

Chapter 1

Introduction

*Sharing power does not diminish power;
in fact it multiplies power.*
(Gill 2006:211)

1.1 INTRODUCTION: CONTEXT OF STUDY

From an empirical perspective, this study has been motivated by various situations in the Presbyterian Church in Cameroon (PCC). For example, theological students at the Presbyterian Theological Seminary Kumba¹ are told that the pastor's mission is essentially to explain to Christians the gospel whose content is a response to Jesus' question: "Who do the crowds say I am?" Graduating from the Seminary in June 2000, the young pastors were cautioned: "Be careful with those who come to you first, as you get to the parish. They may be the first to oppose you". When the graduates inquired why things must be so, they were reminded that "the crowd that sang Hosanna in the highest to Jesus was the same crowd that confirmed his crucifixion". Secondly, they were urged to remain careful because no one understands their mission more than they themselves, as well as the one for whom they were being commissioned – Jesus. Such words of caution nursed a prejudice toward this "crowd",² whose attitude could reverse at will; and created the worrisome question: "Why can a supporting "crowd" at the same time be an obstacle?"

In the early nineties a pastor of the PCC introduced the notion of *revival* in the Church. This notion was rejected by the Synod, as a matter of procedure.³ Consequently, he decided to quit the Church. This was highly applauded and encouraged by a "crowd" that soon abandoned him. A few years later, another pastor thought the Church was not *reformed* enough.

¹ The Seminary is the institution where the Presbyterian Church in Cameroon prepares all her pastors for the ministry.

² The "crowd" in this context is representative of the people with whom and for whom the pastor is expected to work.

³ According to *The Constitution* of the PCC, the Synod is the highest organ that "deliberates in all matters which concern the Church, especially in doctrine, worship, discipline and organisation" (Presbyterian Church in Cameroon 1998:30).

This notion was also rejected, which also led to the pastor's resignation. Interestingly, the same "crowd" that earlier was against revival, also applauded this decision! One wonders what later happens to a people who seem to show enthusiasm at the start of events! Is it that respective interests and goals are misunderstood? However, one has the impression that many clergy seem not to understand their mission well, being the reason why they are quite often (mis)led by emotions or carried away by enthusiasm.

When people are appointed or elected into an office, others often acclaim with a lot of expectation, but in very rare cases does such enthusiasm last. Leaders find themselves in a sort of dilemma because of the risk of losing the support of the "crowd" that seems to have very strong influence. Here again the problem of goals and interests surfaces. Some leaders easily get confused in their leadership, especially when they are faced with crises. Most often the hierarchy has its demands that clash with that of the people, as well as with those of the leaders themselves.

Finally, having attended to leadership in general in my master's thesis (see Nyiawung 2005), I had promised that I would, in due course, pick up and treat specific issues pertaining to leadership in church and society. At this point, my interest has been aroused by the numerous conflicts that threaten leadership in contemporary society. My quest is therefore to research how Jesus dealt with hostility and to see how his inclination towards acceptance, friendliness and compassion could be of help to present-day leaders. It is in this light that the dialogue between Jesus and his disciples in Caesarea Philippi (Lk 9:18-22) has caught my attention. It offers a glimpse of Jesus' identity; explains why conflict sometimes erupts between leaders and their followers and defines the correct approach to leadership. These motivating factors therefore triggered a research on the topic: **"Who is the Christ? Leadership and conflict in Luke 9:18-22: A social scientific- and narratological analysis from an African perspective."**

1.2 DEFINITION OF TERMS

This topic of research contains two categories of terms that need to be explained for a better understanding on how they will be used. The first

category has terms such as **narratological analysis**, **social scientific analysis**, and what it means to do a study employing these approaches from an **African perspective**. These terms will be defined in § 4.4. The second category of terms in the title is leadership and conflict. **Leadership** is a noun that comes from the term leader, which refers to someone who leads.⁴ Leaders are normally described in terms of the influence they exert upon the goal setting and goal achieving activities of the community (Stogdill 1970:24, see also Nyiawung 2005:4). Leadership can thus be defined in relation to the activities of the group. Hunter (1990:634) defines it as a “process of influencing the actions and behaviour of persons and/or organisations through complex interaction toward goal achievement”. Hunter’s definition takes care of both individuals and their motivation to a group. From the above contributions, leadership could be understood as a series of acquired skills, abilities, and behaviour that improve or better the performance of two or more individuals within a given community, to enable its members to achieve a common and well-defined goal(s).

Conflict as a generic term is linked to terms such as antagonism, hostility, quarrels, controversy, violence, rejection, competition, rivalry, opposition, tension, misunderstanding, disagreement and confrontation. Fink (1968:45) is correct when he observes that it is difficult to have a definition of conflict that will unanimously be accepted. However, the term **conflict** is a derivative from the Latin *configere*, which means to strike or to clash. This definition projects physical confrontation. Mack and Snyder (1957:218) define conflict as “a particular interaction process or ‘interaction relationships’ between parties who have mutually exclusive or incompatible values”. Coser (1956:135) criticises this understanding of conflict which seems to draw a distinction between conflict and other related terms such as hostility, tension, disputes, contest, and competition. Conflict thus has both physical and emotional elements. In broader terms, Dahrendorf (1959:135) defines conflict as “all relations between sets of individuals that involve an incompatible

⁴ Etymologically the noun leader comes from the verb to ‘lead’. ‘Lead’ is derived from *laedan*, corresponding to the Old Saxon *ledian* and Old High German *leiten*, which means to “take with one” or to “show the way.” Formerly, *ledere* was used for a person who shows other people the path to take. Gill (2006:8-9) remarks that in the Old Icelandic derivative *leidha* means the person in front. He further states that the noun “leader” was used in English in the thirteenth century, while “leadership” only appeared later in the nineteenth century.

difference of objective”. This definition seems more inclusive. For Turner (1982:183), it is “a process of events leading to overt interaction of varying degrees of violence among at least two parties.” Conflict is here understood as an eruption resulting from an impending unresolved problem of which its manifestation is open confrontation.

Lumley concurs with Turner in that he sees conflict as a “‘battle’ between parties who wish to use the same resources for different purposes” (Lumley 1986:35). Once more, both physical and psychological or emotional conflict comes into play. This then is also the way in which Boulding defines conflict, namely as a “system of interacting systems, each party to the conflict being a system in itself, bound, however, to the other party by a system of communication, information, subjective knowledge, and behaviour reactions” (Boulding 1957:122). Boulding’s (1957:129) definition is important for the current study, since Jesus as an individual indeed constituted a system. Following from this insight, the study of conflict in this study will give attention to conflict between the different “systems” in the Lukan text: the “system” of Jesus and other independent systems such as those of the Roman aristocracy, the Jewish elite, and the Jewish peasantry.

1.3 CURRENT RESEARCH AND RESEARCH GAP

1.3.1 Current research

As indicated in the topic; the research on the issue of leadership, conflict and identity in Luke with reference to the question “Who is the Christ”, is essentially exegetical. The second quarter of the last century has noticed an amazing methodological proliferation in the area of New Testament studies, with new ways of studying ancient texts coming to the fore. Prominent in this research has been the urge to apply methods from other disciplines in Biblical interpretation. It has also been an era where the various approaches in Biblical interpretation are no longer considered as conflicting methodologies. Rather, there has been an on-going effort to use various exegetical approaches in Biblical studies as complementary.

Various studies on Luke’s gospel indicate that Luke had initially been regarded as a mere compiler and arranger of traditions and/or documents

(Thiselton 2005:4).⁵ The various studies on Luke-Acts also show that Luke-Acts has initially been studied from a historical perspective, then from a literary perspective, and currently most Lukan scholars concentrate on social scientific criticism in interpreting Luke. The latter approach, according to Thiselton (2005:8), has indicated that historical inquiry alone is not enough for an understanding of the Lukan text.

The use of the historical-critical approach, according to Wenham (2005:79), affirms that the stories about Jesus are set against particular historical contexts and can only be understood within these contexts. He also argues that the understanding of the Gospel is possible only when serious work is done on its historical context, the author's intention and the extra Biblical sources related to the text (Wenham 2005:81). Hence, Wenham's understanding of Jesus' events in Luke's gospel has been approached from a purely historical-critical perspective. Wenham's ideas were criticised by Spencer (2005:120), arguing that Wenham's historical method is presumptive, reductive and speculative. According to him, the use of historical-critical approach brackets out matters of faith and experience (Spencer 2005:105). He therefore agreed with the literary approach (Spencer 2005: 104), which had already been used by Knight (1998). Their analyses are especially based on the relationship between Jesus, God and the Holy Spirit in Luke's gospel (see § 2.2.2), with more emphasis on God's activity. Knight (1998:129) concludes that Jesus was responsible for the conflicts that he faced in Luke's gospel.

Van Staden (1990) and Goheen (2005) propose a hermeneutical-critical reading of Luke's gospel from a reader-oriented perspective. In his approach, Van Staden does not explain the ideological difference in Luke as a source of conflict (Van Eck 2009:10). His ideological study of Luke brings him to the conclusion that Luke's Jesus is an ethical Jesus (Van Staden 1990:4). Goheen (2005:235) approached Luke's gospel from a missionary perspective in which he brought the missionary context of the audience into dialogue with the text, trying to shape practices that are consonant but not identical with

⁵ In response to this assertion most scholars nowadays are of the opinion that Luke-Acts exhibits a coherent structure and should not be seen as "simple raw material" (Thiselton 2005:4, see also Green 2005:56).

that of the text (see also Wright 2004:107). From this context, he defined Jesus as a missionary Christ (see Moessner 1983:579).

Another current approach to Luke's gospel is social scientific criticism championed by Moxnes (2001), Malina (1991) and Neyrey (1991a). This approach seeks to understand Biblical texts in their social and cultural context. Malina (1991:6) opines that "meaning is not in the wordings; rather meaning resides in the social system of individuals that is held together by a shared culture, shared values, and shared meanings along with social institutions and social roles to realise those values and meanings" (Malina 1991:6; see also Neyrey 1991a:xiv). Supporters of this approach hold that the understanding of the cultural and social world of Luke's gospel is fundamental in the interpretation of its text, if not, the exegete simply becomes anachronistic and/or ethnocentric in his/her evaluation. The application of the social scientific approach also, from a methodological point of view, helps the exegete to check, in an abductive way, presupposition and results (Van Eck 1995:223).

While this approach leads Moxnes (2001:194) to define three main areas of conflict in Luke, it enables Malina and Neyrey (1991a:99) to understand and interpret the dynamics of these conflicts, using a cross-cultural theory of labelling and deviance (§ 2.2.4). Esler (1989) equally used the socio-redaction approach in order to establish a relationship between Luke's theology and the context of his audience (§ 2.2.5).

It flows from the above approaches that there has been an on-going interest to read Jesus' story in Luke's gospel in a new way. Unfortunately, these approaches have been applied in specific domains, giving the impression that they conflict with each other. In effect, all exegetical methods of interpretation are important and complementary as long as they remain relevant.

In the area of leadership, Horrell (1999a:309) treats leadership in the early church. He argues that itinerant and resident leadership were the two leadership patterns that existed during the period of early Christianity (see § 2.4.1). His study *inter alia* shows that the transfer of leadership from the itinerant leaders to resident leaders implied social transformation and change, which went along with conflict and opposition, influenced by "household

codes”. Still from a general perspective, Wilkes (1998) and Nyiawung (2005) have concentrated on leadership modelled after Jesus and concluded that leadership for Jesus meant service (Wilkes 1998:9, see also Wehrli 1992:104, Nyiawung 2005). Wilkes (1998:127) further opines that effective leadership is risk taking. For him, leadership is risk and conflict by definition.

In like manner, several scholars have made a contribution in the area of conflict in Luke, focusing on the nature of the conflicts, as well as their *raison d’être*. Hence, Tyson (1983) concludes that the different conflicts in Luke were a conflict between incompatible systems: Jesus, the Roman aristocracy, the Jewish elite and the Jewish peasantry (see Boulding 1957:129). Kingsbury (1991) simply focuses on the description of these conflicts without indicating its further implications, while France (1990:22) and Desjardins (1997:75) argue that Jesus faced conflict because of his arrogant attitude (see § 2.5.3). For Malina (1991:99), the conflict Jesus endured was because he stood against the powerful elite who perpetrated injustice by labelling and thus marginalised those who did not adhere to the accepted social norms of the day.⁶ Cassidy (1980:35) and Desjardins (1997:78) have argued that Jesus stood against religious abuse, the down-play of women and social status and the misuse of political structures. Cassidy (1980:124) and Van Eck (2009:24) have observed that Jesus’ conflict ridden public ministry was due to the fact that first-century Palestine was essentially an agonistic society.

In each of these studies conflicts and leadership in Luke are studied independently, without establishing any relationship between the two. Secondly, so far, there seems to be little or no interest yet in the study of leadership in Luke’s gospel in particular. The results from the above research prove that as of now, there are still some shortcomings in the area of leadership, conflict and identity in Luke’s gospel.

1.3.2 Research gap

The research gaps identified from the previous research in the area of the subject-matter of this study can be divided into two groups: the first is

⁶ Harnack (1957:103-104) agrees with Malina that those in power like the priests and the Pharisees held the Jewish nation in bondage and murdered its soul. He then argues that Jesus responded to such an unconstituted “authority” by showing a really emancipating and refreshing disrespect.

methodological, and the second relates to the question of relevant theology. With reference to the first group of the research gaps, this study takes as point of departure the premise that exegetical studies of Luke, in comparison with the work done on the other gospels, have been relatively scanty. More specifically, proper attention has not been given to the dialogue between Jesus and his disciples in Luke 9:18-22. Secondly, the speculations from the crowds have often been taken for granted, while emphasis has been laid mostly on Peter's confession. Thirdly, the relationship between Jesus' identity and the antagonism that he faced has sometimes eclipsed from many findings. These three research gaps seem to point to the defects caused in the area of the methodological approach to Luke's gospel and justify the need for the present thesis. In fact, Lukan scholars seem to have neglected to look at the traditional methods of exegesis (historical-critical analysis), the literary methods (narrative criticism) and those of social sciences (social scientific criticism) as complementary.

The second group of research gaps can further be split into two. Firstly, there seems to have been neglect in associating the ordinary audience in theological discussion. Secondly, there seems to be a chasm between current theologies and the social realities of Africa. As a result, Africans have read about Jesus, not as the Christ who offers a solution to the present socio-political, economic and ecological problems that plague Africa and render its citizens in misery and death, but as a "strange white man" who cares less about human condition.

1.4 AIM, HYPOTHESIS AND RESEARCH ITINERARY

1.4.1 Aim and hypothesis

The aim of this study is threefold: First, to use historical criticism, narrative criticism and social scientific criticism in the study of leadership, conflict and identity in Luke's gospel from an African perspective. Two main issues harness this venture and showcase its relevance in the twenty-first century African Biblical studies. The first is the key question centred on Jesus' identity "Who is the Christ?" Secondly, it is to define the place of conflict within the context of leadership. This is a means to help leaders so that they do not dread conflict and opposition; but face them as realities of leadership. Thirdly,

it is a study of Luke 9:18-22 (which seems crucial in Luke's gospel) in terms of its position within the macro-context of Luke's narrative story. It is thus a literary study of the meaning of Luke's text in its original historical, social and cultural context (and not necessarily their historical accuracy), and its relevance and application in the African context by way of contextualisation.

The main hypothesis that will orientate this study is that the Lukan Jesus was opposed by his contemporaries because of the goal and content of his mission, as well as the way in which they understood his identity. Jesus worked at the margins of society, that is, his actions were seen as going against the grain of accepted societal norms. He mingled with those who were considered as outsiders and did not operate in conformity with the goals and interests of his opponents. Secondly, his identity revealed in his message was an open challenge to the *status quo*. He challenged the social order by x-raying societal abnormalities such as injustice, oppression, exploitation and racism, and stood for an alternative that consisted of justice, love, equality and peace – all virtues of the kingdom.

The question "Who is the Christ?" was a fundamental question in the early church. It is also crucial to this study. If this question was a crucial one to Jesus' contemporaries who knew him, as well as to the early Christian communities, it is even more crucial for African Christians who sometimes live on nothing more than bare faith. The problem attended to in this study is centred on the action of Jesus' contemporaries for whom he came. Why did they reject his mission in order to realise their goals rather than support him? What is so important within the people's community that they do not want to loose as a result of some external influence? In other words, why do some people often cling to the *status quo* at the detriment of innovation and change? These questions will facilitate the debate in this study through the itinerary below (see § 1.4.2).

1.4.2 Research itinerary

One of the aims of this study as stated in § 1.4.1 is to seek to justify the place of conflict within the context of leadership, as well as the leader's identity. The guiding principle for this search is the question "Who is the Christ?" This question and those mentioned earlier (see § 1.3.2) will be attended to in six

chapters. Chapter 2 will examine previous research carried out with regard to Luke's gospel. It will lay emphasis on the various approaches in the study of Luke's gospel, as well as the issue of conflict surrounding the question of Jesus' identity. The first research gap will be attended to in Chapters 3 and 4. Chapter 3 serves as an evaluation of the current debate described in Chapter 2; lays emphasis on the structure of Luke's gospel and describes the narrative function of Luke 9:18-22 within the macro narrative structure of Luke's gospel. Chapter 4 defines the models and theories that will be used in the study as a means of making a blend between historical criticism, narrative criticism and social scientific criticism. Chapter 5 is an emic reading of leadership, conflict and identity in Luke. As a solution to the second research gap, it will highlight the importance of the crowds' conjectures in Luke 9:18-22.

The third research gap is the focus of Chapter 6, which is the etic reading.⁷ It dwells on the sources of conflict in Luke's gospel and draws a correlation between Jesus' identity and the conflict he faced in his ministry. His "methods" of curbing conflicts that arise in leadership will then be analysed in § 6.3, and his leadership approach will be studied in § 6.4. The fourth and fifth research gaps will be the focus of Chapter 7, where an African hermeneutical reading of leadership, conflict and identity in Luke is carried out by way of contextualisation. In response to the question of Jesus' identity, some African models that have so far been used will be examined. Some sketches to the answer of Jesus' identity will be provided in § 7.4.

1.5 CONCLUSION: MAIN THESIS

By reflecting on the topic "Who is the Christ? Leadership and conflict in Luke 9:18-22: A social scientific- and narratological analysis from an African perspective", I wish to make a contribution on how to handle a crowd that does not seem to accept leadership, without considering them as enemies since conflict is not necessarily negative. The study agrees that there is no universal understanding of Jesus' identity. However, relevant Christology is that wherein the definition of Jesus as the Christ of God does not become a

⁷ The terms emic and etic will be explained in § 4.4.2.6.

barrier of separation between individuals of differing contexts. The study highlights ten aspects which are considered as requisites for effective leadership:

- The position of the leaders or their role within the context of the group;
- the leaders' mastery of their mission;
- the leaders' ability to stay focus and unperturbed;
- the leaders' knowledge of all the stake holders involved in leadership;
- the leaders' recognition of the followers' support;
- the leaders' ability to harness followers and other external agents such as the hierarchy;
- the followers' support by way of the legitimation of the leaders' authority and power;
- the relationship between leaders and followers;
- the leaders' appraisal of conflicts; and
- the leaders' dependence on God.

As its main thesis, this study postulates that a proper definition, understanding and interpretation of Jesus as the Christ is the beginning of the understanding of the conflicts that animated his ministry. By extension, it is also the beginning of a solution to contemporary problems posed as a result of leadership crises in Africa and the world.

Chapter 2

The current debate: Approaches to Luke, Luke 9:18-22, leadership and conflict

*We judge ourselves by what we feel capable of doing,
while others judge us by what we have done already.*⁸

2.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter seeks to explore the contributions of various scholars in the area of leadership and conflict in Luke's gospel in general, and specifically in Luke 9:18-22. The following question will be addressed: how have scholars interested in the study of Luke made a blend between the leadership of Jesus and the various conflicts he had with the authorities of his time (the Roman elite, the Jewish elite and the Jewish peasantry)?

Considering that Luke-Acts has been described as "one of the great storm-centres" of New Testament scholarship (Van Unnick 1980:18), the first topic in this chapter centres on some of the approaches scholars have used to study Luke. A short *Wirkungsgeschichte*⁹ of previous interpretations of Luke 9:18-22 is then presented. In this regard attention will also be given to the function of this micro narrative in terms of the narrative structure of the Gospel, since the position of Luke 9:18-22 (as a micro narrative) within the narrative context of Luke influences its reading, as well as its understanding and interpretation.

The third and fourth topics addressed in this Chapter are leadership and conflict. The terms leadership and conflict may seem contradictory at face value, but they are indeed interwoven. People like to lead, but shun away from conflict which is almost always an integral part of leadership. The reason for this is that conflict has always been considered negative, and to associate conflict with leadership, for some, means failure.

⁸ This was a thought from Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, an American poet (1807-1882).

⁹ This technical term is normally used referring to the study of all the different ways in which a specific focus of interpretation, like Luke 9:18-22, has been interpreted and how this interpretation has influenced the understanding and application of, for example, a specific passage. It is often referred to as 'impact history' because the meanings of texts are those that have been profoundly affected by the identity and the purposes of the interpreter (Holgate & Starr 2006:85).

Meyer (2002:25) is correct when she states that “God has put the same potentials in us that he has put in anybody else”. This assertion relates leadership and conflict to the question of identity. All human beings probably have the same leadership potential, but that which distinguishes this identity are each individual’s focus and the way in which each person applies the leadership skills with which s/he is endowed. The question “who is the Christ” in Luke 9:18-22 is all about identity, and links leadership, conflict and identity to one another. Because of Jesus’ identity he adopted a specific leadership style, which led to conflict with other leaders in the Gospel. At the base of these conflicts were clashing ideologies.

The end of this chapter will be devoted to the definition of the research gaps that will be addressed in this study. These research gaps will be formulated on the basis of the contributions that have been made by Lukan scholars on the four topics named above.

2.2 CURRENT APPROACHES IN READING LUKE

The Bible contains a “verbal reality” (Chouinard 1997:68) that remains silent unless it is unveiled through scientific research, that is, exegesis. During the Middle Ages exegesis was aimed at ensuring that Biblical interpretation “squared” with the church’s tradition (Chouinard 1997:65). This conviction, however, has changed gradually over the years that followed since the Middle Ages.

Nowadays exegesis is a discipline that strives for excellence. In the analysis of texts Biblical scholars concentrate on three aspects of the text: its author, the text itself, and its receptor (Hartin & Petzer 1991:1). Each proposed methodology in the study of New Testament texts has so far insisted on either one or two or on all of these poles for a meaningful interpretation. Each of these poles is grounded in a specific “centre of authority” (Porter 1995:87). The historical exegetical approach, with the historical context of the text as its centre of authority, focuses on the author of the text. Text-immanent exegesis, on the other hand, has the text itself as its centre of authority and concentrates on the inner structure of the text. And the reader-oriented exegetical approach focuses on the reader/receptor of the

text, including contextual issues that surround the reader of the text (e.g., feminism or materialism).

A reading of the text that takes the social dynamics embedded in texts nowadays intently complements these three traditional approaches. This approach, known as social scientific criticism, renders texts as products of specific social systems. In analyzing a text, attention is *inter alia* given to aspects like social institutions, societal arrangements and social values that are part of the social world in which the text originated. This approach goes beyond a mere study of the author and the text in order to understand social structures and social contexts of which the text can be seen as a vehicle. The main aim of this approach is to avoid the twin dangers (Neyrey 1991a:xiv), sin (Malina 1991:23) or errors (Elliott 1993:11) of an ethnocentric and anachronistic¹⁰ reading of ancient texts. As such, it takes the cultural difference between the first receptors of the text and that of the modern exegete seriously.

A brief overview of the research history of Luke indicates that the interpretation of Luke has not escaped from this historical-hermeneutical evolution. Initially, Luke as author was considered as merely a compiler and arranger of documents or traditions of Jesus (Porter 1995:81, Thiselton 2005:4, Green 2005:56). Most scholars nowadays, however, are of the

¹⁰ According to Van Eck (1995:9) ethnocentrism is a term that was introduced by Sumner, referring to a “view of things in which one’s own group is centre of everything, and others are scaled and rated in reference to it”. Ethnocentrism is therefore an attitude through which values derived from one cultural background are applied to another cultural context, where different values operate (Levine & Campbell 1972:1). In this respect, an in-group culture or attitude is considered as a norm for what is human (Malina 2001b:6), while out-group behaviour is seen as a deviation. This attitude is judgmental because it relegates one culture while affirming cultural superiority to the other (Strecker 2001:119). Everyone, everywhere at every time, however, does not think and behave identically (Malina 1991:9). Etymologically, anachronism comes from a combination of two Greek words ἀνα& (backwards or against) and χρό&nov (time), meaning an error in chronology in terms of events. The exegete treats a text with the understanding that it is a product of its own social context, although it represents a different time frame. Anachronism then refers to the approach of a text by bringing into it a foreign social world. In other words, anachronism is the projection of the patterns and dynamics of the modern world back into the world of antiquity (Rohrbaugh 1991:127). It is an attempt to fashion figures or events of the past to support twenty-first century agenda (Malina 2001c:ix). In social scientific Biblical studies, these two terms are often used as synonyms in order to insist on their effect on the text (Van Eck 1995:10, Elliott 1993:11, Malina 2001b:3, Stansell 2001:35). McKnight (2004:150) emphasises the need for exegetes to bracket off presupposition when analysing Biblical texts. The exercise of exegesis is that of extracting meaning out of a text. To fall into the trap of ethnocentrism and/or anachronism is a wrong theological creativity, which is eisegesis, because in that way the exegete simply sticks his own words into the mouth of the Biblical writer (Malina 1991:23).

opinion that Luke-Acts exhibits a coherent structure and not “simple raw material” (Thiselton 2005:4, see also Green 2005:56). The various studies on Luke also show that Luke initially has been studied from a historical perspective, then from a literary perspective, and currently most Lukan scholars concentrate on social scientific criticism in interpreting Luke. The latter approach, according to Thiselton, has indicated that historical inquiry alone is not enough for an understanding of the Lukan text (Thiselton 2005:8).

2.2.1 A historical-critical reading: David Wenham

Historical-criticism focuses on the historical context of the text and its author in trying to establish the meaning of the text. In using this approach exegetes establish their findings on the basis of three principles: probability, analogy and correlation¹¹ (Vorster 1991:16). The historical-critical approach is considered by many scholars as the best of all approaches (Hartin & Petzer 1991:3), and “operates like yeast” (Troeltsch, in Vorster 1991:16), since it has influenced and continues to influence almost every subsequent approach that are applied in Biblical interpretation.

One of the scholars who applied a rigorous historical-critical analysis of Luke is David Wenham. His contribution should be seen as a response to the quest of the Enlightenment which encouraged scholarly investigation in the study of Scripture (Chouinard 1997:66). According to Wenham, the stories about Jesus are buried in particular historical contexts and can only be understood within these contexts (Wenham 2005:79, see also Vorster 1991:15). A meaningful interpretation of Luke therefore has to take the historical context, the author’s intention and extra Biblical sources (related to the text) into consideration (Wenham 2005:81).

¹¹ The principle of probability rests on methodological doubt. This principle is used in exegesis because no text has a fixed meaning. Van Aarde and Joubert (2009:442) agree with Pierce that any truth is provisional, and the truth of any proposition cannot be certain but only probable. The principle of analogy, on the other hand works on the premise that the courses of events in the ancient world follow the same or similar logic as events in the world of present day reader. This apprehension of history enables the exegete to appreciate his/her context with the lenses of the ancient world. In other words, it is an assumption that the past is analogous to the present, and that one human society is analogous to another (Miller 1999:17). With this correlation principle, the exegete tries to make sense out of past events or to make connections between past and present events.

Wenham's historical study of Luke leads to the following conclusions regarding the prologue of the Gospel, Jesus, wealth and poverty, Judaism and Christianity, and what he calls "the controversial Gentile mission" in the Gospel. Luke's prologue transmits historically reliable theological and spiritual information about the Jesus tradition; the Lukan Jesus is depicted as "Saviour, who is Christ the Lord" (Wenham 2005:83). As Saviour and Christ, Jesus has concern for the poor and the marginalised. Luke uses a host of examples to show the Jewish rootedness of Jesus and the Christian gospel (the gospel begins and ends with activities in the temple).¹² Also in Luke's gospel, there are several Jewish practices (the presentation of Jesus in the temple, his circumcision, his preaching in the synagogue and the journey to Jerusalem for the celebration of Passover) and Jerusalem as the place of Jesus' death presents the fulfilment of Judaism and Jewish hope (Wenham 2005:91; Tuckett 1996:64). Finally, Wenham understands Jesus' mission to the Gentiles in Luke as controversial because of the long-standing tension between the Jews and the non-Jews.

2.2.2 A text-immanent reading: Scott Spencer and Jonathan Knight

A text-immanent approach to Biblical texts has the text in its final form as its focus¹³. The text is studied as a work of literary art, and results of exegetical studies within this approach indicate that Biblical texts are, like other secular texts, well structured (Porter 1995:78). Fitzmyer (1981:5), for example, considers Luke as a literary artist, and employs different literary devices to guide his understanding of Luke as a cohesive text (see also Resseguie 2005:19).

¹² Jesus' temple activities start with the story of John the Baptist, and ends with Jesus and the disciples. According to Wenham (2005:98), this shows that for Luke, Jesus' intention was not to create a new religion (see Tuckett 1996:63). Rather, it was to revive and transform Judaism by reorienting its practices to include a sense of universalism. Jesus thus was not against Judaism as a religion; he reacted to the misinterpretation of the Torah by the temple and its authorities.

¹³ A text-immanent analysis of texts differs from redaction and source criticism (that concentrate on smaller units in the gospel narratives and render 'inter-gospel' amendments as redactional activity of the author) in focusing on the literary work as a whole (Spencer 2005:114; Resseguie 2005:19). Texts make sense when they are considered in terms of their totality, and not in terms of their parts. As such, a text-immanent reading can be considered as a corrective of, *inter alia*, redactional criticism.

Like Porter and Fitzmyer, Spencer (2005) believes that texts only make sense when they are considered in their totality and not in terms of its different parts. He therefore opts for a text-immanent reading of the text¹⁴. He criticises Wenham's historical-critical analysis of Luke as being presumptive, reductive and speculative (Spencer 2005:120). He also disagrees with Wenham that the historical method is theologically necessary and a helpful ingredient in the process of Biblical interpretation (Wenham 2005:80). A historical approach to the study of Luke's gospel, like that of Wenham, brackets out matters of faith and experience (Spencer 2005:105). Historical criticism, especially redaction and source criticism, only concentrate on "inter-gospel" amendments rather than the text as a literary whole (Spencer 2005:114, see also Resseguie 2005:19), and a focus on the external elements of the text (e.g., the identity of the author, and date and place of writing) is misleading and inadequate.

With regard to Wenham's analysis of Luke, he lauds Wenham's treatment of the theme of Jesus in Luke, but disagrees with what he calls Wenham's "Christomonism". Wenham's understanding of Jesus in Luke, he argues, plays down the activities of God, as well as those of the Holy Spirit in the gospel (Spencer 2005:117). According to Spencer, this overemphasis on Jesus by Wenham is the result of Wenham's methodology. Although Luke's gospel is historical in nature (as Wenham argues), its genre is narrative. Moreover, "beyond tracking key historical-political events making headlines in Luke's era, it is vital to understand the pervasive social-cultural environments and symbolic-ideological universe in which Luke-Acts is embedded and from which it emerges" (Spencer 2005:120)¹⁵.

In his literary analysis of Luke, Spencer (2005:117) focuses on the work of God and the Holy Spirit. Without the work of God and the Spirit, Jesus' birth cannot be understood, and God functions as the prime mover behind Luke's narrative (see also Knight 1998:64). The stories in Luke are shaped by God's will, and not by Roman and Jewish politics. Consequently, a study of

¹⁴ Spencer's supposed dichotomy between a historical-critical and text-immanent in fact does not exist. The literary method of interpretation (which concerns itself *inter alia* with the way in which texts are composed) takes its roots from redaction criticism, an exegetical method that operates within the sphere of historical-criticism.

¹⁵ It is interesting that Spencer, with this remark, not only questions the possibilities of the historical approach, but also projects the very limits of the literary approach.

the political situation to which the Lukan texts refer can only be misleading. Spencer also identifies a second important theme in Luke: hearing and accepting God's word. A close reading of the Lukan text shows that God and Jesus are the ones that speak, and the people are those that hear. This theme in Luke has a profound theological impact in the lives of its readers, which can be recognized only when the text of Luke is analysed from a literary perspective.

Knight's (1998:1) motivation for his narrative approach in reading Luke stems from the fact that he appreciates Luke's gospel as a text which tells a story. The reading of Luke as a narrative text already led him to address one of the shortfalls in Lukan studies that were later taken up by Spencer: the importance of God's activity in Luke's gospel (Spencer 2005:117; Knight 1998:4). He holds that a reading of Luke's gospel as a narrative enables the reader to pay attention to the different relationships established in the gospel (see also Goldsmith 2000:2), as well as issues such as plot and characterisation, which are at the heart of all narratives (Knight 1998:2). He acknowledges the older approaches to the Gospels – they have not lost their value – but also remarks that some research on the gospels still tends to treat them as uniform documents, thereby ignoring the differences between them. Such research ignores the fact that no two stories can be the same, even if they were told by the same reporter (Knight 1998:28). Hence, he opts to treat Luke's gospel as a different kind of story from that of the other Synoptic gospels.

First of all, Luke situates his story within the context of Jewish history (Knight 1998:28) through the presentation of the various authorities in action (Lk 1:5; 3:1), especially the religious authorities (Zechariah, Simeon and Anna) and the political authorities (Caesar, Pilate and Herod). These authorities are a signal of the system within which Jesus will minister. Secondly, Luke is interested in moral and ethical topics such as the attitude to wealth and human relationships (Knight 1998:7; see also Esler 1989:165). Thirdly, Knight (1998:16) agrees with Franklin (1994:371) that in Luke's gospel, as compared to Matthew, the law no longer has a strict part to play in defining the boundaries of the people of God. Consequently, Luke's Jesus

defines God's people in terms of God's forgiving love, and not in terms of their observance to the law.

In situating Jesus' story within the context of authority, Luke supplies the reader with the perspective from which his story should be understood. He presents Jesus as the Messiah-king in the infancy narratives. Opposition between Jesus and the present authorities is signalled in the canticles of Luke 1:46-55 and Luke 2:29-32, and in the prophecy of Simeon (Lk 2:34-35). His mission statement presented in the synagogue also attests to this fact. He is the one through whom God's eschatological enfranchisement will be discharged (Lk 4:14-30). According to Knight, Luke continues to show that in spite of the powerful nature of the authorities (religious and political), they both show their powerlessness when it comes to protecting Jesus' movement. While the religious leaders become powerless in their attempt to arrest Jesus because of the people (1a0&j), the political authority (Pilate) also shows his powerlessness by declaring Jesus' innocence during his trial (Knight 1998:142; see also Esler 1989:203).

Luke's gospel presents both John's and Jesus' ethical teachings as appropriate to the standards of the new society, the kingdom of God, where future judgment is dependent on the criteria of present status and response (Knight 1998:90). Without being a society of vengeance, it will be a society where the treatment accorded to people will be commensurate with their previous attitude *vis-à-vis* others. This is an appeal to responsible and consequential life. The urge for the kingdom of God is pressing, urgent and important. Hence, believers need to turn their attention from material belongings in order to yearn for the virtues of the kingdom that bring satisfaction. The provision for material well-being in this new sphere is entirely God's concern. The picture of the kingdom of God is that of a new society of generosity, hospitality and forgiveness (Knight 1998:112, 118).

With reference to Jesus' regard of the law, Luke demonstrates the lawlessness of the law in its inability to exonerate Jesus during his trial (Esler 1989:203). By contrast, he shows the positive side of the law which is executed with the spirit of love. However, Jesus' status as Messiah shows that a new order of love and concern has arrived. His actions, irrespective of time and space, have a restorative purpose. Because of this concern, his

attitude becomes unpredictable, even if it means going against the law (Knight 1998:88). For Luke's Jesus, therefore, the correct respect for the law goes hand in hand with the ethical concerns of the new community – a community where the traditional concept of patriarchy is replaced by the new belief in mutuality and the fatherhood of God (Knight 1998:179).

Knight's narrative approach leads him to the following conclusions. First, although Luke's gospel forms part of the canon, it can be interpreted by the same kind of methods as secular narratives (Knight 1998:21). Secondly, even though the story of the life of Jesus gives an initial shape and coherence to the gospel, it is not so much a description of Jesus' life, but rather about what Acts 2:11 calls "the mighty works of God" (Knight 1998:6). Through Jesus, God offers a new era which is not necessarily law bound, but an era whose status is controlled by human love and concern for one another (Knight 1998:121). Luke's Jesus is an enigmatic figure (Knight 1998:38). Jesus is like a prophet, John the Baptist, David, Elijah; but he is also unlike these figures. Fourthly, Knight's (1998:42) narrative reading causes him to explain the reasons for Jesus' crucifixion in two dimensions. He was crucified because of the necessity to fulfil Scripture. Hence, Jesus' journey to Jerusalem is interpreted as a move that enables Israel to be what they intended to be; that is, a liberated nation (Knight 1998:116). Also, Jesus was opposed because of his attitude towards the temple and its leaders. Knight (1998:129) holds that, by cleansing the temple, Jesus gave to himself a new status in the eyes of his opponents, which caused them to rise against him.

Evans has raised criticism against the literary method of interpretation, characterizing it as vulnerable because it can lead to a subjective reading of the text (Evans 1995:19). Spencer's reading of Luke, as well as Knight's reading can thus be seen as subjective readings, because it is the result of their personal analysis of events reported by Luke. Porter has also labelled criticism against a mere literary reading of the text, arguing that it lacks a rigorous methodological control (Porter 1995:78). This criticism of Evans and Porter has to be taken seriously. It does not, however, mean that an analysis of the narrative structure of a text cannot in principle contribute to a better understanding of its textual world.

2.2.3 A hermeneutical-critical (reader-oriented) reading: Pieter van Staden and Michael Goheen

Any text has three types of owners, each of whom has the right to produce the meaning of a text – the reader, the author and the copyright owner (Aichele 1996:123). A reader-oriented approach focuses on the place of the reader (the first type of owner) in producing a meaning of a Biblical text. Reader-response criticism, an exegetical method within the reader-orientated approach, works with the premise that literary texts have “gaps” that the reader is expected to fill (Iser 1974:282). In this method the main issue thus has to do with the effect that the text has on the reader (Resseguie 2005:33). Each text has an identity and at the same time creates meaning(s) that can only be disclosed through reading.

A second exegetical method within the reader-orientated approach operates from the premise that at the basis of every text lays ideas, and it is the responsibility of the reader to make use of these ideas within his own context (Van Aarde 1988:239, Van Tilborg 1991:262, Aichele 1996:140). Examples of these readings are feminist criticism, materialistic criticism and liberation criticism (see Pippin 1997, Oeming 2006:v; Van Eck & Van Aarde 2009:5). These readings are normally typified as ideological-critical readings, a subset of reader-orientated criticism (Pippin 1997: 268).

This definition of an ideological-critical reading of the text poses a problem of where exactly to situate ideological-critical exegesis. Essentially, the heuristic value of the ideological critical approach is to help in bringing out neglected aspects of the text into exegetical discussion. This definition places the ideological approach somewhere between a text-immanent and reader-oriented approach, since an ideological reading grants equal freedom to both text and reader. Ideology is “not something extra added to texts but rather the way in which a set of texts is assembled, a picture puzzle that turns out different for each reader” (Aichele 1996:151). Ideological criticism thus also relates to points of view that is, the norms, values, attitudes beliefs and general worldview of the narrator or the reader (Culpepper 1983:32-34; Resseguie 2005:172; Malina & Neyrey 1991a:103). Finally, ideological criticism is also connected with both historical criticism and social scientific

criticism in that it exposes the political, social and economic realities of the communities for which the text was originally written (Stratton 2000:123).

An ideological-critical reading of a text could therefore not be seen as only reader orientated. Clearly this reading also focuses on the text, and more specifically, on ideologies in the text, whether political, social or economic. It would therefore be more appropriate to typify these readings as hermeneutical-critical, a term that designates these readings as an approach that focuses not only on the reader, but also on the text.

In this sense then, the studies of Luke by Van Staden (1990) and Goheen (2005) could be deemed as hermeneutical-critical. Van Staden (1990:73) defines ideology as general ideas, general perception about reality, principles or point of view. Point of view is understood by Van Staden not with reference to the reader of the text, but with reference to the text itself. This understanding of point of view relates to what Soulen and Soulen call the ideology of the text. According to Soulen and Soulen, ideological criticism considers three areas in which ideology affects a text: the ideology of the context of the text, the ideology of the text (on which Van Staden concentrates) and the ideology of the reader and the interpreter (Soulen & Soulen, in Holgate & Starr 2006:132). In his reading of Luke, Van Staden understands the narrator's point of view as the ideology of the author. The specific contribution he makes is to equate the ideology of the author, in religious texts, with the theology of a specific religious text. He thus applies the sociological concept of ideology (as theology) to literary criticism in order to understand the ideologies present in the social context of Luke's gospel. His reading concludes that the difference between Jesus and the Pharisees is a difference in ideology, that is, an ideology of compassion (Jesus) and an ideology of holiness (Pharisees; see Van Staden 1990:8).¹⁶ In this reading of Luke, Van Staden affirms that for the Lukan Jesus God's compassion has no boundaries, as compared to the Pharisaic understanding of God whose holiness is exclusive. His ideological reading of Luke also brings him to a

¹⁶ Recently Van Eck (2009a:10), in an ideological-critical analysis of the Tenants (GThom 65/Mark 12:1-12 and par), has come to the same conclusion: the main source of conflict between Jesus and the Pharisees was a difference in ideology.

second conclusion, namely that Jesus is an ethical Jesus (Van Staden 1990:4). This conclusion ties well as one of the possible answers to the question “who is the Christ?”

In his hermeneutical-critical reading of Luke, Goheen (2005:230-232) remarks that modern scholarship has failed in two ways in reading Biblical texts: it has not enabled people to hear God speak in the text, and mission has not occupied a central place as it ought to (see also Wright 2004:107). Goheen therefore, in following the work done by Bosch in reading Luke by means of a missional hermeneutic approach, suggests a hermeneutical-critical reading that can be called “missional hermeneutics”. Missional hermeneutics entails reading the Bible focusing on what God is saying in terms of mission (Wolters 2000:103). The aim of this reading is to establish a dialogue between the reader and the text in terms of the reader’s missional situation. It also means to acknowledge, understand and apply the four types of missions prescribed in the Bible: God’s mission, Israel’s mission, Jesus’ mission, and the church’s mission.

In his reading of Luke, Bosch focuses on Luke 4:16-30¹⁷, and understands the Lukan Jesus as a missionary inclined Christ. He qualifies Jesus’ mission as a universal mission to the Jews, the Samaritans and the Gentiles alike, a mission to both the rich and the poor, and a mission of peacemaking. His missional reading of Luke shows that Jesus has left a missionary legacy for the church so that the church may continue to empower the weak and the lowly; heal the sick and save the lost. For Bosch, applying Jesus’ mission in Luke means to “incarnate the gospel in time” (Bosch 1984:173) – the application of Jesus’ missionary strategy in response to the missionary demands of time and space.

Goheen also appreciates Bosch’s idea of mission, that is, mission that goes beyond the narrow conception of mission as geographical movement (see e.g., Ac 1:8). He also observes that Bosch’s study would have made a bigger contribution in the area of Biblical interpretation if he also attended to

¹⁷ This section is often called “the thematic introduction” to Luke (Moxnes 2001:192), and parallels Mark 1:15 and Matthew 4:17. The “thematic introduction” defines Jesus’ mission as understood by each of the evangelists, and occupies a central place in the narratives of the three Synoptics.

two other aspects of Luke's gospel: the link between mission in Luke and mission in the Old Testament, and the link between Jesus' mission in Luke and the mission of the apostles in Acts.

According to Goheen, there is an inseparable link between mission in Luke and mission in the Old Testament. He interprets Jesus' mission in Luke as a fulfilment of God's mission that had already begun with the people of Israel in the Old Testament. This link is made easy when Jesus is seen in the light of Isaiah's description of the "suffering servant". Secondly, he opines that Luke's gospel is about Jesus' mission, which has become the church's mission. As such, all the themes in Luke (e.g., the travel motif, suffering and prayer) should be viewed from the perspective of mission.

A hermeneutical-critical reading of Luke thus also, although indirectly, brings Goheen and Bosch to provide an answer to the question "who is the Christ?" For them Christ is the missionary Jesus or a "journeying teacher", preparing his disciples for a church after his death (Moessner 1983:579).

2.2.4 A social-scientific reading: Halvor Moxnes, Bruce Malina and Jerome Neyrey

Social-scientific criticism as an approach to Biblical interpretation derives its strength from its focus on the social context of the text (Elliott 2001:11). As a tool of retrieval and an aid to interpretation (Pilch 1991:182), this approach seeks to understand the meaning of words in the text in terms of the social system in which they are used. Words being used in a text always contain an anthropological component (Rohrbaugh 1996a:11, Malina 2001b:12-13). Unlike the historical approach that focuses on a descriptive analysis (what happened, when and where), social-scientific criticism asks the "why" question – why did it happen? This why-question, according to social scientists, relates to meaning, since

meaning is not in the wordings ... rather meaning resides in the social system of individuals that is held together by a shared culture, shared values, and shared meanings along with social institution and social roles to realise those values and meanings.

(Malina 1991:5-6)

This is also the point of view of Neyrey (1991c:xiv): the understanding of the cultural and social world (e.g., that of Luke's gospel) is fundamental in the interpretation of texts, if not, exegetes become anachronistic or ethnocentric in their understanding of texts.

This approach is not without its critics. From its inception, Gager described the relationship between sociology and Biblical studies as a marriage between enemies (Gager, in Richter 1995:266). Stowers has equally questioned the credibility of the social scientific approach in the study of New Testament documents (Stowers, in Taylor 2002:581).¹⁸ In spite of the above criticisms¹⁹, the application of a social scientific approach, from a methodological point of view, helps the exegete to check – in an abductive way²⁰ – presupposition and results (Van Eck 1995:223).

In the past two decades several social-scientific readings of Luke (or aspects thereof) have seen the light. Moxnes (2001), for example, has used the social-scientific approach to analyse the concept of “the kingdom of God” in Luke as to a better understanding of the conflict between Jesus and the

¹⁸ This credibility is established at two levels (Esler 1989:12). The social scientific approach to the study of scripture is accused for being reductionist. Supporters of this idea suggest that this approach claims to provide a total explanation of the Bible, leaving no scope for the activity of individuals to figure in the explanatory task. It is equally accused for being too dependent upon contemporary cultural patterns (models) in order to understand first century texts (cf Judge 1980: 201-207). This criticism thus questions the understanding of models and their role in historical research. However, Elliott (1993:89) and Scroggs (1986:140) disagree: “No ‘scientific’ approach need be reductionistic. *Every ‘scientific’ approach* – including the historical – *can* be reductionistic. That is, reductionism does not lie in the methodology itself, but in the theological [philosophical] presuppositions which one brings to sociological or any other methodology. Statements informed by social pressures *can* be apprehended as revelation. That is as legitimate a faith as the contrary” (Scroggs 1986:140).

¹⁹ See also Esler (1989 12-15; Elliott 1993:87-100) for a discussion of the different criticisms levelled at social scientific criticism as an approach.

²⁰ The abductive method of research is an alternative to the traditional inductive and hypothetico-deductive accounts of scientific methods of investigation. In the inductive method the researcher observes facts from which generalised conclusions about particular issues are made (see Chalmers 1999). In the hypothetico-deductive method the researcher suggests a hypothesis which is then tested. From this process, some other observational predictions also then can be derived. The abductive method is broader; it evolves from the construction of empirical facts to the construction of theories, which in turn explain these facts. It is a method of investigative theory that enables the exegete to move, for example, from the “facts” about the conflicts that Jesus faced as a leader in Luke's gospel, to the detection of empirical phenomena (breeding grounds for conflict) that are found in Luke's social world.

various authoritative systems in Luke's gospel.²¹ Moxnes' study of Jesus' preaching on "the kingdom of God" shows that in Luke a shift from the traditional understanding of the kingdom (as a geographical place) to a new understanding thereof can be indicated: the "kingdom of God" in Luke relates to a transformation of social structures. Like Malina (1996a:137), he comes to the conclusion that Jesus' message on the "kingdom" presupposed obvious opposition from political authorities (Moxnes 2001:176). Most of the events in Luke are narrated within the context of political power. Hence, he situates Jesus' expression of the kingdom of God within two contexts. In the extra-context there are two political forces: the political rule in Palestine and that of the Roman Empire. Three main issues build up the intra-context: the political ideology of Luke's day, the Jewish traditions about "God's reign", and the cosmological conflict between Jesus and Satan (Moxnes 2001:188-90).

The above social-scientific analysis of the kingdom of God in Luke results in Moxnes identifying three specific areas of conflict between Jesus and first-century Palestine context as a whole (Moxnes 2001:194): conflict over the dominion of space (who has authority?); conflicts over boundaries (who are those considered as God's people?); and cosmological conflict (who owns the geographical space, including the welfare of people and creation; Jesus or the devil?). All these conflicts are presented in Luke 4, which stands as an introduction to Jesus' ministry in Luke.²²

Moxnes concludes his study by associating the kingdom of God with two important social structures in Luke's gospel. He considers the table (meals) as a structure through which Jesus defines a new order. Instead of a patron-

²¹ Malina has worked extensively on the same theme, not only in the gospel of Luke. He focuses on the possibilities of meaning this term could have had in a first-century Mediterranean milieu, and qualifies Jesus' preaching on the theme: the kingdom of God as a "social gospel" (Malina 2001b).

²² Luke 4 opens with conflict about who owns space and authority in a cosmological conflict. Satan gives the impression that he has power and authority over space. Jesus, however, refuses to see the kingdom of God in terms of space. In Nazareth he is opposed by his people because he suggests an alternative space in which the poor (spiritually and materially), liberated prisoners and the socially marginalized are part of God's plan of salvation. Jesus then continues his ministry by healing and performing exorcisms. This attitude was a sort of war declared against cosmological forces (illnesses, magic and suffering), which held God's people hostage. Through healing Jesus regains the kingdom. Although he is accused of upsetting the world order, he seems instead to be putting the devil and his agents in their rightful places.

client or master-slave order at table, he takes the lead as Master, and serves (see also Malina 2001b:10). In this new structure people are not invited in terms of social status; everybody has a seat. The table stands as a symbol for the abolition of hierarchy. The second structure is that of the temple: it ceases to be a symbol of exploitation and becomes a symbol of the kingdom as a household in which God is not “king” but “Father”. The opposite of the kingdom of God in Luke is Jerusalem. The kingdom is not a place of death; it is a place of life and celebration (Moxnes 2001:200). This reading of Luke thus also, although indirectly, brings Moxnes to provide an answer to the question “who is the Christ?” For Moxnes Jesus is an advocate of social transformation.

Malina and Neyrey (1991a:99) equally use a social-scientific reading in order to understand and interpret the dynamics of the conflicts in Luke using a cross-cultural theory of labelling and deviance. In their study they focus on the trial of Jesus with the crucifixion as the climax of the conflict between Jesus and his opponents. Luke reports the story of Jesus’ ministry within the context of conflict, rejection and hostility. At least two areas of conflict can be indicated: the conflict between Jesus and the authorities (supra-human and human) over practical ways on how God should be understood and obeyed, and conflict among the various groups and individuals who surrounded Jesus on the appreciation of Jesus’ mission and his identity (Malina & Neyrey 1991a:97-98).

During the trial Jesus is proven a deviant through the labels attributed to him. He perverts, subverts and blasphemes (Lk 22:5, 23). As a result of this labelling, Jesus is subjected to a Jewish and then to a Roman trial where he is described as a “deviant of the worst sort” (Malina & Neyrey 1991a:116). The aim of labelling and deviance (especially during the trial) is to discredit and depersonalise Jesus. It leads Jesus to lose his status (leadership and identity) and honour, and subjects him to shame (Malina & Neyrey 1991b).

2.2.5 A hermeneutical-critical (socio-redaction criticism) reading:

Philip F Esler

Socio-redaction criticism is an exegetical approach which results from the fusion between the historical critical approach and what Esler (1989:6) calls

the “sociological exegesis” (*sic*) of Elliott (1982). According to Esler (1989:3), redaction criticism has been very meaningful in defining the particular theological thoughts of an author. It has, however, failed to investigate the social context of texts. With this passion for the study of the social context of the text, Esler proposes a hermeneutic reading that combines redaction criticism with a conscious application of ideas and techniques drawn from social sciences. A socio-redaction analysis of Luke-Acts highlights and insists on the role of Luke (in his own right as author), as well as the role of his social and political communities in the development of his theological thoughts.²³

In previous Lukan studies, Esler argues, the Gospel has been misread in three dimensions. First is the conception that Luke does not associate his theology to his context, second is the presumption that Luke’s gospel is apologetic and lastly that Luke wrote in order to portray the cruelty of the Roman authorities. Contrary to the presumption that Luke seems to have separated his gospel from the realities of his community, Esler (1989:165) argues that such realities instead served as motivation for the Lukan theology. Luke’s theology begins with Jesus’ mission of property with reference to poverty and riches. Because of this, Luke can only be understood in terms of the political, social and religious realities of that community.

In response to the second misreading, Esler (1989:24) considers it an erroneous presumption to read Luke as an apologetic, that is, in search of tolerance towards the Roman authorities. By comparing Luke with Hellenistic literary conventions of preface composition, Esler comes to the conclusion that Luke was not animated by an apologetic desire. Luke’s gospel is rather a legitimation²⁴ of Old Testament prophecy and some Jewish practices which his audience was already familiar with (Esler 1989:25). Luke’s intention was to legitimize Christianity to Christians (including Jews and Gentiles) who “needed strong assurance that their decision to convert and to adopt a different life-style had been the correct one” (Esler 1989:16). Luke’s audience

²³ Esler’s work (1989) is an analysis of both Luke and the Acts of the Apostles. Since the focus of this study is the gospel of Luke, emphasis in this section is on Esler’s arguments that are relevant to the understanding of Luke.

²⁴ The concept of legitimation used by Esler has a difference in application to how legitimation is used as a concept in this study. For Esler (1989:16-17), legitimation refers to “the collection of ways in which an institution is explained and justified to its members”. In this study the concept is applied to the validation of someone’s leadership.

was not pagan and the formulation of his theological material conforms to this idea. With this conviction, Esler complements his historical analyses of the gospel by investigating the loyalty of Jesus and his followers to the Jewish tradition.

Esler's third response to previous Lukan studies focuses on Luke's position towards the Roman government. Earlier comments on Luke have relied on the argument that if one of Luke's intentions was to portray Christianity as politically innocuous, why does Luke then mention aspects that prove the contrary in his text?²⁵ For Esler (1989:204-205) Luke instead sought to show that, in spite of accusations levelled at Jesus and his disciples, they were repeatedly pronounced innocent of breaking any Roman regulations. Esler (1989:210) further opines that there is only one answer which offers a satisfying explanation for the political theme in Luke: "faith in Jesus Christ and allegiance to Rome were not mutually inconsistent".²⁶

Esler's use of socio-redaction criticism to show the interrelatedness between Luke's theology and the social and political pressure of his community leads him to three conclusions: Luke's gospel is a legitimization of what his community already knew about God and his promises. The formulation of Luke's material, secondly, confirms that Luke is an independent writer, distinct from the Synoptic writers, with specific social and political concerns. Finally, the "marriage" between theology and sociology as portrayed in the gospel, shows that Luke's community experienced a crisis relating to ethnic and religious identification.

2.2.6 Summary

The variety of approaches in reading Luke described above broadens the exegete's understanding of the Gospel and its content (i.e., Jesus). Hence, all

²⁵ Luke's gospel presents many instances where Jesus seems not to agree with the Roman authorities. According to the Lukan Jesus the Roman authorities tolerate and encourage exploitation in all its senses: social, economic, political and religious. During Jesus' trial they prove ineffective in exonerating him, but legitimated his crucifixion on their "right" to order the death penalty (see Esler 1989:203).

²⁶ Esler basis this conclusion on the following: Luke situates the beginning of the gospel within the context of Roman history (Lk 2-3:3). A favourable attitude is shown by Roman officials towards Jesus (see e.g., the generosity of the centurion [Lk 7:1-10] and another centurion that declares that Jesus was *di&kaioj*, that is, innocent [Lk 23:47]). Luke's version of the trial of Jesus also favours the Romans: Pilate declares Jesus innocent of the charges against him, the Roman soldiers do not subject Jesus to physical violence (contra Mark 15:16-20), while the Jewish soldiers do (Lk 23:6-12). In all, Esler (1989:203) concludes that the Jews were solely responsible for Jesus' death.

exegetical methods of interpretation are important as long as they are relevant for a given exercise. The approaches and readings described above could be considered as the various possibilities or options in the field of Biblical interpretation. They are the sources or 'axes' of theology (Porter 1995:96, Crossan, in Chouinard 1997:68) and not competing approaches (Hartin & Petzer 1991:2). Different approaches should rather be seen as complementary: they have different and particular functions and address particular issues, depending on the type of text that has been chosen (Porter & Tombs 1995:13; Van Aarde & Van Eck 2009:47). Each Biblical interpretation aims at bringing clarity to obscure areas of the text so as to help the understanding of its readers, and thereafter, to enhance their faith. In such an activity the exegete plays the role of a bridge between theology and society.

In the interpretation of New Testament texts preference for a specific approach and method should relate to the nature of the text and the objective of the exegete, which should be to formulate theology that addresses and challenges society to positive change.²⁷ In this respect the above approaches should be appreciated in terms of their richness and developments in New Testament studies whose objective is to connect today's believer with the various testimonies about Jesus that are inscribed in the New Testament. For the purpose of this study, it is therefore the conviction that, the application of the above exegetical approaches from an African perspective can shed new light on Jesus' leadership in Luke. The latter perspective will also make it possible to apply the results of this study to leadership in an African context.

2.3 THE WIRKUNGSGESCHICHTE OF LUKE 9:18-22: WHO IS THE CHRIST?

2.3.1 "Who is the Christ?"

2.3.1.1 D P Moessner

Moessner (1983:582) has studied Luke 9:1-50 as a "window preview" to Luke 9:51-19:44. In his study he makes a comparison between Moses' journey to the Promised Land in Deuteronomy and Jesus' journey to Jerusalem. Although Moessner's treatment of Luke 9:18-22 as part of the "window

²⁷ This does not exclude the possibility for exegetes to prefer a specific approach. An approach taken can be a combination of more than one method, or simply relying on one specific method. Porter (1995:121), for example, prefers a literary-critical reading assisted by a historical understanding of the text.

preview” in Luke 9:1-50 is scanty, two remarks are worthy to note. The crowd referred to in Luke 9:18 is said to be the same crowd present at the feeding miracle in Luke 9:10-17. Moessner thus sees a connection between Luke 9:17-21 and Luke 9:18-22. Secondly, the prediction of Jesus’ death in Luke 9:22 is considered to foreshadow the future suffering of the disciples in Luke 9:23-27. This remark equally links Luke 9:18-22 to Luke 9:23-27. Apart from these two remarks directly concerned with 9:18-22, the rest of the study is a correlation between the Lukan Jesus who must suffer and die in Jerusalem and Moses who must suffer the anger of the Lord because of the sin of his people (see Dt 31:2, 14; 32:48-50; 34:4; Moessner 1983:584; Brawley 1987:22, 24; Tuckett 1996:85; see also Evans 1955).²⁸ In summary, Moessner’s Lukan Jesus is Moses of the New Testament – God’s plan of salvation initiated in the Old Testament through Moses is being fulfilled in the New Testament through Jesus (Bosch 1984; Goheen 2005).²⁹

2.3.1.2 J A Fitzmyer

Fitzmyer (1981:134) suggests a reading of the gospel of Luke in terms of eight sections:

1. The prologue (Lk 1:1-4);
2. The infancy narrative (Lk 1:5-2:52);
3. The preparation for the public ministry of Jesus (Lk 3:1-4:13);
4. The Galilean ministry of Jesus (Lk 4:14-9:50);
5. The travel account, Jesus’ journey to Jerusalem (Lk 9:51-19:27);
6. The ministry of Jesus in Jerusalem (Lk 19:28-21:38);
7. The passion narrative (Lk 22:1-23:56a) and

²⁸ Tuckett (1996:84) substantiates his conviction with the fact that the noun “departure”, used in Luke 9:31 in order to explain Jesus’ movement to Jerusalem is *exodus*. He opines that the mention of *exodus* refers to Moses’ story. He also supports the idea that Jesus’ *route* will be similar to that of Moses who was “rejected by the people and then raised up again” (Tuckett 1996:84). Although words are vehicles of information, it is evident that they do not have only one meaning. Secondly, (using Tuckett’s argument), to say that Moses was raised means that Moses was resurrected. The verb “to be raised” is the same verb that is used by Jesus to refer to his resurrection (Lk 9:22). Consequently, a quick comparison between Moses and Jesus on the basis of the term *exodus* could be misleading. If this were the case, all the places where the noun *exodus* is used in the New Testament would refer to Moses. An example in point is Acts 13:24, where *exodus* is used as a verb referring to Jesus.

²⁹ Franklin (1994:336) also disagrees with the Deuteronomistic reading of Luke 9:1-50 by Moessner, Tuckett and Evans. He opines that the closeness of the Deuteronomistic connection with the events of Luke 9:1-50 is not enough evidence that Deuteronomy exerted the final control over the order of Luke’s report.

8. The resurrection narrative Lk 23:56b-24:53).

These eight sections can further be restructured in to four:

- Prologue and infancy narrative (Lk 1:1-2:52);
- Preparation and ministry in Galilee (Lk 3:1-9:50);
- Journey to Jerusalem and ministry (Lk 9:51-21:38);³⁰ and
- Passion, resurrection and ascension (Lk 22:1-24:53).

Since the story of Jesus' ministry only starts in Luke 3, Fitzmyer (1981:134) also sees a possibility of reducing the structure of the Gospel into seven (or even into three), omitting the prologue and the infancy narrative (see also Edwards 1981:29). This choice, however, is arbitrary, since the essence of the narrative of Jesus' ministry clearly takes place in Galilee and Jerusalem.

As can be seen from the above proposed structure of Luke's narrative, Fitzmyer locates the question of Jesus' identity (Lk 9:18-22) within the macro-context of Luke 3:1-9:50, being part of a smaller narrative (Lk 9:7-36) that he calls "Who is this?" In terms of this narrative structure Luke 9:18-22 stands at the very centre of Luke's salvation history (Fitzmyer 1981:137, 192). It is the identity of Jesus as the Christ that takes him from Galilee through Jerusalem to the cross. In all of this, it is only Peter that understands the identity of Jesus as the Christ of God.

2.3.1.3 O C Edwards (Jr)

Excluding the prologue and the infancy narrative, Edwards (1981:29) divides the Gospel into three sections of almost equal length:

- Jesus' ministry in the surrounding of the lake of Galilee (Lk 3:1-9:50);
- Jesus' journey to Jerusalem (Lk 9:51-19:27); and
- Jesus' teaching, arrest, crucifixion and resurrection in Jerusalem (Lk 19:28-24:53).

³⁰ Fitzmyer separates Jesus' journey to Jerusalem from Jesus' ministry in Jerusalem itself. This separation could be questioned, since either on his way to Jerusalem or in Jerusalem, Jesus' activities contributed to his fame. All the events as narrated by Luke are interrelated and culminate with the passion story as the consequence of Jesus' earlier predictions. The journey to Jerusalem prepares the events that will eventually take place in Jerusalem, that is, Jesus' arrest, crucifixion, resurrection, ascension, and his return to Galilee. It therefore makes more sense to study Jesus' journey to Jerusalem and his ministry in Jerusalem as a whole.

Edwards is further of the opinion that Luke 22:1-24:53 is not part of Jesus' teaching and therefore cannot be taken into consideration as part of the structure of Luke that relates to Jesus' ministry. This means that his proposed structure is reduced to two sections, Luke 3:1-9:50 and Luke 9:51-21:38 (see also Fitzmyer 1981:134).

Edwards situates the gospel within the context of conflict, beginning with the temptation story of Jesus in the wilderness, and identifies a "crisis-motif" relating to Jesus' identity that runs through the Gospel. In the narrative of Luke the devil leaves Jesus in Luke 4:13, and returns in Luke 22:3. The time between Luke 4:13 and Luke 22:3, when the devil is absent, is the time of salvation (Edwards 1981:33). His analysis of Luke 4:14-30 leads him to conclude that Jesus' ministry starts with two important declarations: his mission statement and the prediction of the fate that awaits him as a prophet in Jerusalem.

In response to Edward's identity crisis motif, Johnson (1999:230), working also with the principle of "the conflict of identity" in Luke, suggests a prophet motif. Using the conflict in Nazareth as a case study, Johnson opines that the Jewish elite indeed wanted a prophet, but not one who offers salvation to those they considered being outside the chosen group. They therefore rejected Jesus. According to them Jesus was just like all earlier prophets that embarked on an inclusive mission. The intensity of this conflict between Jesus and the Jewish leaders can especially be seen in the splitting of the crowd into two groups: those who accept Jesus and those who do not.

2.3.1.4 R Aland Culpepper

Culpepper (1995:10) equally divides the gospel into seven sections:

1. Prologue (Lk 1:1-4);
2. Infancy narrative (Lk 1:5-2:52);
3. Preparation for the ministry of Jesus Lk 3:1-4:13);
4. The ministry in Galilee (Lk 4:14-9:50);
5. The journey to Jerusalem (Lk 9:51-19:27);
6. Jesus' ministry in Jerusalem (Lk 19:28-21:38) and
7. The passion and resurrection narratives (Lk 22:1-24:53).

These seven sections can further be summarised as follows (cf Fitzmyer 1981:134):

- Prologue and infancy narrative (Lk 1:1-2:52);
- Preparation and ministry in Galilee (Lk 3:1-9:50);
- Journey to Jerusalem and ministry (Lk 9:51-21:38); and
- Passion, resurrection and ascension (Lk 22:1-24:53).

Culpepper also suggests another division of the Gospel. From a geographical point of view, Jesus' ministry can be divided into three periods:

- In Galilee (Lk 4:14-9:50);
- *en route* to Jerusalem (Lk 9:51-19:27); and
- in Jerusalem (Lk 19:28-21:38).

Culpepper (1995:13), like all the scholars mentioned above, is also of the opinion that Luke's focus in his gospel is the question of Jesus' identity. Almost all the characters in the Gospel, according to Culpepper, battle with the question of Jesus' identity: the scribes and the Pharisees (Lk 5:21), John the Baptist (Lk 7:20), the guests at Simon's house (Lk 7:49), the disciples (Lk 8:25), Herod (Lk 9:7) and even Jesus himself (Lk 9:18).

While Moessner makes a correlation between Moses and Jesus in Luke 9:1-50, Culpepper sees it as a section the narrator uses to depict the Messiah as the Son of man. Luke 9:18-22, a part of this micro narrative, is not part of the question relating to Jesus' identity, but should be seen as part of Jesus' ministry in Jerusalem (Culpepper 1995:192). He further follows Nolland (1989b:454) in considering Luke 9:18-22 as a dependent sub-unit of Luke 9:18-27, where Luke 9:18-22 serves as a mere preparation for Luke 9:23-27 (Nolland 1989b:454, Culpepper 1995:198).

2.3.1.5 Jack Dean Kingsbury

Kingsbury, as Culpepper, traces the question of Jesus' identity in Luke from as early as Luke 5:21, concluding that Luke's intention is clear in his eagerness to see Jesus' identity legitimated. This legitimation comes in Luke 9:18-22, where Jesus is finally identified by Peter as the Christ of God (Kingsbury 1985:101). Luke 9:18-22 reveals Jesus' identity in two sets of

responses. In the first set, Jesus could be John the Baptist, Elijah, or one of the prophets of old. In the second set, he is the Messiah and the Son of man.

The Messiah-title, according to Kingsbury (1985:100), plays a more important role in Luke than in Matthew and Mark,³¹ and the misunderstanding of this title by the characters in Luke is the source of conflict in Luke. This conflict that arose around the understanding of this title is also the axis on which the plot of Luke is built (Kingsbury 1997a:5) – the moment that the Messiah-title in Luke is identified with the one that has to suffer (the Son of man), the conflict points forward to its climax in the crucifixion of Jesus.³² This is also the point of view of Tyson (1983:319): Luke 9:22 (where the Messiah is identified as the Son of man) points forward to the climax of the conflict in Luke. From this verse the understanding of Jesus as the Son of man dominates and provides an orientation for the rest of the gospel (Tyson 1983:319).

2.3.2 The narrative context of Luke 9:18-22 within the structure of Luke's narrative

As indicated above, Fitzmyer (1981:134) and Culpepper (1995:10) divide the narrative structure of Luke into four sections, that is, the prologue and infancy narrative (Lk 1:1-2:52), preparation and ministry in Galilee (Lk 3:1-9:50), Jesus' journey to Jerusalem and ministry in Jerusalem (Lk 9:51-21:38), and Jesus' passion, resurrection and ascension (Lk 22:1-24:53). Fitzmyer is also of the opinion that the prologue and infancy narratives can be considered as the introduction to the Gospel, which means that the narrative structure can be delimited to three sections. Edwards (1981:29) takes the same point of departure as Fitzmyer (excluding the prologue and the infancy narrative) and divides the Gospel into three sections of almost equal length: Jesus' ministry in the surrounding of the lake of Galilee (Lk 3:1-9:50), Jesus' journey to Jerusalem (Lk 9:51-19:27); and Jesus' teaching, arrest, crucifixion and resurrection in Jerusalem (Lk 19:28-24:53). He is further of the opinion that Luke 22:1-24:53 can be considered as not being part of Jesus' teaching, which reduces the narrative structure to two sections, Luke 3:1-9:50 and Luke

³¹ This claim of Kingsbury can be disputed, since of the thirty-eight times that the Synoptic gospels mention the title of Messiah, Matthew alone has eighteen occurrences, Mark eight and Luke twelve.

³² Based on this interpretation, Kingsbury (1991:99) defines leadership in Luke in terms of the cross.

9:51-21:38. When one focuses on the geography of Luke's narrative, Culpepper proposes yet another division of Luke's narrative, namely Jesus in Galilee (Lk 4:14-9:50), *en route* to Jerusalem (Lk 9:51-19:27), and Jesus in Jerusalem (Lk 19:28-21:38).

Fitzmyer (1981:137, 192), as indicated above, locates Luke 9:18-22 (as part of the smaller unit of Lk 9:7-36, called "Who is this?") within the macro-context of Luke 3:1-9:50. Luke 9:18-22 thus stands at the very centre of Luke's salvation history (see also Edwards 1981:33). Culpepper (1995:192), on the other hand, considers Luke 9:18-22 as a dependent sub-unit of Luke 9:18-27, with Luke 9:18-22 serving as a mere preparation for Luke 9:23-27 (see also Nolland 1989b:454). Luke 9:18-22 is, according to Culpepper (1995:198), structured in two parts: Luke 9:18-20 and Luke 9:21-22. The first part (Lk 9:18-20) contains two questions relating to Jesus' identity, and four answers to these two questions. In the second part (Lk 9:21-22) Jesus charges his disciples not to diffuse the information about his identity, and gives a reason why they should not, that is, because the Son of man is going to suffer (his first prediction of his passion in Luke). Culpepper considers Peter's response "(You are) the Christ of God" as the climax of Luke 9:18-22 since it is clearly the only correct answer to Jesus' questions in Luke 9:18 and 20. This implies that Jesus considered the responses of the crowd to his question in Luke 9:18 as inadequate and misleading (Culpepper 1995:198). Luke 9:23-27, the remaining part of the sub-unit Luke 9:18-27, consists of Jesus' teaching on discipleship. This teaching on discipleship, according to Culpepper (1995:198), flows from Peter's declaration on the identity of Jesus. Peter's declaration thus enabled Jesus to address his disciples on the consequences of discipleship.

Nolland (1989a:361; 1989b:457) identifies two important sections in Luke's gospel, Luke 8:1-9:20 and Luke 9:21-50. He titles the first section *itinerant preaching with the twelve and the women* (Nolland 1989a:361), and the second *making ready for the trip to Jerusalem* (Nolland 1989b: 457). Nolland's structure clearly indicates that Luke 9:18-22 is not considered being a cohesive sub-unit, since Luke 9:18-20 belongs to his first section, while Luke 9:21-22 belongs to the second. Thus, although there is a link between

Luke 9:20 and Luke 9:21, the verses are not considered to be part of the same sub-unit.

Contrary to Culpepper, Plummer (1981:245) and Bovon (2002:363) understand Luke 9:18-22 as an independent sub-unit in Luke. Plummer sees Luke 9:18-22 as a sub-unit within the unit of Jesus' departure to Jerusalem (Lk 9:1-50). Contrary to Fitzmyer and Nolland, he analyses Luke 9:18-22 as an independent passage without a stated or an implied connection with any other passage in Luke (Plummer 1981:245). This is also Bovon's understanding of Luke 9:18-22: Luke 9:18-22 is an independent sub-unit divided into two smaller parts, namely Luke 9:18-20 and Luke 9:21-22. While Peter's declaration serves as the conclusion of the first part, the prediction of Jesus' death introduces the second part. For him there is a close relationship between Jesus' command to silence and the prediction of his passion (Bovon 2002:4). He further opines that up to Luke 9:8 the narrator prepares his readers to understand Jesus' messianic identity that is fully disclosed in Luke 9:22. Contrary to Mark's gospel, the disciples now know Jesus' identity before he approaches his death. Peter's response, however, is still inadequate – instead of approving it, Jesus goes further by adding to Peter's answer: Jesus is the Son of man (Bovon 2002:362).

2.3.3 Summary

From the above, the following is clear: Almost all Lukan scholars agree that Luke 9:18-22 is situated within the context of Jesus' Galilean ministry. Secondly, most Lukan scholars analyze Luke 9:18-22 as part of identified macro narratives in Luke, or in terms of its function in Luke's narrative as a whole.³³ An analysis of the structure of Luke is thus being used as a guide that facilitates the understanding of the function and meaning of Luke 9:18-22 in the gospel. Thirdly, only a few Lukan scholars identify Luke 9:18-22 as an

³³ According to Tuckett (1997:18) much has not been done on the narrative structure of Luke when compared to similar works on the other synoptic gospels, especially in Mark (see Tuckett 1997:18). Evans justifies this disparity in the study of Luke with the fact that Luke's sources have not been as available as those of Mark (Evans 1995:18). Scholars also are not unanimous in their appreciation of the research done in Luke. Fitzmyer, for example, affirms that no other single author in the New Testament has occupied scholars as Luke-Acts (Fitzmyer 1981:3). Fitzmyer is certainly right; but what he fails to realise is that when such work is carried out on Luke, more emphases are laid on the *Acts of the Apostles*.

independent micro narrative in the Gospel. No specific analysis of Luke 9:18-22 as a micro narrative in Luke's gospel, however, has thus far been undertaken. Finally, Luke 9:18-22 is seen as crucial for the understanding of Jesus' identity and mission. Luke 9:18-22 thus occupies a very important position in Luke. All of this necessitates a rethinking of the narrative structure of Luke, as well as the specific narrative place and function of Luke 9:18-22 within the macro-context of Luke.

2.4 JESUS AND LEADERSHIP IN LUKE 9:18-22

No study of leadership *per se* with reference to Luke 9:18-22 has yet been undertaken in Lukan scholarship. Horrell (1999), however, has treated leadership in Luke-Acts, while Kee (2002) has evaluated leadership in the early church.

2.4.1 David G Horrell

Horrell (1999:309) has studied leadership from a social-scientific perspective, focusing on itinerant and resident leadership, two leadership patterns he identifies in the period of early Christianity.³⁴ His study *inter alia* shows that the transfer of leadership from the itinerant leaders to resident leaders was accompanied by social transformation and change (see also Moxnes 2001), which went along with conflict and opposition, influenced by the "household codes". The authority of resident leaders most probably was legitimated by these codes³⁵ (see 1 Tm 3:4-11). *Patres familiarum* like Philemon, Apphia and Archippus, for example, occupied powerful positions because they hosted churches (Phlm 1-2).

Horrell (1999:320) holds that itinerant leaders remained the locomotives of power and authority in the early church. Using the leadership model of

³⁴ These two types of leadership differed one from the other in that, itinerant leaders were considered as those ones that moved from place to place in order to evangelise (e.g., Paul, Barnabas, Apollos, James and Peter). Resident leaders were those who were located in particular communities over which they exercised leadership (Horrell 1999:312). It is, however, not that easy to say whether some leaders of the Jerusalem church were itinerant or resident leaders, like the case of Prisca and Aquila (Rm 16:3-5, Act 18:2-3), and Phoebe (Rm 16:1-2), Gaius (Rm 16:23), Stephanas the householder (1 Cor 16:15-18) and Philemon.

³⁵ These codes were also imbued with injustice because they were male chauvinist, conservative and served the interest of the leaders.

Theissen, he explains how the itinerant models of leadership created conflict within communities. Itinerant leaders either worked in order to support themselves, or they remained dependent on the hospitality of their host congregations (Theissen, in Horrell 1999:311). The latter option was dangerous, since itinerant leaders could abuse and take advantage of any situation, an attitude that could be a source of conflict between the itinerant/resident leaders and the host community (Horrell 1999:320).

Another source of conflict was when itinerant leaders left the communities they founded, but still, remained very influential (like Paul). Weber describes three types of legitimate domination: rational-legal, traditional and charismatic (Weber 1968:212-301). According to Horrell, it was routine that charismatic leaders (like Paul) in many instances became traditional, and this was a source of conflict. Resident leaders also had influence, and in many cases their leadership was unquestioned (Horrell 1999:328). In other cases resident leaders did not have the legitimation of itinerant leaders that created a specific community. In the case of Colossians and Ephesians the traditional leaders of these communities most probably used the household codes to legitimize their leadership pattern and cement their power (Horrell 1999:331). Equally, they misused their positions to write the epistles of Colossians and Ephesians in Paul's name (Horrell 1999:334). This is a typical example of how some leaders use their position of power to enact laws that can guarantee, reinforce and sustain their power for as long as possible.

2.4.2 Howard Clark Kee

Kee's (2002) sociological study on leadership focuses on leadership in the early church. According to Kee, leadership in the early church (see, e.g., 1 Tim 3:1-3 and 1 Pet 2:9) was understood in terms of Paul's prescription in 1 Corinthians 12:28: "And God has appointed in the church first apostles, second prophets, third teachers, then workers of miracles, then healers, helpers, administrators, speakers in various kinds of tongues". His study especially focuses on how each of these offices of leadership – apostles, prophets, teachers, elders and helpers – functioned in the early church. His conclusion is that the role of these offices of leadership was to ensure

continuity between the activities of the early church and that of Jesus (Kee 2002:350).

2.5 JESUS AND CONFLICT IN LUKE

2.5.1 Joseph B Tyson

Tyson (1983:304) begins his study of conflict in Luke by criticising form criticism and redaction criticism for only concentrating on selected material in the gospels, rather than treating them as cohesive literary works. He sees his literary analysis of conflict in Luke as a correction of previous historical-critical approaches to the Gospel (Tyson 1983:305). According to Tyson (1983:313), Luke is a well-directed narrative (an orderly and chronologically presentation of Jesus' ministry) driven by the theme of conflict (Tyson 1983:314, see also Kingsbury 1997a:5). Conflict in Luke, he further argues, develops in four stages: anticipation of conflicts, early conflicts, conflict in the temple, and climactic conflict.

Already at the beginning of the Gospel (Lk 1:5-2:52) the reader is alerted to the conflict that will follow when, in the *Magnificat* (Lk 1:52-54), the reversal of the social status of Mary is announced (see also Malina & Neyrey 1991a:97). Mary's prediction is an indication of class conflict because position and power are reversed. This prediction is followed with the *Benedictus* which foretells the release from enemies (Lk 1:68-69). Zechariah's prediction is an indication of conflict(s) between systems (see also Boulding 1957:122). The third prediction is that of Simeon in the *Nunc Dimittis* (Lk 2:34-35), in which Jesus is described as a future source of conflict. Jesus will cause the fall and the rise of many people, even piercing hearts (of Mary), if it becomes necessary. These three predictions, according to Tyson, are then rounded off by John's preparatory messages for Jesus' mission and his confrontation with Herod.

The early conflicts (Lk 4:1-19:27) begin with the confrontation between Jesus and the devil. This conflict at a non-human level (see Kingsbury 1991:79) is a test of Jesus' strength (Tyson 1983:316). This is followed by the narrative of Jesus' activity in the synagogue in Nazareth (Lk 4:16-30). The question of the Nazarenes on the identity of Jesus (Lk 4:22) is the result of surprise, not a question of opposition (Tyson 1983:317). The dialogue between Jesus and those in the synagogue, however, is full of controversy,

conflict and tension. Jesus predicts that he will, *inter alia*, violate the Torah, especially through healing. As such, his predictions are an attack on the Pharisees and the scribes as representatives of the Jewish elite. As a result of this controversy, they want to kill him, but do not succeed.

The conflict in the temple (Lk 19:45-48) initiates the series of Jerusalem controversies, which earlier have been foreshadowed by Jesus' rejection in the Samaritan village (Lk 9:53; Tyson 1983:320). In his conflict with the chief priests, Jesus publicly challenges their authority and continues to challenge them in his teachings, as he had done earlier with the Pharisees. In Luke 20:1-8 the temple becomes a battlefield of the conflict between the ideologies of Jesus and the religious leaders when Jesus engages them into a question-and-answer session (Tyson 1983:322). Jesus' authority and leadership is now constantly questioned, because the chief priests have been challenged in their very office.

In the last phase of conflict in Luke (Lk 22:1-23:56), Tyson (1983:319) emphasizes the importance of the temple teaching (Lk 20-21) in the development of conflict in Luke's narrative. In Jerusalem the main opponents of Jesus are the members of the Sanhedrin, consisting of the chief priests, scribes, elders and some of the Sadducees. He acknowledges that Lk 9:22 points to the climactic moment in conflict in Luke because it sets the proper agenda of conflicts as has been predicted in the early part of the gospel and clearly defines Jesus' opponents. He also observes that, in the early conflicts, Jesus' opponents are not as malevolent as is the case with the chief priests who systematically want to have Jesus killed. The Pharisees, on the other hand, also opposed Jesus, but quite often protected him from being killed (see Luke 13:31).

Tyson's understanding of conflict in Luke as a conflict between systems (see again the *Magnificat* and *Benedictus*), ties with Boulding's (1957:122) definition of conflict as a clash between incomprehensive systems. According to Boulding (1957:129), Jesus as an individual constitutes a "system". This "system" is one of the four "systems" that are involved in the conflict in Luke: Jesus, the system of the Roman aristocracy, the system of the Jewish elite, and that of the Jewish peasantry.

2.5.2 Jack Dean Kingsbury

Kingsbury (1991) is also of the opinion that the story of Jesus in Luke is primarily a story of conflict. He identifies two kinds of conflict in Luke, namely supra-human and human conflict. The first kind of conflict Jesus is involved in the narrative is the supra-human, when the devil questions his identity. The second is the conflict between Jesus and humans, namely the disciples and the religious authorities (the most important conflict in the Gospel). The conflict between Jesus and the disciples comes from the disciples' spiritual immaturity. They are unable to deduce Jesus' identity from his works. On the other hand, the conflict between Jesus and the religious authorities simmers around the question of who is ruling God's people (Kingsbury 1991:79, 100). At the end of Luke's narrative the populace in Jerusalem also becomes a part of this conflict when they conspire with Pilate to kill Jesus.³⁶

Cassidy (1993:150) has commented on the work of Kingsbury's from the perspective of the "Roman realities" described in the gospel. In Kingsbury's thought the Roman elite are not to be considered as one of Jesus' opponents because no confrontation between Jesus and them is described in the Gospel. Jesus' preaching on the new kingdom and his salvific work, however, had such major implications for Roman rule that the Romans could not simply ignore it. Also, the main reason for the Jews in expecting a messiah was the Roman oppression. "Any study of conflict in Luke will remain out of focus unless a systematic treatment of Jesus' conflict with the Roman order is integrated into the overall analysis" (Cassidy 1993:151).

Cassidy also criticises Kingsbury's depiction of the religious authorities. Kingsbury does not make a distinction between, on the one hand, Jesus' conflict with the Pharisees and the scribes in Galilee, and on the other hand, his conflict with the temple priests, the elites or elders and the Roman governor in Jerusalem. The reason why the religious authorities opposed Jesus also entails more than just the question of who is ruling God's people. They also opposed Jesus because he took a stance against religious abuse

³⁶ There are, according to Kingsbury (1991:120), also positive characters in Luke that embody an attitude other than that of the religious leaders, namely Zechariah (Lk 1:5), Jairus (Lk 8:41), and Joseph of Arimathea (Lk 23:50-51). Kingsbury (1991:79) is also of the opinion that the crowd (λαο&j/ο!x1οj) never opposes Jesus. They remain well disposed towards Jesus until he appears before Pilate, and even then they took concerted stand against him (see Luke 23:4, 13-24).

that was condoned by the Roman authorities (Cassidy 1993:151). He also differs from Kingsbury's point of view that the conflict surrounding Jesus was at its most acute in Jerusalem (Cassidy 1993:151).

2.5.3 Michael Desjardins

While Kingsbury's analysis focuses on a description of the different conflicts in Luke, Desjardins (1997b) analyses these conflicts having in mind the question why Jesus faced opposition in his ministry. His conclusion is that Jesus himself was the main cause of his crises – Jesus suffered rejection because he occasionally condoned and incited violence (Desjardins 1997:72). Jesus, for example, permitted his disciples to carry weapons (Lk 22:36), never criticised soldiers for their choice of profession, and used military terms such as “swords” (Lk 2:35; 21:24; 22:36, 38, 49, 52) and “armour” (Lk 11:22). Jesus' tone was also provocative which caused people to rise against him.³⁷

Desjardins (1997:75) also understands the way in which Jesus entered Jerusalem, as well as his attitude in the temple, as highly provocative. These two events that preceded Jesus' arrest provoked the crowd to be hostile towards him and to support his crucifixion. Desjardins' understanding of how the Jews conceived the period of Passover also supports his view that Jesus' entry into Jerusalem was provocative and insulting to both the crowd and Jewish religion in general:

To be sure, the entry is said to be non-violent, but its historical context has to be kept in mind in order to appreciate the full force of such an action. Passover, for Jews, symbolized freedom – the escape of the Israelites from Egypt centuries before, and since that time, freedom from oppression from all foreign oppression. Emotion ran high during this festival, a time when all Jews tried to visit Jerusalem. Indeed, emotions ran high that the Romans would keep the high priest's sacred vestments locked up, lest the people rise up and declare him their political leader.

Desjardins (1997:75)

According to Desjardins, Jesus thus disrupted the serenity of the Passover solemnity, an action that could not be tolerated in view of the respect the Jews had for this important feast. By causing a great crowd to follow him

³⁷ To substantiate this understanding of Jesus, Desjardins (1997:72) refers to the several “woes” of Jesus aimed at the Pharisees and the lawyers (see Lk 11:37-52), as well as the parable of Tenants (Lk 20:1-19).

singing, Jesus disrespected this Jewish festival, which was one of the most important memorials of God's goodness.

Desjardins is further of the opinion that Jesus was opposed because, he involved himself in societal issues that were of no concern to him (see also France 1990:22). He mingled with those who were considered as outsiders and did not operate in conformity with the goals and interests of his opponents. His identity revealed in his message, was an open challenge to the *status quo*. He challenged the social order by questioning societal "normalities" such as injustice, oppression, exploitation and racism, and stood for an alternative that consisted of justice, love, equality and peace. This attitude of Jesus – as a fellow Jew – caused him to lose his credibility in the eyes of his contemporaries and because of this, he was considered an opponent. Finally, Desjardins holds that Jesus was rejected because he caused family disunity by discouraging his disciples from being faithful to their families (see Lk 8:19-21; 9:57-62; 12:51-53).

Jesus, however, sometimes took a totally different approach. He responded to physical agitation with persuasive arguments and miracles, and, in spite of the oppressive nature of the political structure of his time, did not preach armed revolt, but rather advocated a non-violent attitude: "No more of this" (Lk 22:51). Jesus also did not fall in the trap of those who saw him as a political messiah and therefore wanted to make him a king. Finally, Jesus preached that violence is ineffective in altering God's control over human history.

2.5.4 Summary

The above analyses testify to the fact that even though much has not been said and done on conflict in Luke's gospel, Jesus' mission of salvation involved opposition from both his fellow Jews and the Roman aristocracy. Several reasons account for such an atmosphere. The first is that Jesus was opposed because he fought against social injustice. In this respect, Malina & Neyrey (1991a:99) report that those in power (e.g., the religious authorities) perpetrated injustice by labelling and thus marginalising those who did not

adhere to the accepted social norms of the day.³⁸ Knight (1998: 181), in his narrative reading of Luke, also portrays an ethical Jesus whose principle of humility and service stand at the ethical heart of the gospel. Such an ethical stand symbolised a reversal of social status. This, of course, constituted a breeding ground for conflict. Secondly, Jesus was opposed because he stood against religious abuse, the down play of women, social status and the misuse of political structures (Cassidy 1980:35; Desjardins 1997:78).

Thirdly, first-century Palestine was essentially a world of conflict on at least three levels: political, socio-economical and religious (Cassidy 1980:124, Malina & Neyrey 1991a:98; Van Eck 2009a:24). Politically Palestine was under the Roman rule; economically an inequitable distribution of resources existed (Desjardins 1997:78); and religious exploitation took place especially through the temple system and its officials. France (1990:22) and Desjardins (1997:75) argue that Jesus was responsible for the problems that befell him, because he addressed these conflicts in an arrogant manner when he declared that “I have come to bring fire on earth” (Lk 12:49). Through his words and deeds Jesus turned the accepted conventions of his time upside-down (France 1990:22). He was provocative, violent, impolite and critical (Desjardins 1997:75).

Fourthly, many scholars agree with France and Desjardins that Jesus was opposed because of his behaviour. He was considered as one who constantly violated accepted societal rules, and therefore was rendered as a social deviant (Malina 1991:100). His behaviour was seen as susceptible to societal norms since he stood against the interest and ideology of both the Roman aristocracy and the Jewish elite. Van Eck therefore is correct when he argues that the conflict between Jesus and his opponents is to be understood in terms of incompatible and opposing interests, goals, values and expectations (Van Eck 2009a:9). The conflict between Jesus and his opponents thus can be categorised as “mutually exclusive conflict” (see Jessie 1957:112).

The historical Jesus’ main opponents most probably were the Roman aristocracy, the Jewish elite and the peasantry (Malina & Neyrey 1991a:104; Van Eck 2009a:6). This is also the case in Luke’s narrative. The crowd in

³⁸ In Luke there are both positive and negative labels. Negative labels are names by which people are ostracised from the normal (accepted) societal arrangements of society, and Jesus, according to Malina, fought against these stigmatising labels (see § 3.4.2.3.2).

Luke, however, should also be seen as opposing the ministry of Jesus.³⁹ As for the outcome of the conflict between Jesus and his opponents in Luke, Cunningham (1997) observes that conflict and opposition played a very negative role in Jesus' ministry. In this regard it will be argued that even if this may be the case, Jesus' conflict with his opponents not only created awareness to the many social injustices in his times, but also led to positive change.

2.6 RESEARCH GAP

Many scholars agree with Tyson (1983), Evans (1995) and Tuckett (1997) that so far not much attention has been given to the study of Luke 9:18-22 in particular and Luke's gospel in general as has been the case with the other Synoptic gospels (2.3.3).⁴⁰ One of the main reasons for this fact is the assumption that Luke is in part dependent on Matthew and Mark. Notwithstanding, on several occasions, Luke gives himself a large freedom of literary movement in the gospel (Danker 1979:108; Esler 1989) because of the *Sondergut*-sources he used in the compilation of his gospel (Awoh

³⁹ Although Kingsbury (1991:79) contests this view, the main problem has been that of not making an appropriate distinction between $\sigma\lambda\lambda\omicron\gamma$ (crowd) and $\lambda\alpha\omicron\&j$ (people). Quite often both have been used as synonyms. This may also stem from the fact that Nestle-Aland sometimes falls in the same error of translation (see Lk 8:35, 37; 13:17). This idea will further be developed in § 5.5.2.

⁴⁰ Farmer (1983), in his study of the Synoptic gospels, gives more attention to Mark and Matthew. Of the twenty-one articles that focus on the Synoptic gospels eight are on generalities; six are on Mark, four on Matthew and only three on Luke. Moessner undertakes a study of Luke 9:1-50, but concentrates on a comparison between Moses and Jesus focusing on the place that each of them occupies in the history of Israel as prophets of different epochs. In his analysis of the passion narrative in Luke's gospel, Karris (1985) focuses on factors related to the crucifixion of Jesus such as injustice, but omits a critical study on Luke 9:18-22 which is a springboard to the passion story (Godet 1976:408). Kingsbury (1985:95) considers the theme of salvation as depicted in Jesus' name: "God is salvation", as an important theme in Luke. He further emphasises on key terms used by Jesus in his proclamations, namely $\delta\eta\&g\eta\sigma\alpha\iota$ (Lk 1:1) and $\kappa\eta\rho\&s\sigma\epsilon\&i\eta$ (Lk 8:39). Unfortunately, he shuns Luke 9:18-22, which is the starting point to the fulfilment of the mission which Jesus incarnates in these proclamations. BurrIDGE, in *Four gospels, one Jesus: A synoptic reading*, treats the theme of conflict in both Mark and Matthew, but analyses the theme of "bearer of burdens" as the domineering theme of Luke's gospel (BurrIDGE 2005:101-131). Esler has done a tremendous scholarly contribution on Luke-Acts (1989). However, from the point of view of its content, it is sometimes difficult to decipher issues which are particular only to Luke's gospel. The above interest shown in scholarly research is imbalanced, considering the fact that, comparatively, Luke has more material peculiar to him: 38%, as compared to Mark (2%) and Matthew 17% (Plummer 1981:xxxv). Secondly, stories from one gospel cannot explain events in another gospel because no two stories can be reported in the same way by two different reporters (Knight 1998:28). Each narrated Synoptic story is autonomous and can be appreciated only in terms of its autonomous account.

2003:75). Moreover, approaches to the study of Luke show that no particular study has been done on Luke 9:18-22 as an independent sub-unit within Luke's gospel in general.

Even when Luke 9:18-22 is mentioned, the popular approach has been the traditional historical-critical approach. Conflict in Luke is social, cultural, economical and political in nature, that is, societal (Neyrey 1991a). Such studies therefore need to be complemented by approaching conflicts in Luke from the perspective of the social world of Luke. Malina & Neyrey (1991a:97) confirm that Luke tells the story within the background of conflict, rejection and hostility. The social scientific critical approach will therefore be a complement to the historical approach that had been carried out in the study of Luke because it will lead the "why" questions into the understanding and interpretation of these conflicts.

The failure to consider Luke 9:18-22 as an independent sub-unit within Luke's gospel has often led to its misinterpretation. From an exegetical point of view, Peter's confession has often been considered as the climax of Luke 9:18-22. This appreciation has given an inappropriate attention to the response from the crowds and the implication or the meaning of the name Messiah. Source criticism and redaction criticism seem to enhance a better understanding of the text as they assist to situate the climax of Luke 9:18-22 on Jesus' prediction of his death. The particularity of Luke in this narrative lies on the first and the last verses. The first verse serves as context for the last verse. The prediction of Jesus' suffering and subsequent death and resurrection would not have been an easy pill to swallow, hence the spiritual preparation.

So far, sociological (even historical and literary) studies of Luke's gospel have failed to connect Jesus' identity to the question of conflict and leadership. Instead, such studies have been limited to a description of leadership functions within the early church, without any further evaluation (see § 2.4). Also, where the title "Christ" has been studied, emphasis has been more on the name "Christ", rather than on the implications of the name. A study of conflict, which neglects leadership (see Tyson 1983) in Luke, misses the understanding of the gospel altogether. The name "Christ" is synonymous to "leadership" and "conflict".

In the same vein the question about Jesus' identity has traditionally been answered in terms of Jesus' question addressed to the disciples concerning the perception of the crowds. For example, the common response that Christians know is that of the clergy, either from Sunday school classes or from the pulpit. The question of Jesus' identity is actual and urgent, demanding an individual response: "Who do I say that the Christ is?" This study therefore seeks to see the possibility of individualising the response to the question: "Who is the Christ?" Copan in an attempt to answer this question has dwelt on the question: *Who was Jesus?* (Copan 2001).⁴¹ In other words, the responses from the crowds open the way for a discussion on relevant theology⁴², that is, a theology from the perspective of the people. The knowledge of who Jesus was should inspire present day Christians in formulating their faith based upon their personal encounter with Jesus. This makes the question of Jesus' identity more relevant.

The quest for relevant theology is the fourth research gap to be addressed in this study. Just as Esler (1989:24) sees interrelatedness between Luke's theology and the social and political pressures of his community, the intention of this study is to create awareness for theologians (especially African theologians) to engage in the development of "participatory theology". This is theology derived from, and not theology imported into the social realities of life; it is a theology by the people through their interaction with and response to God's word as addressed in Scripture. Relevant theology is not theology in defence of something (apologetic theology); it is theology derived from the social, political, economic and religious thirst of the

⁴¹ Copan's work is a dialogue between Christianity and Judaism based on the understanding of who Jesus was, and in defining the place that he occupies in the both religions. This debate is very important at the level of inter-religious dialogue. However, for it to be complete, it needs to address the second question on the person of the Christ because the question about "who was Jesus?" is more historical than actual. A study of past events that does not enhance life in the present and project the possibilities of growth and progress in the future is more or less irrelevant for twenty-first century Christianity.

⁴² Relevant theology is theology reconstructed from people's personal experiences. Pobee (1986) refers to this method of reconstructing theology as a "do-it-by-yourself theology". Jesus was probably conscious of this fact. That is why at a certain point in time; he wished to know what the crowds thought about him. This method did not only lead to the legitimation of his identity; but it also enabled him to appreciate the crowds' response of his ministry. Peter's response, for example, was as a result of a personal experience, which should not be considered in opposition to the crowds' perception of who Jesus was.

community (“legitimated” or “participatory” theology; Esler 1989:16). The relevance of investigating the African response to the question “Who is the Christ?” is an attempt into such a venture. It is a serious hiatus for theologians not to consider the contribution of a given context to theology.

As a corrective to the traditional way of studying Biblical texts this study also intends to move from the socio-cultural context of Luke 9:18-22 to its application in the context of African readers. Hence, there will be a move from a social scientific study of Luke 9:18-22 to a contextualised study: the African context. This will also mean an examination of some African socio-cultural values that breed conflict. This will culminate with a search for the African response to the question: “Who is the Christ for the African?”

The objective of this study is to diagnose, explain, interpret and narrow the chasm between leadership and conflict within the African society, and enable leaders not to dread conflict but to use conflict when it occurs, as a positive ingredient to societal change and innovation. Van Eck (2009a:9) decries the fact that conflict has mostly been viewed as something negative (Cunningham 1997, Desjardin 1997). Certainly, “good news” should be understood in normal cases to mean welfare. This study will try to open another way of understanding “good news” as something negative that can be used positively. It is in this light that Luke will be analysed in the last chapter as: *The gospel or the good news of “conflict” according to Luke.*