narrow definition of family lead on to surprise at the act of severance itself; that cultures where family and connection are paramount would sever bonds with one of their own rather than welcome another in points to a huge depth of both passion and suspicion. It also suggests an understanding of custom or *tikanga* that did not value strangers enough to make room for them. Two Samoan and one Maori participant were directly impacted, while the majority of the Chinese knew of similar situations in their extended family or communities, but not their immediate families. The passionate defence of core values and custom by these Maori, Chinese and Samoan families may have been motivated by a desire to protect customs and identity, but resulted in exclusion, illustrating how a community’s greatest strengths can also be the greatest potential for weakness. Whakaaio, Alipate and Aveolela described seeing attitudes of contempt in their extended family towards the excluded ethnic group, and Aveolela also referred to her family’s angry withdrawal from Pakeha culture in response to the discrimination suffered by her great-grandparents on their arrival in NZ.

Stories of separation and oppression are part of many histories. Christine Pohl describes God’s challenge to his people to actively welcome resident strangers, a welcome that was unique among Israel’s Ancient Near Eastern neighbours.\(^{203}\) It’s the sort of welcome that was not offered to the young family in Whakaaio’s story,

yet what if, for the sake of illustration, we re-write their story through the biblical lens of Israel’s unique responsibility to resident strangers: Provided Whakaaio’s father had been willing to respect local tikanga, God required the community to welcome and protect him in ways that over time would lead to eventual inclusion. If both parties had followed this biblical framework, they would have avoided the isolation suffered. This biblical practice that protects identity while making space for welcome requires a clear sense of one’s own identity. It takes security to offer welcome to those different from ourselves, as three of the Maori participants who have re-engaged with their whakapapa affirm. Yet welcoming and honouring difference is a powerful tool for exploring identity, both our own and others. Communities will always face obstacles and bridges to engaging with difference yet leaders wanting those communities to express active welcome and honour could consider together identifying their own stories of exclusion and look for biblical frameworks of welcome from which to rewrite them.

**INDIVIDUALIST OR COLLECTIVIST**

The clear divide between collectivist and individualist cultures was evident in the four ethnic groups I interviewed. As anticipated, a majority of the Maori, Chinese and Samoan are collectivist, evidenced in their values of family and connection, their wide hospitality, acceptance and welcome, their attitudes and actions of deference and respect, of shame and saving face. Even Whakaaio and Alika, despite defining family as immediate, shared these collectivist values, so much so that these excluded families had found other ways to be connected. There’s an element of surprise that these minority ethnic groups surrounded by an individualist majority culture have retained their collectivist values, especially because the Chinese families are part of a tiny and disenfranchised ethnic minority
who made NZ home four or five generations ago. The renaissance of Maori culture shows courage and leadership in the face of much discrimination and loss.

As noted, three of the four Pakeha were less Individualist and more Collectivist in their definition of family. The members of this majority ethnic group displayed varying levels of awareness and interaction with people from minority cultures, and this is reflected in the unexamined status of their ethnic identity. Typically, members of a majority culture have more power than those from minority groups yet they are often unaware of any power imbalance, taking it for granted. With power comes responsibility, and the first responsibility in honouring and protecting those with less power is to listen with humility and to learn, honouring by acknowledging the others’ difference, illustrating again God’s challenge to actively protect the resident stranger. Australian based Samoan academic, Jione Hawea in “Sea of Talanoa” expresses his frustration at the way his vibrant and vitally alive people shut down in the presence of Palagi, somehow losing their voice when it comes to sharing significant values with Pakeha.

In their response to decades of prejudice, Aveolela’s family offered one example of why a minority ethnic family has shut out difference, closing family ranks to protect itself. While a minority group needs to be willing to engage, and share the same attitudes of humility, the greater responsibility is for those from a majority ethnic group to make room for others. It’s important for Pakeha to be more aware of those who will likely stay silent until assured of safety, looking for gentle and culturally appropriate ways to respectfully engage with the minority groups within as well as beyond their borders. Part of this journey will require exploring

205 This behaviour pattern is illustrated in model minorities like NZ’s Chinese community, Wong, “A Place to Stand,” 129-130.
those collectivist values, like deference and respect, which may also contribute to a lack of voice and be easily misunderstood across cultures.

**Truth telling**

The practice of truth telling revealed a clear pattern of unfamiliarity with its concept and healthy practice, and none of the 16 interviewed had seen it modelled, yet I got a glimpse of a range of interpretations of truth-telling across the four cultures. For some collectivist participants, truthful living is held in tension with shame and saving face, as Adeney reports in his accounts of the dishonour attached to saying ‘No’ in Indonesia and the non-confrontational conflict resolution style in the Middle East\(^{206}\) - are these differences a lack of honesty or a different but valid practice understood within non-verbal cultures which give words less weight? And how do different cultural meanings and valuing of honesty impact on truthful living? How do they differ from clear deformations like the manipulation and bullying shown in Alipate’s extended family, and the isolation and contempt referred to by Whakaaio? These are questions that suggest an area for future exploration. It requires honour to discern between difference and deformation of a practice, and it takes truth telling and honour to value others enough to challenge and support each other so that we can explore these differences together, being willing to learn from one another, to recognise richness in the other and weakness in our own ways of being and seeing, and so to grow into the character and maturity that Christ calls us to.

**Unarticulated culture**

An early encounter with surprise in this research occurred when I paused to look around my church community for potential participants of Maori, NZ

\(^{206}\) Adeney, *Strange Virtues*, 18, 43.
Chinese and NZ Samoan ethnicities. I knew a few of Maori ethnicity but I had not realised how many Maori, Samoan and Chinese faces I joined with in worship. My surprise was greater as I have so often lived on the boundaries of cultures and reflects a theme that has surfaced in multiple ways through this research, that of unarticulated culture.

One example of what I mean is the way Pakeha, myself included, struggle to describe their culture, because as mentioned earlier, those inside a culture take it for granted that, “that’s just how we do things.” While identifying Pakeha culture is beyond the scope of this field of research, when people recognise the importance of doing so, they display another aspect of honour. When Pakeha – or any individual or group - don’t know their own identity, it’s difficult to discern the cultural perspectives, those underlying values and assumptions that colour our views of the world, including how we interpret God at work.

This sort of examination of ethnic identity is best carried out in dialogue with difference because it takes conversation with different perspectives to get to know our own. It takes time and energy to listen when we’re struggling to understand, and yet offering that time and energy is both honouring and rewarding. As we dialogue with those outside our cultures in an attitude of honour, not only do we grow in love for our neighbour, but we see our own cultural perspectives more clearly, and when we see more clearly we can identify our strengths – what parts of our own perspectives to value, and our weaknesses – those parts that need to be laid down. It’s a process that mirrors the personal practice many Christians are familiar with, as they honour God by regularly and intentionally taking time to recognise God’s presence, express gratitude, submit actions and attitudes to his light, and dialogue with him in prayer. This place of worship is our fundamental encounter
Growing in grace and maturity also requires growing in relation with a community of faithful people. Here too, a dialogue with the other, with difference, offers room to see ourselves and others more clearly.

These examples of personal and corporate ways of engaging with God and others, with difference, illustrate that the dialogues that I’m encouraging, dialogues across cultural difference, already exist within the framework of the church’s current practices. Like each such practice, dialogues with cultural difference require intention and commitment if we are to grow together in Kingdom values and essential to strengthening communication within and between cultures.

Further exploration of identity and engaging across cultures in NZ churches could be taken by way of the collectivist values identified. The collectivist values identified, of family and connection, hospitality, acceptance and welcome, deference and respect, of shame and saving face, are useful starting points as points of difference from Pakeha culture. I make this final suggestion for engagement in dynamic conversations, actively asking and listening, initially to Pakeha within church congregations as those most unaware of difference: What do these values look like to Pakeha, how do Pakeha interpret, misinterpret or assume? Is the initiative of the individualist in tension with the collectivist deference, how does initiative and leadership work in collectivist cultures? What about practicing hospitality where the majority culture allows the minority to lead, honouring their different ways of organising as well as the variety of menu items? This takes intention. When communities understand each other’s cultural concepts of honour and explore together how these are expressed through practices like food and hospitality, they grow in their ability to value and honour one another and feast on

---

a rich diversity, increased intimacy and a sense of belonging. In so doing, they honour others above themselves, and display the glory of God’s image bearers.

The simplest answer to the question, what does honour look like, is different things to different groups. And yes, traces of contempt may be found in our common assumptions of understanding, our often unintentional blindness and even our sometimes arrogant and intentional avoidance, but especially when we judge different as “less than.”

Engagement in any relationship but especially across cultures requires an intentional component, where people choose to pause and make room in busy lives and social worlds full of family encounters. The need to be intentional applies to so much of value. Intention is both honour and welcome.
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3. Personal identifying information on video/audiotape will be destroyed at the conclusion of the project but any raw data on which the results of the project depend will be retained in secure storage for at least five years;
4. This project involves an open-questioning technique. The general line of questioning includes questions about honour at a typical hospitality event from my childhood as well as a present day hospitality event within my Christian community. The precise nature of the questions which will be asked have not been determined in advance, but will depend on the way in which the interview develops and that in the event that the line of questioning develops in such a way that I feel hesitant or uncomfortable I may decline to answer any particular question(s) and/or may withdraw from the project without any disadvantage of any kind.
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I agree to take part in this project.
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In the passage below, Luke gives us a slice of life in an unnamed Jewish city. Following custom, the religious leader invites the visiting preacher home for a meal after the Sabbath synagogue meeting.

Appendix 3: Luke 7:36-50

36 One of the Pharisees asked Jesus to eat with him, and he went into the Pharisee’s house and took his place at the table. 37 And a woman in the city, who was a sinner, having learned that he was eating in the Pharisee’s house, brought an alabaster jar of ointment. 38 She stood behind him at his feet, weeping, and began to bathe his feet with her tears and to dry them with her hair. Then she continued kissing his feet and anointing them with the ointment. 39 Now when the Pharisee who had invited him saw it, he said to himself, “If this man were a prophet, he would have known who and what kind of woman this is who is touching him—that she is a sinner.” 40 Jesus spoke up and said to him, “Simon, I have something to say to you.” “Teacher,” he replied, “Speak.” 41 “A certain creditor had two debtors; one owed five hundred denarii, and the other fifty. 42 When they could not pay, he cancelled the debts for both of them. Now which of them will love him more?” 43 Simon answered, “I suppose the one for whom he cancelled the greater debt.” And Jesus said to him, “You have judged rightly.” 44 Then turning toward the woman, he said to Simon, “Do you see this woman? I entered your house; you gave me no water for my feet, but she has bathed my feet with her tears and dried them with her hair. 45 You gave me no kiss, but from the time I came in she has not stopped kissing my feet. 46 You did not anoint my head with oil, but she has anointed my feet with ointment. 47 Therefore, I tell you, her sins, which were many, have been forgiven; hence she has shown great love. But the one to whom little is forgiven, loves little.” 48 Then he said to her, “Your sins are forgiven.” 49 But those who were at the table with him began to say among themselves, “Who is this who even forgives sins?” 50 And he said to the woman, “Your faith has saved you; go in peace.”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Glossary, Maori</strong>&lt;sup&gt;209&lt;/sup&gt; <strong>and Samoan</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aotearoa</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hapu</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hareru</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hongi</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hui</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Iwi</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kai</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kaumātua</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kaupapa</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kawa</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Korero</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Koroua</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kuia</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kumara</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mana</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Manuhiri</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maori</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maoritanga</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marae</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Matauranga</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mihi</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mokopuna</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<sup>209</sup> Primarily sourced from the Glossary in Metge, *Tuamaka*. 
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**Nau mai! Haere mai!** Welcome! Welcome (come here)!

**Ngaweri**  
Calm.

**Ngapuhi**  
A Maori *iwi* located in the Northland region of New Zealand, and centred in the Hokianga, the Bay of Islands and Whangarei.

**Ngati Porou**  
A Maori *iwi* traditionally located in the East Cape and Gisborne regions of the North Island of New Zealand.

**Pakeha**  
Non-Maori NZers of British and European descent, especially those who feel that their roots are in NZ.

**Paua**  
Abalone.

**Pohiri / Powhiri**  
1. action song of welcome, typically involving women waving greenery;  
2. welcome ceremony including action-songs of welcome... used to describe the whole.

**Rangatira**  
2. chief of a *hapu*, chosen on basis of senior descent and leadership capacity.

**Rongo-whaakata**  
A Maori *iwi* of the Gisborne region of New Zealand.

**Tangata whenua**  
1. Person of the land, member of a marae community or locality.... 2. In plural, the hosts at a *hui*, especially on a *marae*.

**Tangihanga**  
A gathering held to mourn the dead, usually lasting several days.

**Taumata korero**  
Distinguished orators, speakers’ bench.

**Te reo Maori**  
Maori language.

**Tikanga**  
Customary way of doing something.

**Turangawaewae**  
A standing place for (one’s) feet; one’s home base; one’s home *marae*.

**Wānanga**  
Wise person; *hui* for sharing traditional knowledge, learning.

**Whaikorero**  
Speechmaking, art of oratory.

**Whakamaa**  
Used to describe a range of inward feelings from shyness to embarrassment to shame, and behaviour involving varying degrees of withdrawal and unresponsiveness.

**Whakapapa**  
Descent lines tracing connections between ancestors and descendants; study of same.

**Whanau**  
Group of descendants stemming from recent named ancestor; term of address for a people gathered for a common purpose.

**Whare**  
Building, house, *Whare-hui* = meeting house

---

**SAMOAN**

**Fa’a Samoa**  
The Samoan way.

**Fale**  
House or building with thatched roof and open sides.

**Matai**  
Chief.

**Palagi**  
Pakeha, NZ European.

**Poi**  
Banana drink.

**Umu**  
Earth Oven.