Appendix A

Analysis of the Chiasm in Luke’s Journey Narrative

A rigorous process was used to identify and lend support to the 25-element chiasm embedded in Luke’s Journey Narrative. This appendix (and exhibit A1) will

1. describe how the Journey Narrative is consistent with the general characteristics of a chiasm;
2. identify and provide empirical support for the specific breakpoints and 12 pairs of twinned passages in the chiasm;
3. identify and provide empirical support for the four-phase process model embedded in the chiasm; and
4. provide corroborating evidence from other parts of Luke’s writing and the first century that lends support to the model.

Confirmation That Luke’s “Journey Narrative” Meets the General Criteria of Being a Chiasm

A number of scholars have developed criteria for evaluating the presence of chiasms,¹ which can be summarized into five general characteristics of a chiasm. Luke’s Journey Narrative clearly satisfies these five general criteria:

1. Scholars agree that the structure of the Journey Narrative text is problematic (e.g., it is clearly not structured in the form of a geographical journey).
2. Other biblical commentators (including those not interested in chiasms) have called attention to parallelisms in the two halves of the Travel Narrative text (e.g., this is most evident in the two parallel references to “What must I do to inherit eternal life?” found both in both Luke 10:25ff and in Luke 18:18ff).
3. Scholars agree that the Journey Narrative chiasm is much longer than a three-part ABA format.²
4. The midpoint passage of the Journey Narrative chiasm is worthy to be considered a climax in light of its theological significance (the midpoint foreshadows Jesus’ death in Jerusalem, and encapsulates Jesus’ countercultural message and others’ opposition to it, Luke 13:31–35; “Yet today, tomorrow, and the next day I must be on my way. Because it is impossible for a prophet to be killed outside of Jerusalem.’ Jerusalem, Jerusalem, the city that kills the prophets and stones those who are sent to it!’” Luke 13:33,34a).
5. The theme at the midpoint—with its focus on journeying to Jerusalem—is also prominent in the first and last part of the chiasm (the chiasm starts with “When
the days drew near for him to be taken up, he set his face to go to Jerusalem” Luke 9:51; and finishes with “After he said this, he went on ahead, going up to Jerusalem” Luke 19:28).

**Identification of Specific Breakpoints and Parallel Passages of the Journey Narrative Chiasm**

Having established that it is plausible that the Journey Narrative is written in the form of a chiasm, it is appropriate to apply a set of three criteria developed by scholars to identify the breakpoints and the parallel “elements” within a chiasm. The first step in this process was to create a printed copy of the Journey Narrative with headings and chapter and verse markers removed, and then providing it to each of five researchers familiar with chiastic structures who were asked to independently read the Journey Narrative and to identify its natural breakpoints (e.g., including change of location, change of audience, repetition of certain transition words, use of summarizing remarks to signal the end of a sections, and so on). This helped to meet the criterion that the overall text has been divided into its separate passages at natural breakpoints that would be agreed upon even by others who do not argue that the Journey Narrative text is written in chiastic form (i.e., the proposed chiasm does not violate the structure of the text). These breakpoints were then recorded onto a spreadsheet, which provided the basis for the next step in the process.

Based on these breakpoints, and attending to thematic similarities in possible parallel passages that constitute the chiasm, the lead researcher then developed a first draft of the possible chiastic structure of the Journey Narrative. This draft, which raised uncertainties and questions and variations, was then provided to the other researchers who eventually met to make final decisions about how to subdivide the Journey Narrative chiasm into its separate passages. At the end of the process the researchers were surprised to find that each half of the chiasm had 12 passages (this was a “pleasant” surprise because “12” is a recurring biblical number, as in, e.g., the 12 Apostles of Christ and the 12 tribes of Israel).³ While it may seem unimaginable to modern readers that people two millennia ago would have been sensitive to finding 12 sets of parallel passages in such a long chiastic text, note that it corresponds exactly to the 12 pairs of the 24 letters in the alphabet that students would have learned at that time (which they learned in chiastic form), and that chiasms with 24 “elements” in ancient texts are not unheard of.⁴

With breakpoints established, the next criteria for establishing the existence of a chiasm involves demonstrating that there is similar thematic and/or linguistic content across the paired “twin” passages (i.e., determine whether there are similarities between the first and last passage, between the second and second-last passage, and so on). Each pair was analyzed to identify and document common themes (see table A.1 for a side-by-side analysis of common themes in each chiastic pair). Similarly, each pair was also analyzed for parallels and similarities in linguistic/verbal content (e.g., both use identical catchwords or grammar), aware that these should involve central or dominant imagery or key terminology (i.e., not include trivial or peripheral language) and that these keywords should not be regularly found elsewhere within the overall chiasm.⁵

As a final step to examine the validity of this chiasm, an experiment was designed to test whether “naïve” readers of the chiasm would also place the passages in the same “pairings” as in the proposed chiasm. As described in appendix A1 in greater
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cycle 1: The Samaritan cycle—Managing relationships with cultural outsiders (passages #1–4)</th>
<th>Cycle 6: The salvation cycle—Managing relationships with social outcasts (passages #21–24)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase 1: Problem recognition (Luke 9:51–56)</strong>&lt;br&gt;• Jesus begins his journey to Jerusalem&lt;br&gt;• Jesus sends messengers to a Samaritan village ahead of them to make ready for him&lt;br&gt;• The Samaritans in the village reject the messengers&lt;br&gt;• Two disciples, James and John, ask Jesus whether they should command fire to come down from heaven and consume the Samaritans&lt;br&gt;• Jesus rebukes his disciples for their judgmental attitude toward the Samaritan people</td>
<td><strong>Phase 1: Problem recognition (Luke 19:28–40)</strong>&lt;br&gt;• Jesus prepares to enter Jerusalem&lt;br&gt;• Jesus sends messengers to village ahead of them to ask a man for a donkey to make ready for him&lt;br&gt;• The man in the village accepts the messengers’ request, and Jesus rides the donkey into Jerusalem amid cheering from a multitude of people&lt;br&gt;• The Pharisees ask Jesus to order the people to stop saying things like: “Blessed is the king who comes in the name of the Lord!”&lt;br&gt;• Jesus rebuffs the Pharisees for their judgmental lack of understanding: “I tell you, if these [crowds] were silent, the stones would shout out!”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase 2: Action response (Luke 9:57–10:20)</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Story #1:</strong> Describes people who wish to experiment with following Jesus, but who remain committed to conventional oikos ways&lt;br&gt;• Jesus is on the road&lt;br&gt;• A potential follower says, “I will follow you wherever you go.”&lt;br&gt;• Jesus says he has no oikos: “Foxes have holes, and birds of the air have nests; but the Son of Man has nowhere to lay his head.”&lt;br&gt;• Another potential follower asks to first go back to his oikos and bury his father, but Jesus says “Let the dead bury their own dead” [thus Jesus counters traditional standards of honor]&lt;br&gt;• A third potential follower reverts to traditional oikos norms by saying, “I will follow you, but let me first say farewell to those at my home.”&lt;br&gt;• Jesus says that people who revert back to traditional oikos structures and systems are not fit for the kingdom of God&lt;br&gt;<strong>Story #2:</strong> Jesus sends 70 followers on a mission, providing instruction and correctives, and then appraises the results of this little experiment&lt;br&gt;• Jesus is on his way to Jerusalem [where he will die on the cross]&lt;br&gt;• Jesus appoints 70 followers with a task to prepare others for his arrival&lt;br&gt;• Jesus sends the 70 out in groups of two&lt;br&gt;• Jesus tells the 70 not to bring their purse [money]&lt;br&gt;• The 70 are told to bring peace to others’ oikoi, to cure the sick, and to tell them the KOG is near&lt;br&gt;• Jesus puts contingency plans into place to be used in villages who do not welcome the 70; Jesus notes that villages who reject his followers also thereby reject Jesus and God&lt;br&gt;• The 70 who follow Jesus’ instruction are given authority over the power of the enemy, but villages who reject Jesus’ message will face a judgment (they will be rejected by the one who sent Jesus)</td>
<td><strong>Phase 2: Action response (Luke 19:1–27)</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Story #1:</strong> Describes someone who wishes to experiment with following Jesus, and who implements oikos practices consistent with KOG&lt;br&gt;• Jesus is on the road (entering Jericho)&lt;br&gt;• Zacchaeus follows Jesus wherever he goes as he walks through Jericho&lt;br&gt;• Jesus says he wants to visit Zacchaeus’s oikos&lt;br&gt;“Zacchaeus, hurry and come down [from the perch in that tree]; for I must stay at your house today.”&lt;br&gt;• Observers grumble that Jesus should know better than go the oikos of a sinner [thus Jesus counters traditional standards of honor]&lt;br&gt;• Zacchaeus changes the structures and systems in his oikos, giving half the money to the poor and repaying fourfold anyone who has been defrauded&lt;br&gt;• Jesus says that salvation has come to this countercultural oikos, for the Son of Man has come to seek out and to save the lost&lt;br&gt;<strong>Story #2:</strong> A nobleman sends 10 managers on a mission, providing instruction and correctives, and then appraises the results of this little experiment&lt;br&gt;• A nobleman is on his way to the emperor to get more power for himself&lt;br&gt;• The nobleman appoints ten slaves with a task that will prepare for the nobleman’s return&lt;br&gt;• The nobleman sends his slaves out individually&lt;br&gt;• The man in the village accepts the messengers’ request, and Jesus rides the donkey into Jerusalem amid cheering from a multitude of people&lt;br&gt;• The 70 are told to use their pounds to make money from others’ houses&lt;br&gt;• A contingency plan is put into action by subjects who do not welcome the nobleman’s rule; they travel to Rome to ask the emperor to reject the nobleman’s request for more power&lt;br&gt;• The slaves who obey the nobleman are rewarded with power over cities, but the slaves who refuse to participate in the nobleman’s acquisitive economic power-seeking behavior are impoverished; others who opposed the nobleman are slaughtered</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Continued*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cycle 1: The Samaritan cycle—Managing relationships with cultural outsiders (passages #1–4)</th>
<th>Cycle 6: The salvation cycle—Managing relationships with social outcasts (passages #21–24)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• People traditionally considered to be wise and intelligent, such as prophets and kings, are unable to see the Father because they refuse to see Jesus as the Son</td>
<td>• Most people recognize Jesus’ lineage only as someone who comes from Nazareth, and thus are unable to see him as the Messiah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• It is Jesus’ disciples and the very young who can see that Jesus is the Son, and who are thus able to see the Father</td>
<td>• It is a blind man who can see that Jesus is the merciful Son of David [i.e., the Messiah who will release people from oppressive rulers and ideas]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cycle 2: The new rules for the oikos cycle—Managing relationships within the oikos (passages #5–8)</th>
<th>Cycle 5: The justice cycle—Managing relationships with the social elite (passages #17–20)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• A lawyer asks Jesus “What must I do to inherit eternal life?”</td>
<td>• A certain ruler asks Jesus “What must I do to inherit eternal life?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Jesus poses a counterquestion: What do you read in the law?</td>
<td>• Jesus poses a counterquestion: Why do you call me good? No one is good but God alone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A fivefold response to the original question is offered: “You shall love the Lord your God with: —all your heart, —and with all you soul, —and with all your strength, —and with all you mind; —and you shall love your neighbor as yourself.”</td>
<td>• A fivefold response to the original question is offered: “You know the commandments: —you shall not commit adultery; —you shall not murder; —you shall not steal; —you shall not bear false witness; —honor your mother and father.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The reply from the lawyer—“‘Who is my neighbor?’”—elicits a follow-up response from Jesus</td>
<td>• The reply from the ruler—“‘I have kept all these since my youth’”—elicits a follow-up response from Jesus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A lowly Samaritan who shows mercy does a better job fulfilling the Law than priests and Levites whose adherence to keeping religious purity laws prevents them from helping the needy</td>
<td>• People who choose not to be beholden to traditional oikos structures and systems “get” the kingdom of God and get much more than people with high status within traditional social structures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Two women (Martha and Mary) host Jesus in their house</td>
<td>• Two men (a Pharisee and a tax collector) go to pray in the house of God</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• One woman (Martha) does all the things expected of her (e.g., the tasks of a hostess)</td>
<td>• One man (Pharisee) does all the things expected of him (e.g., fasting, tithing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The other women (Mary) fails to perform her traditional household duties, and instead sits at Jesus’ feet and listens to him</td>
<td>• The other man (tax collector) fails to perform his traditional religious duties, and instead beats his breast and asks God for mercy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The first woman (Martha) notes that she is doing all the housework, and tells Jesus that she would like Mary to join her and help</td>
<td>• The first man (Pharisee) notes that he is doing all the right things, and thanks God that he is not like other people (like the tax collector)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The story has a countercultural ending because Jesus says Mary made a better choice (Martha was too distracted by housework)</td>
<td>• The story has a countercultural ending because Jesus says the humble tax collector went home more justified than the Pharisee (the Pharisee was too busy exalting himself); whoever does not humble themselves as a little child will not enter the KOG</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Jesus teaches his disciples how to pray</td>
<td>• Jesus teaches his disciples about their need to pray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Jesus teaches them a prayer that has four components: i. acknowledge God as holy, head of oikos ii. desire to have everyone’s daily needs met</td>
<td>• Jesus tells a parable about an unjust judge who has four characteristics: i. the judge has no fear of God ii. the judge has no respect for people’s daily needs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Continued*
### Table A.1  Continued

| iii. forgive sin/debts (even though retaining the debt would, in conventional eyes, be just) | iii. the judge grants justice to a widow because she persisted (even though he initially refused) |
| iv. ask to avoid situations where you are tempted to follow conventional norms | iv. the judge wants to avoid situations where he is “worn out” by persistent justice-seekers |
| • People will give bread to persistent neighbors who need it | • Unjust judge granted justice to the persistent widow |
| • Parents give children the needs they ask for | • God grants justice to those who ask for it |

- Jesus heals a mute who begins to speak (and the crowds are amazed)
- Jesus invites exorcists to determine whether healing was by God or Beelzebul
- People ask Jesus for sign that he is from God (versus from Beelzebul ruler of demons)
- Jesus will be a sign for this generation:
  - just as Jonah was a sign for the Ninevites
  - even greater than the sign of the queen of the south found in Solomon
- Contrast between a body full of light (good) versus darkness (bad)

- Jesus tells Pharisees that they care too much about external show (“but inside you are full of greed and wickedness”)
- Jesus identifies six woeful shortcomings of religious leaders’ norms:
  - tithing without practicing justice/love
  - seeking best seats for self rather than seeking to honor others
  - inadvertently dishonoring the dead
  - creating burdensome rules ostensibly to bring out the true goodness in others
  - withholding the key of knowledge
- Ends with observation that the religious leaders took offense at Jesus, cross-examined him, and sought to catch him in something he might say

**Cycle 3: The yeast cycle—Managing relationships regarding the interpretation of Scriptures (passage #9–12)**
- Jesus tells listeners to beware of the yeast (hypocrisy) of the Pharisees: “nothing is secret that will not become known” (Luke 12:2)
- Listeners are told to be accountable: “even the hairs of your head are all counted”
- People who acknowledge Jesus before others will be forgiven [and forgiving]
- Don’t worry about defending your countercultural actions to authorities, the Holy Spirit will teach what you ought to say

**Cycle 4: The benefaction cycle—Managing relationships between patrons and clients (passages #13–16)**
- Jesus tells story about a rich man who was made aware of that his resources were being scattered by the (shrewd) manager
- The manager is called to give an accounting of his actions
- The manager acknowledges that what he must do for others is be forgiving [and forgiven]
- The manager does not worry about how he will defend his countercultural actions to his boss; the boss commends the manager
- No oikos member can serve both God and money; you will either hate one and love the other, or be devoted to one and despise the other

**Continued**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cycle 3: The yeast cycle—Managing relationships regarding the interpretation of Scriptures (passage #9–12)</th>
<th>Cycle 4: The benefaction cycle—Managing relationships between patrons and clients (passages #13–16)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
- Don’t seek to maximize the inheritance money you get from your oikos: “Be on guard against all sorts of greed, for one’s life does not consist in the abundance of possessions.”  
- Jesus tells parable of a householder who hoards up his oikos money for himself  
- Do not worry about your personal wants, but instead ensure that everyone’s needs are met  
- Be ready for the return of the master  
- Woe to the manager who abuses his position, but blessed is the manager who authentically serves the needs of the holistic oikos rather than their own wants | **Phase 2: Action response (Luke 15:1–32)**  
- Any joy that comes from recovering 1 or 10 percent of lost oikos assets, or even keeping all your oikos assets, pales in comparison to the joy in heaven when one sinner repents  
- Jesus tells parable about a son who squanders his oikos inheritance on himself  
- Even foreigners helped the son (who had squandered his resources fulfilling his wants) to meet his basic needs  
- The master was ready for the return of his son  
- Woe to the older son who loyally obeyed all the conventional norms, but even so failed to authentically serve the needs of the holistic oikos rather than his own wants |
- Jesus disrupts conventional views of oikos: “From now on five in one household will be divided, . . . father against son and son against father, mother against daughter and daughter against mother.”  
- Be prepared, read the signs of the KOG just as you read other signs: “He said also to the crowds: When you see a cloud rising in the west, you immediately say, ‘It is going to rain’; and so it happens. And when you see the south wind blowing, you say, ‘There will be scorching heat’; and it happens.”  
- If you fail to make peace with your neighbors, it’ll cost you every last penny  
- A fig tree that does not produce figs is (eventually) cut down | **Phase 3: Changed way of seeing (Luke 14:25–35)**  
- Jesus disrupts conventional views oikos: “Whoever comes to me and does not hate father and mother, wife and children, brothers and sisters, yes, and even life itself, cannot be my disciple.”  
- Be prepared, read the signs of the KOG just as you read other signs: “what king, going out to wage war against another king, will not sit down first and consider whether he is able with ten thousand to oppose the one who comes against him with twenty thousand? If he cannot, then, while the other is still far away, he sends a delegation and asks for the terms of peace.”  
- If you want to become Jesus’ disciple, you must give up all your possessions  
- Salt that does not taste salty is thrown away |
- Jesus heals a crippled women on the sabbath in the synagogue  
- The synagogue leaders becomes indignant, saying such work should not be done on the sabbath  
- Jesus says to them: “Does not each of you on the sabbath untie his ox or his donkey from the manger, and lead it away to give it water?”  
- Do countercultural things like: —plant mustard seeds (weeds) in garden —add yeast (impure) to your dough  
- Jesus likens the KOG to a banquet where “people will come from the east and west, from north and south, and will eat in the kingdom of God. Indeed, some are last who will be first, and some are first who will be last.” | **Phase 4: Institutional change (Luke 14:1–24)**  
- Jesus heals a man with edema (dropsy) on the sabbath in the house of a leading Pharisee  
- When Jesus asked whether it is lawful to cure people on the sabbath, the assembled lawyers and Pharisees refuse to answer  
- Jesus says to them: “If one of you has a child or an ox that has fallen into a well, will you not immediately pull it out on a sabbath day?”  
- Do countercultural things like: —sit beneath your status at a banquet —invite social outcasts to your oikos  
- Jesus likens the KOG to a banquet that includes “the poor, the crippled, the lame, and the blind . . . Then the master said . . . ‘For I tell you none of those who were invited [prior to these outcasts] will taste my dinner.’” |
detail, this experiment involved removing all headings and chapter/verse markings from each of the 24 passages in the chiasm. The first 12 passages were then placed in random order and printed out on 12 separate “cards” numbered from #1 through #12. The last 12 passages were also placed in random order, and printed out on separate cards numbered #13–24. The 30 participants in the study were then asked to find one “match” for each of the first 12 passages from among the second 12 passages. If the passages in the first half of the chiasm were unrelated to the ones in the second half, we would expect them to be matched “correctly” only 8 percent of the time (i.e., one-twelfth). However, on average the participants paired the passages in the way we predicted 47 percent of the time, a statistically significant finding.

These results are striking, especially in light of the conservative nature of our experiment design: (a) our readers did not look at the passages in their original language, so may have missed some clues for matching pairs; (b) our readers were not trained to identify chiasms, and so may have missed some clues for matching; and perhaps most importantly, (c) the passages in our experiment were placed in random order, whereas in the original text readers aware that they are reading a chiasm have the advantage of knowing the sequential ordering of passages, which would have provided even more guidance for connecting the pairs.

Evidence of a Recurring Four-Phase Model

The pairings identified in the chiasm provide a partial explanation for the sequencing of the Journey Narrative passages (i.e., the first passage “matches” the last passage, the second passage matches the second last passage, and so on). However this still does not provide a rationale behind the sequencing of the 12 passages within each half of the chiasm (recall that they do not follow a simple or linear geographic or thematic progression). It seems unlikely that the passages would have been arranged in random order, especially given Luke’s self-identified preoccupation with providing an “orderly account” for his reader (Luke 1:3).7

As it turns out, perhaps the reason it has been difficult to unlock the rationale for the ordering of the passages is because scholars have been using linear and Western ways of reading the text, rather than interpreting it as a cyclical model within a chiastic structure. Perhaps it should not come as a surprise when, upon closer inspection of the Journey Narrative chiasm, its narrative structure can be shown to point to a recurring four-phase process model. Consistent with the criteria to establish a chiasm generally, support for the four-phase process model is evident in word choice, themes, breakpoints, and in the passage that lies at the midpoint of the chiasm.

Keywords and Themes in Each of the Four Phases

Just as use of keywords helps to identify chiastic pairs generally, so also keywords help to identify important themes shared by the six passages that represent each of the four phases in the Journey Narrative. (Note that the keyword analyses were done in Greek, but the English words are reported here for reader-friendliness). To find these keywords the focus was limited to words that are relatively meaningful (e.g., the analysis did not consider common often used words such as “I,” “you,” “he,” “she,” or “we”). Each of the 16 keywords listed in the table A.2 was mentioned an average of 13 times in the Journey Narrative (and not more than 31 times; as a whole this equals about 0.3 percent of the total number of words in the Journey Narrative),
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Keywords, by phase</th>
<th>Number of mentions of keywords in each phase</th>
<th>Frequency ratio = # mentions/# words in phase</th>
<th>Dominance Ratio = frequency in focal phase/frequency other three phases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>Phase 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1a. Disciple/student (<em>mathetes</em>)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b. Two (<em>duo</em>)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c. To rebuke (<em>epitimeson</em>)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total for phase 1 keywords</strong></td>
<td><strong>14</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a. To give (<em>didomi</em>)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b. To find (<em>heurisko</em>)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2c. Proverb/poem/parable (<em>parabole</em>)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total for phase 2 keywords</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>41</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a. To hear, to heed, to obey (<em>akouo</em>)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b. To see (<em>horao</em>)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3c. To receive sight (<em>anablepsis</em>)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total for phase 3 keywords</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a. Law, principle (<em>nomos</em>)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b. Lawyer; trained in law (<em>nomikos</em>)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4c. Rich (<em>plousios</em>)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4d. Poor (<em>ptochos</em>)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4e. Place, position; opportunity (<em>topos</em>)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total for phase 4 keywords</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and each word was mentioned in at least three of the six passages that together make up a phase. As shown in the “Dominance ratio” scores, the words were more than four times as likely to be in the phases they are associated with than in any one other phases in the Journey Narrative. Taken together, these words help to point to the distinct themes that characterize the passages within each phase.

**Phase 1 (Problem Recognition)**

The three keywords associated with the first phase—two, disciple, rebuke—are consistent with the overarching idea that passages in this phase tend to describe a situation or an issue where disciples of Jesus are facing two differing views about an issue, and where one of the views is rebuked. Each phase 1 passage in the Journey Narrative has dual competing positions, and describes how Jesus often takes a position that was likely counterintuitive to many of his listeners.

It may be noteworthy that Luke places considerable emphasis on “dialogue” in the passages in the Journey Narrative generally, and in the first phase passages in particular. There tends to be an average of one dialogue for every three verses in phase 1, whereas there is one dialogue every four verses in phases 2 and 4, and one for every six verses in phase 3. Also, of the six phase 1 passages, four of them contain dialogue that is unique to Luke (i.e., it is not found in Matthew or Mark). Also, it seems that the four-phase process is often driven or animated by issues facing a group of Jesus’ disciples.

**Phase 2 (Action Response)**

The three keywords for the second phase—give, find, parable—point to the idea that the second phase deals with actions that respond to the issues raised in the first phase. First, the passages point to the importance of a giving, benevolent spirit. Just as Jesus gave his followers the kingdom and the authority to address issues, so also they are to have a generous giving spirit to others (especially giving financial resources to the poor). Second, these passages talk about seeking solutions, and promise that those who seek will find what they’re searching for, and that they will find what has been lost. Third, the passages provide a number of parables that provide “what if” scenarios and lessons grounded in lessons from everyday life.

**Phase 3 (Changed Way of Seeing)**

The keywords for phase 3—to hear and to see/receive sight—point to this phase being a time of insight and revelation, literally a new way of seeing and perceiving the world. Perhaps the keystone passage that encapsulates the meaning of a new way of seeing and hearing is found in phase 3 of the first cycle:

At that same hour Jesus rejoiced in the Holy Spirit and said, “I thank you, Father, Lord of heaven and earth, because you have hidden these things from the wise and the intelligent and have revealed them to infants; yes, Father, for such was your gracious will. All things have been handed over to me by my Father; and no one knows who the Son is except the Father, or who the Father is except the Son and anyone to whom the Son chooses to reveal him.” Then turning to the disciples, Jesus said to them privately, “Blessed are the eyes that see what you see! For I tell you that many prophets and kings desired to see what you see, but did not see it, and to hear what you hear, but did not hear it” (Luke 10:21–24).
Phase 4 (Institutional Change)

The keywords for phase four—lawyer, rich/poor, place/position—point to issues of power and status. In these passages the emphasis is on challenging existing institutions and norms, with the idea of creating new structures and systems that are consistent with Jesus’ message. This is illustrated by the emphasis placed on Jesus being tested by lawyers and challenging them, Jesus admonishing the rich to be more generous toward the poor, and Jesus pointing to the folly of caring about status and social position.12

Breakpoints between Cycles, and Coherent Themes within Cycles

In addition to pointing to consistencies in word choices and themes within each of the four phases described earlier (across the six cycles), a second way to provide support for the four-phase model is to demonstrate that each of the six four-phase cycles can be seen as a coherent literary unit, with a distinct breakpoint separating one cycle from the next.

Perhaps the strongest and most obvious signal that there is a breakpoint between the first and fourth phase of the model is that in each of the six cycles phase 4 starts with a reference to Jesus interacting with an elite leader in society.13 Once this pattern is recognized, it functions as a metaphorical “hard return” on a keyboard signaling time to end one line (or cycle) of thought and to begin a new one. In the first century, such mentions of interaction with members of the elite were sure to catch the attention of readers.

In terms of coherent literary units, each of the six cycles can be seen as having its own theme or “story-line” that flows through each of the four-phases. These are described in some length in chapters fourteen and fifteen, and summarized in table 13.1.

Corroborating Evidence: A Four-Phase Process Model in the Early Church?

There is substantial evidence that a four-phase process model is embedded in the Journey Narrative. But is there additional evidence in Luke’s writings to corroborate this finding? And, moreover, is there any evidence that this model is used by Jesus’ followers, or is it simply the model evident when Jesus went on his journey to Jerusalem? Finally, is it even conceivable that first-century listeners would have been attuned to such a four-phase model? Each of these three questions is addressed here.

Evidence of a Similar Four-Phase Process Model in Acts

A good way to begin to answer these questions is by looking at Acts, which is Luke’s account of the early church after Jesus’ resurrection. As it turns out, a very similar four-phase process model seems to be embedded in the organizing scheme and content of Acts. Consider the following similarities and parallels. To start, note how the geographic organizing structure of the Journey Narrative and Acts are inverted. Recall that the Journey Narrative starts with Jesus located in the northernmost point he ever visited (i.e., around Caesarea Phillippi, a Gentile region just outside the
jurisdiction of Herod Antipas) and describes his wanderings through Samaria and Judea and into Jerusalem. The sequential order of this movement is inverted in Acts, which starts with the disciples in Jerusalem and describes how they receive the Holy Spirit as they witness to Jesus in Jerusalem, in all Judea and Samaria, and to the ends of the earth (Acts 1:8).14

Table A.3 provides an overview of how the book of Acts can be seen to be written in four sections, organized according to these four concentric geographic circles moving outward from (i) Jerusalem (Acts 1:12–5:42) to (ii) Samaria (Acts 6:1–9:43) to (iii) Judea (Acts 10:1–12:24), and (iv) the rest of the world (Acts 12:25–end).15 Table A.3 also points to several other differences between each of the four sections, including how each of the story lines within each of the four sections has its own key central cast of characters, and how each section contains one of the only four mention of the Holy Spirit descending and taking possession of human beings where the coming of the Spirit is associated with the gift of speaking in tongues.16

Perhaps of greatest interest for present purposes, each of the four sections of Acts can also be seen to contain within it a four-phase process similar to the one Luke embedded in the Journey Narrative. As shown in table A.3, each of the four sections of Acts: (1) starts with a problem or issue to resolve, (2) describes actions designed to resolve the issue, (3) describes a new way of seeing (especially new ways of speaking/interpreting ancient scriptures in light of Jesus), and (4) concludes with a description of a confrontation with authorities.17

The third of the four sections of Acts described in table A.3 (Acts 10:1 through 12:24) is of particular interest because it describes one of the most significant changes in the early church, as the church abandons traditional aspects of its Jewish heritage and begins to embrace Gentiles as equal members. This transition, which is described in considerable detail and repetition in Acts chapters 10 and 11, can be seen to follow the four-phase process as follows.18

**Phase 1 (Problem Recognition): Avoid Misguided Attempts to Segregate “Clean” and “Unclean” People (Acts 10:1–16)**

The process starts when both Cornelius and Peter independently have what at first seem to be problematic visions while they are praying. Cornelius, a gentile Roman centurion, is the first to receive the vision. Initially the purpose of the vision is unclear, except that he is to send some of his men to Joppa to invite Peter to his house, where Peter would give “a message by which you and your entire oikos will be saved” (Acts 11:14). Shortly thereafter Peter is in prayer and receives a vision that he should not to adhere to conventional religious laws about what is clean and unclean (Acts 10:9–16).19 At first the problem is simply knowing how to respond to these unusual visions, rather than knowing exactly why.


Both Cornelius and Peter act on their visions, even though they are not at all sure what the outcome of this little experiment might be. Cornelius sends messengers to the oikos where Peter is staying to invite him. The Spirit tells Peter to accept the invitation to go to Cornelius’s oikos, and Peter brings along six of his Jewish friends (Acts 10:17–33). The problem that their actions are addressing becomes clearer when Peter says: “You yourselves know that it is unlawful for a Jew to associate with or to visit a Gentile; but God has shown me that I should not call anyone profane or
### Table A.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jerusalem</td>
<td>The Twelve Apostles (esp. Peter and John)</td>
<td>Jerusalem/Asia Minor</td>
<td>Jerusalem/Asia Minor</td>
<td>Jerusalem/Asia Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samaria/periphery of Israel</td>
<td>The Seven Deacons (esp. Stephen and Phillip)</td>
<td>Jerusalem/Asia Minor</td>
<td>Jerusalem/Asia Minor</td>
<td>Jerusalem/Asia Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judea</td>
<td>Peter (and Cornelius)</td>
<td>Jerusalem/Asia Minor</td>
<td>Jerusalem/Asia Minor</td>
<td>Jerusalem/Asia Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest of world</td>
<td>Paul (and Barnabas, Silas, and Timothy)</td>
<td>Jerusalem/Asia Minor</td>
<td>Jerusalem/Asia Minor</td>
<td>Jerusalem/Asia Minor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Problem Recognition

1. **Cycle 1: Acts 1:1–5:42**
   - Problem: The disciples are not sure what to do after Jesus' ascension. Interestingly, the first step is to reestablish the group of 12 Apostles by choosing a new Treasurer.
   - Scripture Reference: Acts 1:23–26

   - Problem: The widows of “outsiders” (Greek-speaking Jews from outside Palestine) are being neglected in the early church (Acts 6:1).
   - Scripture Reference: Acts 6:2–7

   - Problem: Purity laws create segregation between “clean” and “unclean” followers of Jesus (e.g., Gentiles were not yet considered to be full members of the church, Acts 10:1–16).
   - Scripture Reference: Acts 10:17–43

#### Action Response

1. **Cycle 1: Acts 1:1–5:42**
   - Scripture Reference: Acts 1:23–26

   - Response: The group chooses seven deacons (helpers) to resolve the problem by giving and receiving (Acts 6:2–7; two of these deacons subsequently also preach the word of God).
   - Scripture Reference: Acts 6:5–8

   - Response: Cornelius sends people to visit Peter, and Peter and some believers go to visit (unclean) Cornelius and his oikos, where Peter speaks to them about God's peace and inclusiveness (Acts 10:17–43).
   - Scripture Reference: Acts 10:17–43

#### New Way of Seeing

1. **Cycle 1: Acts 1:1–5:42**
   - New Way of Seeing: Jesus is Messiah who brings a liberating new kind of oikos/benefaction (Acts 2:4).

   - Scripture Reference: Acts 7:54–8:40

   - New Way of Seeing: The Holy Spirit is available to all believers (not only Israel) (Acts 10:46).
   - Scripture Reference: Acts 10:46


#### Institutional Change

1. **Cycle 1: Acts 1:1–5:42**
   - Institutional Change: Jewish authorities (Sanhedrin) twice confront the Apostles when they speak (Acts 4:1–22), but the Apostles are given inspiration to continue speaking about Jesus (Acts 4:31–37).

   - Institutional Change: Jewish authorities (Sanhedrin) stone Stephen to death (Acts 7:54–80), but Peter speaks about the resurrection theme (Acts 7:52–60)

   - Institutional Change: Many allusions to the trials of Paul, indicating that Paul was advocating countercultural norms (Acts 11:1–25, Acts 12:1–28).

   - Institutional Change: Jewish authorities (Sanhedrin) stone Stephen to death (Acts 7:54–80), but Peter speaks about the resurrection theme (Acts 7:52–60).

---

**Table 4.1:** How the four-phase process model is embedded within each of the four geographic steps of the “journey” described in Acts (building on Goulder, 1964a) (continued)
unclean. So when I was sent for, I came without objection. Now may I ask why you sent for me?” (Acts 10:28b–29).

Phase 3 (Changed Way of Seeing): The Holy Spirit is Available to All Believers (Not Only Israel) (Acts 10:44–48)

As Peter preached the message of Jesus to these Gentiles they received the Holy Spirit, and all who saw it happen were astounded. Peter remembered the word of the Lord: “John baptized with water, but you will be baptized with the Holy Spirit” (Acts 11:16) and so they were baptized in the name of Jesus Christ.

Phase 4 (Institutional Change): Gentiles Accepted as Full Members in the Church (Acts 11:1–18; 12:1–24)

The cycle ends with a description of institutional change as the church leaders in Jerusalem meet to discuss the whole process and everyone agrees to welcome Gentiles as full members of the church (Acts 11:1–18). At the level of political institutions, though, Herod Antipas (the Roman tetrarch of Galilee and Perea) arrests Peter to the pleasure of Jews who are not followers of Jesus.

Evidence That First-Century Listeners May Have Been Attuned to Such a Process Model

Socrates’s dialogic method, arguably his most important contribution to philosophy, may be a similar early analog to the four-step process model embedded in Luke’s Journey Narrative. Recall that Socrates (469–399 BCE) lived about four centuries prior to Jesus, and that the Socratic method is considered an early forerunner to today’s scientific method. Socrates used his four-step dialogical method to teach and to learn: by continually asking questions to get to the root of an issue, everyone could understand the key dimensions of that issue better. For Socrates, this understanding meant knowledge, which was for him the essence of virtue. He was known for practicing his method with anyone whom he might meet in the marketplace: “If you speak Greek and are willing to talk and reason, you can be Socrates’ partner in searching, with the prospect that truth undisclosed to countless ages might be undisclosed here and now, on this spot, in the next forty minutes, between the two of you.” Here are the four steps of the Socratic method.

Step 1: Present a Faulty Thesis Statement

In the case of Socrates, this refers to problematic statements that were uttered by someone other than himself. Usually the statements were about truth in the moral domain, dealing with questions like: “what is the way we ought to live?” and “what sort of man should one be, and what should one practice?” The statement should be as specific as possible. Participants in the dialogue must remain open-minded, lest they become defensive and thus stifle learning. In modern applications of this Socratic method, the thesis statement is the identification of an issue or problem to be addressed.

Step 2: Gather Information About the Statement, and Seek Agreement on Premises Related to the Statement

The goal in this step is to deeply understand the statement and the assumptions that it rests upon, and to raise related premises that can be agreed upon. This is an
intellectual exercise that does not involve any actions or collecting of empirical data (note how this step is very different from phase 2 of the model embedded in the Journey Narrative).

Step 3: Identify the Shortcomings of the Faulty Thesis Statement by Demonstrating it to be Inconsistent with Other Agreed Upon Premises

This step may threaten people’s way of seeing via “jarring their adherence to some confident dogma by bringing to their awareness its collision with other, no less confident, presumptions of theirs.” It is by compelling people to recognize the faultiness of an original thesis statement that they are prepared for the final step.

Step 4: Accept a New-and-Better “True” Thesis Statement

For Socrates, knowledge was the engine of virtue. He believed that once people had a deeper understanding of what was true and ethical, they would act on their understanding and insights. “Thus elenchus has a double objective: to discover how every human ought to live and to test that single human being who is doing the answering—to find out if he is living as one ought to live.”

To be clear, no one knows whether Luke and his readers would have been familiar with the four-phase Socratic model as described here (or any other similar model). However, it does seem reasonable to speculate that Luke would have been familiar with some Socratic teachings and methods, and also that he would have expected many of his readers to be familiar with Socrates.

Evidence of the Four-Phase Model in Acts When Paul Walks in the Footsteps of Socrates

Finally, it is noteworthy that Luke seems to allude to the four-step process model precisely where the reader would be most likely to look for it. Namely, when Luke describes the Apostle Paul’s trip to Athens (Acts 17:16–32), ample evidence suggests that Luke had Socrates in mind, the greatest philosopher of Athens. This is first evident in the way that this passage starts by describing how Paul spent his days talking to the people whom he happened to meet at the marketplace, which exactly “corresponds to the typical picture of Socrates” and which Luke does not describe happening when Paul visits other cities. It is also evident because this is the only passage where Luke uses the same Greek verb to describe how Paul “argued” in Athens that was used by Plato to describe Socrates’s “dialogical technique.” “Luke depicts Paul as being involved in dialogical teaching a la Socrates with his message.”

The Acts account can also be seen to start off where the story of Socrates ended up, namely with Paul arguing with philosophers who were members of the Aereopagus (the ruling council in Athens that had ordered Socrates’s death). Finally, reminiscent of the charge against Socrates that he had been worshipping other gods, “this is exactly the accusation Paul faced in Athens (Acts 17:18–20). The wording of these accusations mirrors the Socrates tradition.”

Of course, there are several differences in the stories, an important one being that—unlike Socrates—the apostle Paul escapes with his life. Might Paul’s success be partly attributed to the fact that his presentation differed from what would have been consistent with the Socratic method? Put differently, would we expect Paul’s reasoning with the intellectual descendants of Socrates to be an occasion where Luke’s readers could be reminded of the four-phase process model embedded in the Journey
Narrative? It turns out that the passage in Acts can be seen to unfold in four steps akin to the four-phase process model.


The beginning of Paul’s speech draws attention to the problem of the “unknown god,” thereby setting up a dialectic between worshipping “known gods” versus worshipping an “unknown God.” Paul seeks to make known the unknown (Acts 17:22–23), and he thereby implicitly rebukes what the Athenians think they know.

Then Paul stood in front of the Areopagus and said, “Athenians, I see how extremely religious you are in every way. For as I went through the city and looked carefully at the objects of your worship, I found among them an altar with the inscription, ‘To an unknown god.’ What therefore you worship as unknown, this I proclaim to you.” (Acts 17:22–23)


Paul describes how the God he knows has acted, and how God has set in motion the parameters of this great “experiment” that we call the world, and how in the course of events humankind would search for and find God (v 24–27).

The God who made the world and everything in it, he who is Lord of heaven and earth, does not live in shrines made by human hands, nor is he served by human hands, as though he needed anything, since he himself gives to all mortals life and breath and all things. From one ancestor he made all nations to inhabit the whole earth, and he allotted the times of their existence and the boundaries of the places where they would live, so that they would search for God and perhaps grope for him—though indeed he is not far from each one of us. (Acts 17:24–27)

**Phase 3 (Changed Way of Seeing): People are Part of God’s Oikos (Acts 17:28–29)**

Paul then goes on to interpret Greek poetry in a new way so that others may “see” this previously unknown God (v 28–29). In particular, by seeing themselves as children of God, God can thereby be seen as the head of their oikos.

For “In him we live and move and have our being”; as even some of your own poets have said, “For we too are his offspring.” Since we are God’s offspring, we ought not to think that the deity is like gold, or silver, or stone, an image formed by the art and imagination of mortals. (Acts 17:28–29)

**Phase 4 (Institutional Change): Change Your Ways Because Jesus is the Ultimate Judge (Acts 17:30–31)**

Paul concludes by challenging the leading philosophers of Athens to change their ways (i.e., to repent).

While God has overlooked the times of human ignorance, now he commands all people everywhere to repent, because he has fixed a day on which he will have the world judged in righteousness by a man whom he has appointed, and of this he has given assurance to all by raising him from the dead. (Acts 17:30–31)
Summary

In short, this appendix describes how the Journey Narrative has been written in the general form of a chiasm, and offers empirical and experimental support for the contention that it contains 12 chiastic pairs. It then describes the linguistic and thematic support for the recurring four-phase process model embedded within the chiasm. It concludes by describing: how a similar four-phase process model is also embedded in the organizing structure of the book of Acts; how the four-phase process was evident when the early church accepted gentiles as full members; how first-century listeners may have been familiar with the idea of multistep processes to discern truth, especially in light of the Socratic method; and how Paul’s address before the Aereopagus (the same body of leaders that condemned Socrates) is consistent with the four-phase process model.
Exhibit A1

Overview of the Empirical Study
Examining the Plausibility of the Chiastic Pairings

Research Design

In order to develop empirical support for the plausibility of the 12 chiastic pairs that were identified in Luke’s Journey Narrative, a test was designed that asked participants to sort through the 12 passages from the first half of the Journey Narrative, and to pair them with a matching passage from the second half of the Journey Narrative. (The instructions given to participants are described later in this appendix.) The research design was very conservative. First, the passages were placed in random order. In their sequential order in the original Journey Narrative, any reader who recognized that the Journey Narrative was written in chiastic form would then be prompted to see how the parallel texts relate to each other. In particular, they would likely find similarities that they perhaps would not have identified as easily otherwise. By placing the 12 passages in both halves of the chiasm in random order, the design of this study did not permit readers to take their cues from the actual order presented in Luke.

Second, the test was conservative because study participants were given the texts in English (NRSV). Because of this, they were unable to see in the original Greek any wordplay and uses of unique or telling linguistic devices that might signal or point to parallel/twin passages.

Third, the test was conservative because study participants were not accustomed to thinking about and finding parallels between passages in this way. Although at the start of the study participants were provided with a short description and some examples for sorting and pairing the passages, readers in the first century would have had training and experience in developing and identifying and thinking about chiasms.

A total of 30 people participated in this study. Each person was paid $30 for participating in a 90-minute exercise. After being welcomed to the session and provided an overview of the study, each participant was asked to read the instructions and then “trained” for the task they would be participating in via a two-sided page of “sample” parallel passages. Each participant was also given a copy of the 12 passages in the first half of the chiasm (Group A), as well as of the 12 passages from the second half (Group B). Each passage was printed on a separate sheet, and participants
were asked to pair one passage from Group A with one of the passages from Group B. Results were reported on a two-column sheet.

Findings

The results, shown in table A.4, provide very strong support for the chiasm. If there were no relationship among the different pairs, then readers would be expected to put them in the predicted pairings about 8 percent of the time (i.e., one-twelfth of the time). However, participants in the study placed the passages into the predicted pairs about 45 percent of the time, or more than five times more likely than by chance. Moreover, for 9 of the 12 cases (i.e., 75 percent of the time), readers most frequently paired together the two passages predicted by the chiasm. In the remaining 3 cases, the predicted pairing was the second most-frequent twice (tied), and the third most-frequent once.

A chi-square test was used in two ways to determine whether these findings are statistically significant. The first test examined the null hypothesis that the participants’ responses were randomly distributed across the various response categories. The null hypothesis could be rejected in 10 of the 12 cases at alpha = .001 level (i.e., the likelihood that they are randomly related is less than one-thousandth). This suggests that the passages are related to each other in a meaningful (nonrandom) way.

Second, the same chi-square test was performed on all the passages after removing the results from the expected pairing. This was to examine whether, after the expected pairings were removed, the remaining pairings were random. In this case we are unable to reject the null hypothesis in 10 of 12 cases, suggesting that the remaining pairings were indeed random.

Taken together, these findings lend strong support to the chiastic pairs that constituted the Journey Narrative. The support is particularly striking given the conservative nature of our research design (e.g., random ordering of the passages, translated text, readers with little chiastic knowledge/experience).

Discussion of the Findings

The strongest results were in the so-called Deuteronomic pillars passages in Pair 4a/4b (90 percent of readers placed them together). This is not entirely surprising because it is also the twin most often referred to in the nonchiastic literature. The next two strongest results were, appropriately, for the opening (83 percent) and closing (77 percent) twinned passages that “frame” the chiasm. This would be consistent with an argument that Luke wanted to underscore where the chiasm started, and where its central turning point was.

The three “weakest” twins (i.e., the passages where the expected pairing was not the pairing readers most frequently pointed to) also warrant special attention (Pairings #2, #5, and #9). One of these (Pair #9) involved the parable of the shrewd manager, which many see as perhaps the most difficult of Jesus’ parable to interpret. Another involved the parable of the ten pounds, which may have been difficult to place appropriately (i.e., as twinned with the sending of the 72) because the dominant mainstream twenty-first-century interpretation parable of the pounds is very different than a first-century interpretation. Finally, it is unclear why so many readers missed the third pairing (#5), because the parallels seem quite evident at face value, even in the English translation.
Table A.4 Frequency of pairing (a) the 12 passages in the first half of the chiasm with (b) their parallel passages in the second half

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1a</th>
<th>2a</th>
<th>3a</th>
<th>4a</th>
<th>5a</th>
<th>6a</th>
<th>7a</th>
<th>8a</th>
<th>9a</th>
<th>10a</th>
<th>11a</th>
<th>12a</th>
<th>chi-sq</th>
<th>sig at a=.001</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1b</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>220.1</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>46.1</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>259.3</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>68.1</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6b</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>149.7</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7b</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8b</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9b</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10b</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11b</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>81.3</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12b</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Instructions Provided to Study Participants

In this exercise you will be given 24 passages taken from the Bible. Each passage is written on a separate sheet, and each sheet is numbered randomly for identification purposes. Of these 24 passages, the passages #1 through #12 are labeled as “Group A,” and the passages #13 through #24 are labeled as “Group B.”

Your task is to read the passages, and link each with one other passage so that in the end you form 12 “matching pairs.” In each pair, one passage should come from Group A and the other from Group B.

The pairs may be similar in theme (e.g., both passages are about healing, both describe God’s mercy), structure (e.g., a passage where Jesus talks with three women is paired with a passage where Jesus talks to three men; or two passages are linked where Jesus enters a town at the beginning and leaves at the end of each passage), or wording (e.g., both passages talk about “lambs” and “wolves”).

The exercise has been divided into three steps:

Step 1: Read each passage

Please feel free to make notes on the sheets to remind yourself about key themes, structures, or words that you notice in each passage. As you do this keep in mind the following:

a) Themes need not be intricate; for example, “Jesus teaching on Baptism” or “Jesus in the Temple” could both be considered themes. Often the parallel themes in the passages may be “mirror images” of each other. For example, in one passage Jesus may tell a story of a man who asks for healing but receives salvation, and in its paired passage there may be a man who asks for salvation but gets healed. One passage teaches about the love of God, and the other tells about the ways of Satan. In one passage Jesus tells a parable about an escape from captivity, in another he instructs his disciples how to prepare for Passover.

b) Structures can also be rather simple constructions and you need not try to find elaborately built systems of argument. Often paired passages are similar in length and format, and they progress through a similar sequence of ideas/steps from the beginning of the passage to its end. For example, each passage may start with Jesus teaching on fasting, then Jesus going into the wilderness, then Jesus visiting a poor person. Again, sometimes the structures of two paired passages may mirror each other. For example, in one passage Jesus enters a home where he is served a meal, in another he tells a parable of someone who is kicked out of a village for eating unclean food.

c) Key words can be the most tricky to judge in terms of relevance. The parallel words may be very unique (“baptism of the spirit”) or quite common, and often have simple opposites (e.g., “high” versus “low,” “on” versus “off,” “young” versus “old”). Pay particular attention to key words or themes that do not appear in the other passages you were provided.

As you will be able to see from the “sample” paired passages on the attached sheet, parallels can range from quite strong to relatively weak. Agreement in theme, structure, and wording often do not exist together, rather one or two of these concepts are generally present in passages that end up being paralleled. Keep this in mind as you complete the exercise.
Step 2: Once you’ve read and become familiar with each passage, start sorting them into pairs

You may find some pairs very easily. Remember that for each pairing, one passage should come from “Group A” and the other passage from “Group B.” Look for shared themes and words, similar structures and format, remembering that sometimes the parallel passages are mirror images of one another. Move the sheets around until you are comfortable with the pairings you have found. There are no right or wrong answers—we are looking for how you would match-up the passages into pairs.

Step 3: Record your pairings

Please use the “Response Sheet” provided here. Record the “Passage numbers” shown at the top of each passage corresponding to your 12 paired passages. It does not matter which order you list the pairs, so long each pair’s passage numbers are entered on the same row. [Participants were provided with a response sheet that had three columns labeled as follows: “Pairing;” “Passage Number (from ‘Group A’),” and “Passage Number (from ‘Group B’).” Beneath these three columns were 12 rows, and each row was labeled from “1” through to “12” in the first column.]

Hand-out Sheet: Example of Paired Passages (provided to study participants to familiarize and “train” them for their task)

Example #1: The following two passages form a “pair” because of a similar structure and wording. In both John is the key figure and in both he quotes the prophet Isaiah from the Old Testament regarding the voice crying in the wilderness. This is a very strong parallel.

Passage A: This is the testimony given by John when the Jews sent priests and Levites from Jerusalem to ask him, “Who are you?” He confessed and did not deny it, but confessed, “I am not the Messiah.” And they asked him, “What then? Are you Elijah?” He said, “I am not.” “Are you the prophet?” He answered, “No.” Then they said to him, “Who are you? Let us have an answer for those who sent us. What do you say about yourself?” He said, “I am the voice of one crying out in the wilderness, ‘Make straight the way of the Lord,’ as the prophet Isaiah said.

Passage B: In the fifteenth year of the reign of Emperor Tiberius, when Pontius Pilate was governor of Judea, and Herod was ruler of Galilee, and his brother Philip ruler of the region of Ituraea and Trachonitis, and Lysanias ruler of Abilene, during the high priesthood of Annas and Caiaphas, the word of God came to John son of Zechariah in the wilderness. He went into all the region around the Jordan, proclaiming a baptism of repentance for the forgiveness of sins, as it is written in the book of the words of the prophet Isaiah, “The voice of one crying out in the wilderness: ‘Prepare the way of the Lord, make his paths straight.’”

Example #2: Here the theme and structure are quite different, but the distinct key word “bridegroom” is enough to suggest that the two passages form a parallel pair.

Passage A: Jesus said to them, “You cannot make wedding guests fast while the bridegroom is with them, can you? The days will come when the bridegroom will be taken away from them, and then they will fast in those days.”

Passage B: He who has the bride is the bridegroom. The friend of the bridegroom, who stands and hears him, rejoices greatly at the bridegroom’s voice. For this reason my joy has been fulfilled. He must increase, but I must decrease.
Example #3: The two following passages have parallel themes, structure and words. Each passage starts by describing a surprising visit by an angel (first paragraph), and then continues with instruction as to what name is to be given to the baby being announced (second paragraph).

Passage A, paragraph 1: Now at the time of the incense offering, the whole assembly of the people was praying outside. Then there appeared to him [Zechariah] an angel of the Lord, standing at the right side of the altar of incense. When Zechariah saw him, he was terrified; and fear overwhelmed him.

Passage A, paragraph 2: But the angel said to him, “Do not be afraid, Zechariah, for your prayer has been heard. Your wife Elizabeth will bear you a son, and you will name him John. You will have joy and gladness, and many will rejoice at his birth, for he will be great in the sight of the Lord.”

Passage B, paragraph 1: In the sixth month the angel Gabriel was sent by God to a town in Galilee called Nazareth, to a virgin engaged to a man whose name was Joseph, of the house of David. The virgin’s name was Mary. And he came to her and said, “Greetings, favored one! The Lord is with you.” But she was much perplexed by his words and pondered what sort of greeting this might be.

Passage B, paragraph 2: The angel said to her, “Do not be afraid, Mary, for you have found favor with God. And now, you will conceive in your womb and bear a son, and you will name him Jesus. He will be great, and will be called the Son of the Most High, and the Lord God will give to him the throne of his ancestor David.

Example #4: The two following passages have parallel themes and structures as each starts with (1) a brief introduction to the setting (being alone), and then is followed by three main points: (2) Jesus is tempted to turn rock into bread/Jesus feeds 5,000; (3) Jesus is tempted with power/Jesus is acknowledged as God’s Messiah; and (4) Jesus is tempted to have angels save him from death/Jesus’ followers lose their lives to save them.

Passage A, paragraph 1: Jesus, full of the Holy Spirit, returned from the Jordan and was led by the Spirit in the wilderness, where for forty days he was tempted by the devil.

Passage A, paragraph 2: He ate nothing at all during those days, and when they were over, he was famished. The devil said to him, “If you are the Son of God, command this stone to become a loaf of bread.” Jesus answered him, “It is written, ‘One does not live by bread alone.’”

Passage A, paragraph 3: Then the devil led him up and showed him in an instant all the kingdoms of the world. And the devil said to him, “To you I will give their glory and all this authority; for it has been given over to me, and I give it to anyone I please. If you, then, will worship me, it will all be yours.” Jesus answered him, “It is written, ‘Worship the Lord your God, and serve only him.’”

Passage A, paragraph 4: Then the devil took him to Jerusalem, and placed him on the pinnacle of the temple, saying to him, “If you are the Son of God, throw yourself down from here; for it is written, ‘He will command his angels concerning you, to protect you,’ and ‘On their hands they will bear you up, so that you will not dash your foot against a stone.’” Jesus answered him, “It is said, ‘Do not put the Lord your God to the test.’”

Passage B, paragraph 1: [Jesus took his disciples] with him and withdrew privately to a city called Bethsaida. When the crowds found out about it, they followed him; and he welcomed them, and spoke to them about the kingdom of God, and healed those who needed to be cured.
Passage B, paragraph 2: The day was drawing to a close, and the twelve came to him and said, “Send the crowd away, so that they may go into the surrounding villages and countryside, to lodge and get provisions; for we are here in a deserted place.” But he said to them, “You give them something to eat.” They said, “We have no more than five loaves and two fish—unless we are to go and buy food for all these people.” For there were about five thousand men. And he said to his disciples, “Make them sit down in groups of about fifty each.” They did so and made them all sit down. And taking the five loaves and the two fish, he looked up to heaven, and blessed and broke them, and gave them to the disciples to set before the crowd. And all ate and were filled. What was left over was gathered up, twelve baskets of broken pieces.

Passage B, paragraph 3: Once when Jesus was praying alone, with only the disciples near him, he asked them, “Who do the crowds say that I am?” They answered, “John the Baptist; but others, Elijah; and still others, that one of the ancient prophets has arisen.” He said to them, “But who do you say that I am?” Peter answered, “The Messiah of God.” He sternly ordered and commanded them not to tell anyone, saying, “The Son of Man must undergo great suffering, and be rejected by the elders, chief priests, and scribes, and be killed, and on the third day be raised.”

Passage B, paragraph 4: Then he said to them all, “If any want to become my followers, let them deny themselves and take up their cross daily and follow me. For those who want to save their life will lose it, and those who lose their life for my sake will save it. What does it profit them if they gain the whole world, but lose or forfeit themselves? Those who are ashamed of me and of my words, of them the Son of Man will be ashamed when he comes in his glory and the glory of the Father and of the holy angels. But truly I tell you, there are some standing here who will not taste death before they see the kingdom of God.”
Appendix B

Usage of Kurios in Luke to Describe God and Jesus

Chapter seven examined all the passages in Luke where the word kurios refers to a person who is the “master” of an oikos. However, this same word kurios is translated as “Lord” when Luke uses it to refer to God (34 times) or Jesus (45 times). It turns out that there are some consistent themes that characterize what the word kurios refers to when it is used for Jesus and God. Moreover, these themes may have some overlap with the four key groupings of KOG passages described in chapter ten. Overall, the passages point to four modes that oikos managers who wish to emulate Jesus and God as kurios should attend to:

1. Being prepared and preparing others for KOG;
2. Learning and teaching KOG ways;
3. Implementing countercultural KOG ideas;
4. Facilitating and enjoying KOG outcomes.

References to Jesus as Kurios

Consider how these four modes are evident in the 45 mentions of Jesus as kurios:

1. Nine mentions describe people preparing the way for Jesus:
   i. With the spirit and power of Elijah he will go before him, to turn the hearts of parents to their children, and the disobedient to the wisdom of the righteous, to make ready a people prepared for the Lord (Luke 1:17);
   ii. And you, child, will be called the prophet of the Most High; for you will go before the Lord to prepare his ways (Luke 1:76);
   iii. as it is written in the book of the words of the prophet Isaiah, “The voice of one crying out in the wilderness: ‘Prepare the way of the Lord, make his paths straight’” (Luke 3:4);
   iv. After this the Lord appointed seventy others and sent them on ahead of him in pairs to every town and place where he himself intended to go (Luke 10:1);
   v. He said to them, “The harvest is plentiful, but the laborers are few; therefore ask the Lord of the harvest to send out laborers into his harvest” (Luke 10:2);
   vi. If anyone asks you, “Why are you untying it?” just say this, “The Lord needs it” (Luke 19:31);
   vii. They said, “The Lord needs it” (Luke 19:34);
viii. They said, “Lord, look, here are two swords.” He replied, “It is enough” (Luke 22:38);

ix. When those who were around him saw what was coming, they asked, “Lord, should we strike with the sword?” (Luke 22:49).

2. Seven mentions describe Jesus as a teacher and counselor:
   i. She had a sister named Mary, who sat at the Lord’s feet and listened to what he was saying. But Martha was distracted by her many tasks; so she came to him and asked, “Lord, do you not care that my sister has left me to do all the work by myself? Tell her then to help me.” But the Lord answered her, “Martha, Martha, you are worried and distracted by many things” (Luke 10:39–41; three mentions);
   ii. He was praying in a certain place, and after he had finished, one of his disciples said to him, “Lord, teach us to pray, as John taught his disciples” (Luke 11:1);
   iii. Peter said, “Lord, are you telling this parable for us or for everyone?” (Luke 12:41);
   iv. Then they asked him, “Where, Lord?” He said to them, “Where the corpse is, there the vultures will gather” (Luke 17:37);
   v. And the Lord said, “Listen to what the unjust judge says” (Luke 18:6).

3. Twelve mentions describe how following Jesus means acting in countercultural ways:
   i. Why do you call me “Lord, Lord,” and do not do what I tell you? (Luke 6:46; two mentions);
   ii. To another he said, “Follow me.” But he said, “Lord, first let me [follow convention and] go and bury my father” (Luke 9:59);
   iii. Another said, “I will follow you, Lord; but let me first [follow convention and] say farewell to those at my home” (Luke 9:61);
   iv. Then the Lord said to him, “Now you Pharisees clean the outside of the cup and of the dish, but inside you are full of greed and wickedness” (Luke 11:39);
   v. And the Lord said, “Who then is the faithful and prudent manager whom his master will put in charge of his slaves, to give them their allowance of food at the proper time?” (Luke 12:42).
   vi. But the Lord answered him and said, “You hypocrites! Does not each of you on the sabbath untie his ox or his donkey from the manger, and lead it away to give it water?” (Luke 13:15);
   vii. Zacchaeus stood there and said to the Lord, “Look, half of my possessions, Lord, I will give to the poor; and if I have defrauded anyone of anything, I will pay back four times as much” (Luke 19:8; two mentions);
   viii. And he said to him, “Lord, I am ready to go with you to prison and to death!” (Luke 22:33);
   ix. The Lord turned and looked at Peter. Then Peter remembered the word of the Lord, how he had said to him, “Before the cock crows today, you will deny me three times” (Luke 22:61; two mentions);

4. The remaining 18 mentions describe Jesus as powerful, holy savior or benefactor.
   i. And why has this happened to me, that the mother of my Lord comes to me? (Luke 1:43);
   ii. to you is born this day in the city of David a Savior, who is the Messiah, the Lord (Luke 2:11);
   iii. But when Simon Peter saw it, he fell down at Jesus’ knees, saying, “Go away from me, Lord, for I am a sinful man!” (Luke 5:8);
iv. Once, when he was in one of the cities, there was a man covered with leprosy. When he saw Jesus, he bowed with his face to the ground and begged him, “Lord, if you choose, you can make me clean” (Luke 5:12);

v. Then he said to them, “The Son of Man is lord of the sabbath” (Luke 6:5);

vi. And Jesus went with them, but when he was not far from the house, the centurion sent friends to say to him, “Lord, do not trouble yourself; for I am not worthy to have you come under my roof” (Luke 7:6);

vii. When the Lord saw her, he had compassion for her and said to her, “Do not weep” [Jesus raises her son from the dead] (Luke 7:13);

viii. and sent them to the Lord to ask, “Are you the one who is to come, or are we to wait for another?” (Luke 7:19);

ix. When his disciples James and John saw it, they said, “Lord, do you want us to command fire to come down from heaven and consume them?” (Luke 9:54);

x. The seventy returned with joy, saying, “Lord, in your name even the demons submit to us!” (Luke 10:17);

xi. Someone asked him, “Lord, will only a few be saved?” He said to them (Luke 13:23);

xii. The apostles said to the Lord, “Increase our faith!” (Luke 17:5);

xiii. The Lord replied, “If you had faith the size of a mustard seed, you could say to this mulberry tree, ‘Be uprooted and planted in the sea,’ and it would obey you” (Luke 17:6);

xiv. “What do you want me to do for you?” He said, “Lord, let me see again” (Luke 18:41);

xv. For David himself says in the book of Psalms, “The Lord said to my Lord, ‘Sit at my right hand’” (Luke 20:42; one mention);

xvi. David thus calls him Lord; “so how can he be his son?” (Luke 20:44);

xvii. but when they went in, they did not find the [Lord’s] body (Luke 24:3);

xviii. They were saying, “The Lord has risen indeed, and he has appeared to Simon!” (Luke 24:34).

References to God as kurios

Consider how these four modes referred earlier are also evident in the 34 mentions of God as kuriosis:

1. Ten mentions refer to God preparing the way for Jesus and his message:
   i. Then there appeared to him an angel of the Lord, standing at the right side of the altar of incense [God prepares the father of John] (Luke 1:11);
   ii. This is what the Lord has done for me when he looked favorably on me and took away the disgrace I have endured among my people [God prepares the mother of John] (Luke 1:25);
   iii. And he came to her and said, “Greetings, favored one! The Lord is with you” [God prepares the mother of Jesus] (Luke 1:28);
   iv. He will be great, and will be called the Son of the Most High, and the Lord God will give to him the throne of his ancestor David (Luke 1:32);
   v. All who heard them pondered them and said, “What then will this child become?” For, indeed, the hand of the Lord was with him [God prepares John] (Luke 1:66);
   vi. Blessed be the Lord God of Israel, for he has looked favorably on his people and redeemed them [God prepares Israel] (Luke 1:68);
vii. Then an angel of the Lord stood before them, and the glory of the Lord shone around them, and they were terrified [God prepares shepherds] (Luke 2:9; two mentions);

viii. When the angels had left them and gone into heaven, the shepherds said to one another, “Let us go now to Bethlehem and see this thing that has taken place, which the Lord has made known to us” (Luke 2:15);

ix. It had been revealed to him by the Holy Spirit that he would not see death before he had seen the Lord’s Messiah [Simeon was prepared] (Luke 2:26).

2. Ten mentions refer to receiving God’s law and instruction:

i. Both of them were righteous before God, living blamelessly according to all the commandments and regulations of the Lord (Luke 1:6);

ii. he was chosen by lot, according to the custom of the priesthood, to enter the sanctuary of the Lord and offer incense (Luke 1:9);

iii. for he will be great in the sight of the Lord. He must never drink wine or strong drink; even before his birth he will be filled with the Holy Spirit (Luke 1:15);

iv. When the time came for their purification according to the law of Moses, they brought him up to Jerusalem to present him to the Lord (Luke 2:22);

v. (as it is written in the law of the Lord, “Every firstborn male shall be designated as holy to the Lord”) (Luke 2:23; two mentions);

vi. and they offered a sacrifice according to what is stated in the law of the Lord, “a pair of turtle-doves or two young pigeons” (Luke 2:24);

vii. When they had finished everything required by the law of the Lord, they returned to Galilee, to their own town of Nazareth (Luke 2:39);

viii. Jesus answered him, “It is said, ‘Do not put the Lord your God to the test’” (Luke 4:12);

ix. He answered, “You shall love the Lord your God with all your heart, and with all your soul, and with all your strength, and with all your mind; and your neighbor as yourself” (Luke 10:27).

3. Nine mentions refer to responding to God (often with countercultural actions):

i. He will turn many of the people of Israel to the Lord their God [away from their conventional ways] (Luke 1:16);

ii. Then Mary said, “Here am I, the servant of the Lord; let it be with me according to your word.” [Mary accepts the countercultural news that she is pregnant with the Son of God]. Then the angel departed from her (Luke 1:38);

iii. “And blessed is she who believed that there would be a fulfillment of what was spoken to her by the Lord.” And Mary said, “My soul magnifies the Lord” [Mary’s acceptance that she is pregnant]. (Luke 1:45 and 46; two mentions);

iv. Jesus answered him, “It is written, ‘Worship the Lord your God, and serve only him’ [rather than seek authority and glory on this earth]” (Luke 4:8);

vi. At that same hour Jesus rejoiced in the Holy Spirit and said, “I thank you, Father, Lord of heaven and earth, because you have hidden these things from the wise and the intelligent [according to the conventional ways of this world] and have revealed them to infants; yes, Father, for such was your gracious will” (Luke 10:21);

vi. See, your [conventional] house is left to you. And I tell you, you will not see me until the time comes when you say, “Blessed is the one who comes in the name of the Lord” (Luke 13:35);

vii. saying, “Blessed is the king who comes in the name of the Lord! Peace in heaven, and glory in the highest heaven!” [conventional leaders did not like this response to Jesus’ entry to Jerusalem] (Luke 19:38);
viii. For David himself says in the book of Psalms, “The Lord said to my Lord, ‘Sit at my right hand’” (Luke 20:42; one mention).

4. The remaining five mentions refer to God’s benevolence to humankind:
   i. Her neighbors and relatives heard that the Lord had shown his great mercy to her, and they rejoiced with her (Luke 1:58);
   ii. The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he has anointed me to bring good news to the poor. He has sent me to proclaim release to the captives and recovery of sight to the blind, to let the oppressed go free, to proclaim the year of the Lord’s favor (Luke 4:18–19);
   iii. One day, while he was teaching, Pharisees and teachers of the law were sitting nearby (they had come from every village of Galilee and Judea and from Jerusalem); and the power of the Lord was with him to heal (Luke 5:17);
   iv. And the fact that the dead are raised Moses himself showed, in the story about the bush, where he speaks of the Lord as the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob (Luke 20:37).

**Summary**

As described in greater length in the leadership model presented in chapter sixteen, the implications for managers seeking to emulate the kind of kurios associated with Jesus and God include

1. being prepared and preparing others for signs of the KOG;
2. learning and teaching KOG principles;
3. implementing countercultural KOG ideas; and
4. facilitating and enjoying KOG outcomes.
I Introduction

1. About 2 billion people, or one-third of the world’s population, consider themselves to be Christian, and there seems to be considerable interest in what Jesus might have to say about management (Adherents, 2007). For example, Jesus is ranked third in Hart’s (1992) list of most influential people in history, and is listed in Pollard’s (1997) 100 Greatest Men. The scriptures associated with Christianity also seem to be of some interest. It is estimated that at least 2.5 billion Bibles have been sold (Terego & Denim, 2006: 146), and the total number in print increases to up to 6 billion if all the free copies that have been distributed are included. In second place are the Qu’ran and the Quotations from Chairman Mao (The Little Red Book) each at about 800 million copies (Greise, 2010). By way of comparison, sales of the Harry Potter series have been estimated at over 500 million copies.

2. See Frey (1998), Golembiewski (1989), Herman (1997), Hershberger (1958), Jackall (1988), Jones (1997), Nash (1994), Naughton and Bausch (1994), Novak (1996), Pattison (1997), Pfeffer (1982), and Redekop, Ainlay, and Siemens (1995). The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism was first published in 1903 (Weber, 1958). Max Weber (1864–1920) is considered to be one of the principal architects of the modern social sciences, along with Karl Marx (1818–1883) and Emile Durkheim (1858–1917). In addition to being the father of organization theory, Weber’s work has been rated as the most important in total and for Organizational Behavior in particular (Miner, 2003), and he continues to be recognized as one of the leading moral philosophers of management (Clegg, 1996). It is not surprising then that Weber continues to be among the most highly cited in scholars in management journals, being mentioned in 15 percent of all articles published in two top journals (Administrative Science Quarterly and Organization Studies) between 1980 and 2002 (Lounsbury & Carberry, 2005: 508). In comparison, the most-cited active author between 1981 and 2002 (Kathleen Eisenhardt) in 30 leading management journals is cited 3,628 times in 26,209 articles (if these cites were distributed so that there was no more than one cite in each article, then Eisenhardt’s work would be cited in 13.8 percent of these articles) (Podsakoff et al., 2008: 655, 682).

3. Weber (1958: 182). The secularized materialistic-individualistic ethic that underpins modern management is thoroughly engrained in “the modern economic order” and has an “irresistible force” that determines the lives of everyone born into it (i.e., “not only those directly concerned with economic acquisition”): “Perhaps it will so determine them until the last ton of fossilized coal is burnt” (181–182).

4. For example, Weber (1958) notes that the “individualistic” and “acquisitive manner of life” associated with the modern economic order has been so thoroughly secularized that “it no longer needs the support of any religious forces, and feels the attempts of religion to influence economic life [to be] an unjustified interference” (72; see also 83, 182, 240; cf. Dyck & Schroeder, 2005).

5. For example, a content analysis of the first ten decades of articles in the Journal of Biblical Integration of Business found that the dominant overarching theme among the
most frequently cited biblical passage was “the contrast between the ways of God and the ways of the world” (Dyck & Starke, 2005). Similarly, as we will see in chapter ten, references to biblical ideas such as “the kingdom of God” in secular scholarly management journals are almost always countercultural to the dominant contemporary paradigm (see also Dyck, forthcoming).

6. The past decade has seen a “remarkable growth rate” for sales of books in the religious market generally (Elinsky, 2005: 11; in the United States self-proclaimed evangelical Christians account for over 40 percent of overall religious sales, Catholics 17 percent, and Christian/Protestants 14 percent), and in the growing number of books integrating faith and business issues in the popular press. Overall, sales in the Christian retail industry have grown from $3 billion in 1996 to $4 billion in 2002 and were expected to be about $9.5 billion in 2010, according to Hirdes, Woods, and Badzinski (2009). Similar interest is also evident within the academic community, where this millennium has seen the development of the “Management, Spirituality and Religion” interest group within the Academy of Management (the world’s largest and most respected secular scholarly management association) and the launch of a number of related journals such as: Journal of Religious Leadership (started in 2002), Journal of Management, Spirituality and Religion (started in 2004), Journal of Biblical Perspectives in Leadership (started in 2006), Journal of Religion and Business Ethics (started in 2010), Journal of Islamic Accounting and Business Research (started in 2010). Finally, there is a host of excellent work that has been written at the intersection of faith and business, though none of it is as thoroughly grounded in a first-century understanding of management as presented in this book, including: Alford and Naughton (2001), Bakke (2005), Delbeq (2005), Dodd and Gotsis (2009), Miller (2007), Mitroff and Denton (1999), Sandelands (2010), van Duzer (2010), Volf (2001), Wood (1991), and Zigarelli (2002). For some interesting research looking at modern-day organizations as secular religions, see Ashforth and Vaidyanath (2002).

1 Overview of this Book

1. These variations are interchangeable for present purposes.
2. Similarly, the word “management” can be traced back to the French word for “house” related to the English word “manor.”
3. As will be elaborated in chapter five, modern commentators speculate that perhaps the rich man felt outsmarted by the manager, and grudgingly conceded that the manager had beat the rich man at his own “game.” Or, perhaps Jesus praised the manager not for unilaterally scattering the rich man’s wealth, but rather for being shrewd; Jesus would like it if everyone was shrewd for Godly purposes like this manager was shrewd for his self-serving purposes. However, if Jesus had wanted to make this point, surely he could have done so in a less awkward manner.
4. For example, this is unlike Bruce Barton’s The Man Nobody Knows (1925), where Jesus is described as “the founder of modern business” (159), and which has been called the second most-read life of Jesus ever written in the United States, with two hundred and fifty thousand copies sold in 1925 and 1926 alone. The book even resulted in a silent movie of the same title (Elzey, 1978). This is also unlike Laurie Beth Jones’s (1995) best seller Jesus CEO, which presents Jesus as a “CEO who took a disorganized ‘staff’ of twelve and built a thriving enterprise” (Jones, 1995: back cover).

2 A Short Introduction to the Gospel of Luke

2. Actually, I had initially intended to focus my study on the material that is found in the so-called Q source, which predates and is consistent with the Gospels. I changed my
mind after talking to John Kloppenborg, perhaps the world’s leading authority on Q, who listened to my project and encouraged me to study the Gospel of Luke instead. That was obviously excellent advice, and I am thankful for it.

3. Luke is commonly accepted to be the author of both Luke and Acts, making him the most prolific author in the New Testament (see Achtemeier, Green, & Thompson, 2001: 269). According to the “Analytical Greek New Testament” there are 19,482 words in the Gospel of Luke, and 18,451 words in Acts, which are the two longest books in the New Testament and together account for 27.5 percent of the entire New Testament (138,020 words in Greek; 180,552 words in English KJV) (Just, 2005). By way of comparison, altogether the 66 books of the Bible have 783,137 words (KJV), which is the equivalent to about 72 percent of the entire seven-book “Harry Potter” series (1,084,170 words). This book, Management and the Gospel, has about 150,000 words.

4. For example, Fitzmyer (1970, 1985) and Green (1997).

5. For example, no other New Testament writer “speaks out as emphatically as does Luke about the Christian disciple’s use of material possessions wealth, and money” (Fitzmyer, 1970: 247). Luke is well-known for placing relatively high emphasis on issues related to economic and social justice. For research like that being described in this book it makes sense to choose the Gospel where the phenomenon under investigation is most “transparently observable” (Pettigrew, 1989).

6. The word kurios is applied to God or Jesus 75 percent of the time (for an analysis of these verses, see appendix B). Of the total of 240 mentions of kurios in all four Gospels, 94 (29 percent) are found in Luke, 78 in Matthew, 17 in Mark, and 51 in John.

7. This is not meant to be an exhaustive analysis of all words related to management in Luke or the other three Gospels. Rather, this is more of a first round of analysis using some of the most frequently mentioned words that have some face validity as being related to management. A similar word count using English words in the New Revised Standard Version (NRSV) translation yielded a similar result. Of the 90 mentions of the following words in all four gospels, 43 (48 percent) appeared in Luke: manage/ment, owner (of a house), steward, leader/ship, lord (did not count references to God/Jesus), and master (did not count references to God/Jesus). These analyses were performed using Accordance software, which was also used to do similar analyses in other parts of the book.

8. Of the remaining mentions of “oikos/oikian” in the other three Gospels, 36 appeared in Matthew, 31 in Mark, and 10 in John. Of the 133 total mentions of “house” in the NRSV translation of the four Gospels, 54 (41 percent) occur in Luke, 41 in Matthew, 29 in Mark, and 9 in John. The present study will follow the common practice of using the two terms oikos and oikian interchangeably (Trainor, 2001: 8).

9. In the first century these assets would belong to an oikos, generally not to its individual members.

10. Again, the frequencies for a rough and ready list of Greek words are similar, with Luke accounting for 50 of 107 (47 percent) of relevant variations of the following words in all four Gospels: arguria/on/os, chruson, denarius, drachme, huparchonta, leptos, mamonas, mina, onia, plouton/t/sios/sious, stater, talenton.


15. Fitzmyer (1970: 15). All ancient historians had a motive, and Luke is no different in that his writing is concerned more with the signification of events than with their validation (Green, 1997: 3, 20). Other points in this discussion are found in Bock (2006: 6, 16), Bovon (2002: 3, 9), Fitzmyer (1970), and Green (1997: 7, 21).
16. Information and quotes in this paragraph are from Bovon (2002: 3, 4; emphasis in original).

17. As an explanation for readers who may find it odd that the four main sections of Luke do not correspond to the chapters and verses that are conventionally used to divide the Gospel into its smaller parts (e.g., why isn’t Luke simply divided into four main chapters, possibly with subsections in each chapter?), note that these chapter and verse designations were not included in any of the original biblical texts—they were added in the Middle Ages.


22. Note that Jesus’ temptations are not unlike those facing contemporary managers, namely, for authority of all the kingdoms of the world (a counterfeit version of the “creation mandate” described in Genesis 1 to have dominion over the world), taking unnecessary/selfish risks with the understanding that God will protect, and breaking natural laws to take care of one’s personal needs (counters the “creation mandates” to nurture community, care for the environment, and seek meaningful work).

23. Jesus grew up in the small Galilean village of Nazareth (population of about two hundred), about three miles from its capital city Sephophor (population of about eight thousand). Galilee is a province about a two-day walk north of Jerusalem. Jesus carried out most of his early ministry on the eastern side of Galilee (Capernaum, Sea of Galilee).


26. Fitzmyer (1970); cf. van Duzer (2010). Note that some are questioning this four-phase framework, arguing that it is more influenced by Greco-Roman ideas than by biblical ideas (McLaren, 2010; Spangenberg, 2007).

27. For more information on how these three are related to management theory and practice, see Dyck and Schroeder (2005).

28. Genesis 1:28b; note that to “have dominion” is clearly different than “to dominate.” Note also that this mandate includes care for creation (Gen. 1:29–30).

29. For example, this is evident in how humankind is to “name” creation (Gen. 2:15,19–20a).


31. “And the Lord commanded the man: ‘You may freely eat of every tree of this garden; but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil you shall not eat, for in the day that you eat of it you shall die’” (Gen. 2:16–17).

32. Genesis 3:15.

33. Genesis 3:17–19. Note that when the serpent and ground are said to be “cursed” (Gen. 3:14,17), it means “to be excluded from community” (Kessler & Deurloo, 2004: 54).

34. Genesis 3:16b.

35. Which can subdivided into the three parts as identified earlier (i.e., Jesus’ ministry in Galilee, Jesus’ journey to Jerusalem, and Jesus’ death/resurrection/ascension in Jerusalem). Note also that others start the “Period of Jesus” as early as Luke 3:1 or 3:2 (Fitzmyer, 1970: 185).
3 MANAGERS, GOODS AND SERVICES PRODUCING ORGANIZATIONS, AND FIRST-CENTURY PALESTINE

1. Much of the historical background of first-century management found in this chapter is drawn from Dyck, Starke, and Weimer (2012), which provides a detailed analysis of whether Weber’s (1958) description of the Protestant ethic is plausibly consistent with the biblical ethic understood in its first-century context.

2. Neyrey (2008a: xxiii). Drakopoulou Dodd and Gotsis (2009: 101) call this the “reading back” problem, a phenomenon that arises when the purported meaning of a text is influenced by the assumptions built into the contemporary lens that is used to interpret it (but when those contemporary assumptions are inconsistent with the assumptions held when the text was originally written). This “reading back” problem is called eisegesis, and stands in contrast with the more familiar term in biblical interpretation called exegesis, which refers to interpreting a text in its context or by drawing upon known views of the author.

6. “Even to gesture with the left hand at Qumran carried the penalty of ten days’ penance” (Wink, 1992: 176). The analysis in this section of the “turn the cheek,” “give your undergarment,” and “go the second mile” passages draws heavily from Wink (1992).
7. Wink (1992: 176, 177) states: “A backhand slap was the usual way of admonishing inferiors . . . [If a man] hits with a fist, he makes the other his equal, acknowledging him as a peer. But the point of the back of hand is to reinforce institutionalized inequality . . . [Thus ‘turning the other’ check is not unlike what] Gandhi taught, ‘The first principle of nonviolent action is that of noncooperation with everything humiliating.’”
8. Ibid., 177.
9. For example, see Lantos (2002: 43) and Porter (1999: 29).
11. For a third teaching along these same lines, consider the subsequent verse in Matthew 5:41, where Jesus tells readers to go a second mile if anyone forces them to go one mile. Here Jesus’ listeners would have known that he was talking about the right of a Roman soldier to force civilians to carry the soldier’s backpack for one mile, but not further. This was considered onerous and oppressive, as the backpacks were heavy (60–85 pounds, plus the weight of weapons). Imagine the soldier’s confusion if the civilian took charge by deciding to carry the backpack a second mile. Is the civilian insulting the soldier’s strength? Will the civilian file a complaint with Roman authorities that he carried the backpack for more than a mile? “Imagine the situation of a Roman infantryman pleading with a Jew to give back his pack! The humor of the scene may have escaped us, but it could scarcely have been lost on Jesus’ hearers, who must have regaled at the prospect of thus discomfiting their oppressors” (ibid., 182).
12. One reason that we lack a comprehensive analysis of management in first-century Palestine is because the contemporary idea of “management” would have been foreign to its inhabitants. Even so, historians studying that era have called for contemporary scholars to use the lens of contemporary management theory and practice to examine what was going on in that era: “It is only with such a change in perspective that modern scholars can expect to be able to reconstruct the history of ancient business management. Historical discourse should not be reluctant to use the modern concepts and criteria to formulate the theoretical basis for the study of a range of activities that clearly fall outside the sphere of interest of ancient writers” (Aubert, 2001: 18–19; cf. Aubert, 1994).
14. Ibid., 22; see also Svyantek (1999).


17. It is interesting to note that the etymology of the word hierarchy points to its religious beginnings: hierēs = priest, and hieros = what is holy, and arkhē = rule, hence priestly or sacred rule (Hopfl, 2000: 315).


21. Terms such as stewards, retainers, scribes, and accountants are relatively interchangeable for our purposes (see Dyck, Starke, & Weimer, 2012: 160).

22. For interested readers, Dyck, Starke, & Weimer (2012) provide more detailed discussions of the interplay between the various roles identified in figure 3.1.

23. Gotsis and Drakopoulou Dodd (2004), and Osiek and Balch (1997).


26. See Finley (1973: 17–21), cited in Moxnes (1997: 20). “As is well known there is no term in Greek for what, in modern Western languages, is referred to as ‘the family,’ that is, the nuclear family of husband, wife and children” (Nagle, 2006: 15). The Latin word familia has a different meaning compared to the contemporary word family. In Columella (I,V,7) res familiaris means the villa as a property. Gardner and Wiedemann (1991: 3–4) provide four different meanings for familia: (1) property; (2) “a certain body of persons, defined either by a strict legal bond . . . or in a general sense of people joined by a looser relationship of kinship”; (3) slaves; and (4) “several persons who all descend by blood from a single remembered source.” Familia therefore has the meaning of first-century “household” and not of a contemporary “family” (Destro & Pesce, 2003: 211–212).

27. “The family was a rich social concept that vertically included ancestors and horizontally included the extended family, even though not living together; unrelated persons such as slaves and freedpersons attached by legal bonds; and even the property and assets of the household” (Osiek & Balch, 1997: 216).

28. Balch (1981), Hanson (1989), Judge (1960), Osiek and Balch (1997: 216). Based on Nagle’s (2006: 312) calculations, a typical complete oikos in an ideal state would have managed land about 12 hectares (30 acres) in size, and have been comprised of parents, children, and one or two slaves.


32. And this would counteract the tendency to move even further from its first-century meaning evident when contemporary biblical translations increasingly translate oikos as “home.” Perhaps the most appropriate way to translate oikos is as a “company,” because a company literally refers to a place where people come together to eat (from the Latin word companio, which means “one who eats bread with you”; cum means “with”; and panis means “bread”) (see Hopfl, 2000: 316). Early Christians practiced life in companies that differed significantly from conventional first-century oikoi (Stevens, 2006: 61).


34. The term oikos or oikia appears over 1,860 times in the LXX (i.e., the LXX basically refers to the Greek translation of the Old Testament) (Elliott, 1981: 182).

35. Of the 57 mentions of oikoi (oikos, oiko, oikia) in Luke, there are at least 25 distinct first-century households mentioned. Note that some of these oikoi are referred to more than once (e.g., Zechariah), and about half of the mentions refer to the oikos of David or Jacob or God.
36. In 39 of these 64 allusions to an оικός, a good or service being produced by the household is identified. The number would be higher if repeated mentions of the same household were recorded.

37. This is consistent with Aaron Kuecker’s (2010) observation that Luke is stock full of references to people in their places of work. For example, the opening scene of Luke describes the Spirit talking to Zechariah as he performs his priestly duties at the temple in Jerusalem.

38. For more on this, see Dyck, Starke, & Weimer (2012).


41. Such “expendables” could represent up to 15 percent of the population, and its members typically died within 5–7 years after joining: “As the elites squeezed the dwindling resources of their peasant base, they forced households to exile their children into the most degrading and lethal forms of poverty” (Herzog, 1994: 66).


43. Quotes in this paragraph taken from Elliott (1981: 188, 192, 194, 197; emphasis added here).

II Problem Recognition

1. This implies that first-century Judeo-Christian teachings about management are not consistent with those that Weber associated with what he called the Protestant ethic (Dyck, Starke, & Weimer, 2012). There could be number of explanations for this apparent disconnect between the Judeo-Christian ethic of the first century and the Protestant ethic. First, the Protestant founders, no matter how sincere, simply misunderstood the biblical teachings. Perhaps they did not have access to adequate knowledge of first-century sociopolitical and economic norms, and thus were unable to properly interpret the biblical writings in their original context. Second, perhaps Weber got it wrong, and his rendition of the Protestant ethic does not accurately reflect the teachings of the Protestant founders. Indeed, Weber has been criticized on this basis. Third, perhaps the popularized and subsequently secularized understanding of the Protestant ethic transformed it in such a way as to be inconsistent with first-century Judeo-Christian writings. For example, by taking specific hallmarks of the Protestant ethic out of their larger context, it would skew and eventually change the larger understanding of Christianity. Or perhaps the explanation involves all three of these factors. While a further analysis of these factors may be valuable, that is not our present task, which is to analyze what the Gospel of Luke says about management, as interpreted through a first-century understanding of management.


5. For example, see Herzog (1994: 13) and Julicher (1910, original 1898, 1899).

4 A Three-Dimensional First-Century Lens for Understanding Management

1. This is consistent with the following observations from Goodrich (2010). As Aristotle [384–322 BCE] explains, “[A]ll people rich enough to be able to avoid personal trouble have a steward who takes this office.” . . . But though absentee landownership during the fourth century BCE was perhaps a rare privilege even among the rich, by about the second century BCE it had become
commonplace among the landed elite to entrust the responsibilities of business administration to various kinds of delegates (82).

Although [oikonomos] originally referred to a free proprietor of an estate, over time the title and the responsibilities of estate and business management came to be identified almost exclusively with slaves and freedmen. Administrators, therefore, were typically the subordinates of wealthy masters/patrons, although administrators themselves were normally located in positions of authority as well. Granted the responsibility of running an enterprise, private administrators were charged with making steady—though not excessive—profits for the proprietor and with directing a group of subordinate labourers to achieve that end. Administrators were often authorised to enter into contract negotiations with potential third contracting parties. Both to their slave staffs as well as to third parties, then, administrators acted as representatives of their principals and were entrusted with the right to act for them as such. Administrators, however, were generally not liable for their contracts. Rather, when formally authorised, the principal was normally held responsible for all commercial dealings, as long as the agent acted within the scope of his commission (116).

2. A Seneca put it: “He who entrusts the care of his patrimony to one who has been condemned for the bad management of his affairs will be considered a poor head of a household” (cited in Baergen, 2006: 33). Thus to accuse a manager of incompetence is more an accusation against the householder than against the manager. After awhile the term oikonomia became increasingly generic. It expanded from describing (1) the work of a householder (initial meaning), to (2) the work of a king, a lord, or a mere administrator (i.e., the work of managing was deemed the same, and was not differentiated based on the manager’s position in the oikos), to (3) how the whole world was managed as a house, and to (4) how the human body or natural world were organized/managed (Richter, 2005: 7, 13). It was also used to describe the oikonomia of salvation.

3. Nagle (2006). Subsequent notable Roman writings about oikonomia are provided by Cato the Elder (second century BCE), Varro (first century BCE) and Columella (first century C.E.) (Aubert, 2001). These writings mostly extended Aristotle’s views about management (especially as larger oikoi become more prevalent): “The most striking features of their descriptions are the stress they put on division of labour, and the existence of a rather sophisticated chain of command, from individual workers, skilled or not, to foremen, overseers, supervisors, administrators, and landowners” (8).

4. Readers familiar with the New Testament will note that these three components are also evident in the “Rules of How to Manage a Household”—often called Haustafeln—found in biblical writings such as Colossians 3:18–4:1; Ephesians 5:21–6:9; 1 Peter 2:13–3:7 (see Balch, 1981; Schroeder, 1959; Yoder, 1972: 164ff).

5. Aristotle (2007: Book 1, VII); “Again, the male is by nature superior, and the female inferior; and the one rules, and the other is ruled; this principle, of necessity, extends to all mankind” (Book 1, V).


10. Honor was ascribed (especially via familial lineage) and could be acquired (through acts of benefaction). “Being born into an honorable family makes one honorable, since the family is the repository of the honor of past illustrious ancestors and their accumulated honor” (Malina & Neyrey, 1991a: 28). When people were described as “the child of so-and-so” it was to give an indication of how much honor that child has. The good name of a family signaled the amount of honor held by its members, and influenced which other households would deal with them. To disobey one’s parent was to dishonor or shame him or her (33, 26).

11. Bowen, 1978, cited on page 73 of Malina and Neyrey (1991b). They go on to say that our twenty-first-century understanding of “[i]ndividualism was and still is a way of being a person totally alien to the scenarios of the first-century Mediterranean world” (72).
12. Westermann (1955: 15). Note also that “[t]he Mishnah explains that a slave is a property, a thing” (Udoh, 2009: 316).
16. Ibid., Book 1, VI; see also Nagle (2006: 133).
17. See pages 107 and 108 in Finley (1973). This general principle also helps to explain why clients entered into relationships with patrons, because patrons could protect clients “from dispossession, from the harsh laws of the debt, and on the whole from military service” (108).
19. The ideas in this paragraph are drawn from Meikle (1994).
21. Ibid., Book 1, X. Modern readers will note the irony that what we today call the “economy” seems less similar to Aristotle’s idea of oikonomia (from which we get the word “economy”), and more akin to his description of unnatural chrematistics. That is, when moderns think about the economy they think almost exclusively about the management of financial wealth, and in particular how to maximize financial wealth. This modern preoccupation is more closely aligned with the idea of chrematistic than oikonomia, and is exactly what Aristotle warned against. In light of this, I think it would be very helpful if we would consistently add the adjective “financial,” or perhaps the adjective “acquisitive,” whenever we talk about the contemporary idea of economics, or related ideas such as “value creation.” If we were to begin to talk about “financial economics” or “financial value creation” it would serve as a reminder that there are other forms of well-being beyond financial well-being that are being overlooked (perhaps unintentionally). For example, it might prompt people to think more about “ecological economics” or “spiritual value creation.” This more holistic approach, which recognizes that there are multiple forms of well-being and multiple stakeholders, seems much more consistent with Aristotle’s idea of oikonomia.
24. Dyck and Neubert (2010: 76). Dyck and Neubert go on to add that this idea of “self-interest with guile” is associated with Oliver Williamson’s transaction cost theory, and opportunistic self-interest with agency theory, two of the leading schools of economic thought in management. These ideas are discussed again in chapter seventeen.
26. Goodrich (2010: 95). Varro “advised the estate owner to seek from his investments both ‘profit and pleasure,’” adding that profit was more important than pleasure. Cicero makes the same point, and Columella makes it even more strongly (Goodrich, 2010: 96).
28. See Finley (1973) and Herzog (1994).
30. Malina and Rohrbaugh (2003: 400). Perhaps the ancients weren’t that far off on their ideas about a zero-sum economy, given that the fossil fuel energy being used to drive the modern economy is essentially being taken from future generations (who will also have to pay for the clean-up associated with pollution being created today).
31. Thus, for many people: “Profit making and the acquisition of wealth were automatically assumed to be the result of extortion or fraud. The notion of an honest rich man was a first century oxymoron. (Malina & Rohrbaugh, 2003: 400). Malina and Rohrbaugh quote St. Jerome (347–420), who is best-known for translating the Bible into Latin: ‘Every rich person is a thief or the heir of a thief.’”
32. Scholars agree that (1) within oikos relationships, and (2) between oikos patron-client relationships represent “the two principal vertical relationships in society” (Ferguson, 2003: 67–68).
33. Ibid., 254. In first-century Palestine there was no such thing as a bank: if you needed to go into debt, the only source of financing was another person or oikos. The resulting patron-client relationship made the client subordinate to the patron, which was
something that Jesus wanted to rectify when he taught followers to forgive their debtors (Luke 11:4). Any time interest was charged, a patron-client relationship was established (cf. Green, 1995: 114–115).

34. Hanson and Oakman (1998: 70–71) and Moxnes (1988: 42). One thing that differentiates Rome from modern bureaucratic societies is that in Rome public figures, from emperors to municipal administrators, were not only expected to, but they were supposed to use their position to bestow benefits only on their “clients,” rather than to bestow them impartially on nonclients (Moxnes, 1991: 245).


38. For example, see Destro and Pesce (2003) and Neyrey (2005). Marshall (2009) explains that this is the social-historical conceptualization of “patron-client” relationships. The strict legal definition of patrocinium (e.g., between a patronus and a cliens) is narrower and quite different.

39. For example, the main “benefit”—if that is the correct term—for most people living in the Roman Empire was the positive effect of so-called pax Romana. Because everyone was under the control of the center, there was less regional conflict and political upheaval.

42. “[I]t is clear from the way that Luke tells his story that the position of mediator or broker is of particular importance. Luke employs this role to give a picture of society in which the broker has an important function within the system of social stratification and social relations” (Moxnes, 1991: 254).

43. See Hanson and Oakman (1998: 73). Managers were not restricted to estate management, but were also evident in government, religious institutions, and the military (Herzog, 1994: 57). Because managers played the role of both client (to their patrons, whom they honored) and patron (to the people they managed), they had to act honorably and be trusted by both. This dual patron-client role is evident in many sectors of ancient society. Client-kings were both clients of the emperor and patrons to their subjects. The emperor was a client of the Roman gods and a patron of the entire empire. Jewish high priests were clients of both Jehovah and the emperor, and patrons to other Jews.

45. “The language of benefaction shifted in the period of Roman domination of the Greek-speaking world. Greeks attributed the title ‘common benefactor’ to the Roman emperors, and the meaning of the term benefactor appears to have gradually shifted to acknowledge the inferior/superior notions common to patronage” (Neyrey & Stewart, 2008c: 47).

48. Aristotle (2006, Book 9, VII). “Aristotle’s Nichomachean Ethics describes two forms of benefaction in ancient Greece. The first is the noble individual who provides important benefits for the community as a whole, and the second is the one who exchanges goods and services on an individual level with others who are equals, or nearly so, status equal . . . A key attribute of the ideal benefactor, therefore, is her or his lack of self-interest” (Batten, 2004: 260–261).

50. For more on alternative approaches to contemporary management thinking, see chapters sixteen–eighteen.

5 Interpreting Luke’s Parable of the Shrewd Manager via a First-Century Lens

The core argument and many of the ideas in this chapter are drawn from Dyck, Starke, and Dueck (2006), who provide a more in-depth analysis of this parable.
1. While both this parable and the parable of the ten pounds (analyzed in the next chapter) refer to a master-slave (or master-servant) relationships, neither of these two parables refers to the other two dimensions of managing relationships within an oikos (i.e., husband-wife relations, parent-child relations).

2. Capon (2002: 302) and Herzog (1994: 233); see also Liefeld (1984: 986). Some of the difficulty in interpreting this parable is already evident in the variety of headings that have been used in different Bible translations for it. Most translations agree the central character in the passage is a “manager” (New Revised Standard Version, New International Version, Good News), also called a “steward” (New American Standard Bible, New Jerusalem Bible). However, there is little agreement about which adjective to use to describe the manager. Some translations refer to him as a shady figure, describing him as “dishonest” (NRSV, KJV) and “unrighteous” (NASB). Other translations emphasize his cleverness, describing him as “shrewd” (NIV, Good News) or “crafty” (NJB). For our present purposes he will be called a “shrewd” manager because this adjective seems appropriate when interpreting him from a twenty-first- as well as a first-century lens (Dyck, Starke, & Dueck, 2006: 116).

3. Similar assumptions were also present in the first century: the agricultural manuals of Catto, Columella, and Varro also warned against self-serving actions of managers who use their access to oikos finances for their own purposes (Baergen, 2006: 33).

4. The value of the reduced debt was about 500 denarii for each client (one denarius is about the same as one day of wage labor).


7. The Greek word diaskorpizon in Luke 16:1 is translated as “wasting” in three translations of the Bible (NIV, RSV, Good News), “being wasteful” in another (NJB), and as “squandering” in three others (KJV, NASB and NRSV).

8. Matthew 25:24,26 (see also Luke 1:51 and Acts 5:37). The parable of the prodigal son—who is said to waste his inheritance—is the only other place in the New Testament where translators have given the pejorative twist of “wasting” to the word diaskorpizon (Landry & May, 2000: 306). For readers who cannot quite bring themselves to accept that the word diaskorpizon is better translated as “scattering” in Luke 16:1, consider also that the word translated as “accused of” (diaballo) in that same verse hints at the fact that the manager may not have been squandering. The term diaballo is often translated as false accusation or slander, which also casts doubt on the meaning of what the manager was doing. This might suggest that the charges being brought against the manager are false. Or, it might simply indicate that the rich man was facing peer pressure from other rich people who had noted that the rich man’s oikos was not being managed according to conventional acquisitive economic principles. These peers, perhaps jealous of the honor the rich man was enjoying thanks to his sustenance economic manager, would have had some motivation to slander the manager and thereby the larger oikos.

Finally, even if diaskorpizon is translated as “squandering,” then it results in two back-to-back parables with that word—the parable of the prodigal son (Luke 15:11–32) and what we might call the parable of the prodigal manager (Luke 16:1–13) (Landry & May, 2000: 307). In both parables the prodigal (i.e., wasteful) character is forgiven after they act in ways to restore their householder’s honor (see later).

9. Lygre (2002: 23); see also Landry and May (2000: 298). If the master believed that his manager was “wasting” oikos resources, then why didn’t the master immediately fire his manager? Perhaps the master wants to discover whether the manager is scattering the wealth in order to serve the manager’s own financial self-interests, or to bring honor to the oikos.

10. As Landry and May (2000: 301) point out: “The manager’s actions make his master appear to be generous, charitable, and law-abiding.” In doing so, the manager also increases the likelihood that he will be welcomed into another oikos as a manager, in particular an oikos that does not want to participate in acquisitive economics.
11. Ibid., 308.
12. Ibid., 304.
13. We don’t know whether or not the rich man rehires the manager in the end, though the pressures from peers not to rehire him would still be strong.
14. If the manager is the one who was dishonest, then a more common expression—such as adikos oikonomos (literally, an unjust manager)—could have been used (Dyck, Starke, & Dueck, 2006: 124–125). In any case, note that the manager’s “dishonesty” differs qualitatively from the dishonesty exhibited by modern-day white-collar criminals: the manager in the parable did not feather his own nest by his scattering (Wright, 2000: 228; noting that this observation goes back at least as far as Bonaventure, 1221–74).
15. As will become apparent in the next chapter, this echoes a similar idea found in the parable of the ten pounds, namely, that how a manager responds to acquisitive economic temptations can be seen as a test to see how the manager will manage resources of ultimate worth.
16. A comprehensive analysis of the Greek words translated as “eternal” or “everlasting” (aion-aionios) concludes that these terms do not mean “endless.” The idea that eternal means endless is not supported by its etymology, nor by definitions of lexicographers, nor by Greek writers before and at the time the Septuagint was made, nor by its general usage in the Old Testament, nor by the Jewish Greek writers in the first century, nor by how it is employed in the New Testament, nor by the Christian Fathers for the first three centuries after Christ. Augustine (c.e. 354–430) was the first known to argue that aionios signified endless (Hanson, 1875: 73, 76–77). Thus, a first-century understanding of the New Testament term “eternal life” (e.g., Luke 10:25, 18:18,30) emphasizes “the quality of the Blessed Life . . . the life of the gospel, spiritual life . . . It consists of knowing, loving and serving God. It is the Christian life, regardless of its duration” (43,55). Quoting E.H. Sears: “Not duration, but quality, is the chief thing involved in this word rendered ‘eternal.’ . . . The word aion and its derivatives, rendered ‘eternal’ and ‘everlasting’, described an economy complete in itself, and the duration must depend on the nature of the economy” (Hanson, 1875:60). Barclay (1964: 33–34) adds that the term aionios was in “Hellenistic Greek times the standing adjective to describe the Emperor’s power. The royal power of Rome is a power which is to last forever” and notes that the term “eternal life” had three meanings in classical Greek: (1) a lifetime, (2) an age or a generation or an epoch, and (3) a very long space of time.
17. Note that this dispersing is purposeful and planned—not haphazard squandering—and different from handouts that create a dependency that may lead to a lack of motivation for recipients.
19. Cited in Just (2003: 255–256; emphasis added here; though note that Chrysostom’s rationale—“that in the future we may count on them”—could also be interpreted to be instrumental in nature, and thus not entirely inconsistent with a broad interpretation of conventional patron-client logic).
20. According to Augustine:
   [T]o our prayers we must add, by almsgiving and fasting, the wings of loving-kindness, so that they may fly more easily to God and reach him. For this the Christian mind can readily understand how far removed we should be from the fraudulent filching of other people’s property; when it perceives how similar it is to fraud when you don’t give to the needy what you don’t need yourself (cited in Just, 2003: xxvi; emphasis added here: Augustine was commenting on Luke 6:37–38).
This chapter borrows heavily from Dyck, Starke and Dueck (2009), which provides a more detailed analysis of the parable of the ten talents.

1. This is the only passage in the Gospel of Luke where the explicit purpose of money is to make money (Oakman, 2002), even though in first-century Palestine it was apparently not unusual for slaves to be given such managerial responsibilities (e.g., Fitzmyer, 1985: 1235; Goodrich, 2010; Green, 1997: 678).

2. The third slave describes the nobleman's business practices as exploitive, fraudulent, and unlawful (Green, 1997: 679–680). The idea of the master taking what he did not deposit “is drawn from banking, and is used here to describe a person who seeks a disproportionately high return from his investments” (Marshall, 1978: 707).

3. It has been noted that the master kills those who opposed his rule, but does not kill his slave (Green, 1997: 680)—perhaps this is because he owns the slave and does not want to reduce his own wealth.


7. For example, see Fitzmyer (1985: 1233) and Marshall (1978: 701). Whereas in the parable of the shrewd manager the word kurios is translated as “master” (as it is in most other occasions in Luke where it refers to someone other than Jesus or God), it is curious that in the parable of the ten pounds the same word kurios is translated as “Lord” (this happens only one other time in Luke—in Luke 13:8—whereas the other more that 70 times the word “Lord” is used it refers to God or Jesus [see appendix B]). An unintended consequence of this translation may be that modern readers are more likely to interpret the nobleman to represent God.

8. This is consistent with the third manager in Matthew’s parable of the talents (Herzog, 1994: 153).

9. Some modern commentators (perhaps grudgingly) acknowledge such problems, but are quick to dismiss parts that don’t fit well with a twenty-first-century interpretation by deeming them to be “secondary additions to the parable” and thus not relevant for its main message (e.g., Marshall, 1978: 701).


11. Archelaus was the ethnarch of Judea from 4 BCE to 6 CE. (Fitzmyer, 1985: 1235; Green, 1997: 676; Marshall, 1978: 703).

12. Temin (2004: 14) and Myers (2001). However, Marshall (1978: 705) suggests that “1,000% profit . . . was quite possible under ancient conditions with enormous interest and commission rates.”


14. With regard to earning interest from a bank, recall in that time there were no “banks” as there are today. The reference literally means to place the money “on a (moneylenders’) table” (compare Matt. 21:12; Mark 11:15; Luke 19:45; John 2:15). Recall also that charging interest was permissible only when Jews lent to non-Jews (e.g., Deut. 23:19–21) (Fitzmyer, 1985: 1237). At a more fundamental level, earning interest also seems to go against the Creation story, where God desires work to be inherently meaningful and for people to work as God worked. Does the desire to use money to make money reflect an attempt to avoid working by the sweat of our brow (Gen. 3:19)? In this light, perhaps it is no coincidence that the third manager had wrapped his pound inside in a soudarion (literally, “a cloth for perspiration”), which refers to a sweat cloth used for face or neck for protection from the sun (Fitzmyer, 1985: 1236; Marshall, 1978: 706). By using “money
to make money” the managers in the parable were likely increasing the amount of literal and metaphorical sweat on the brows of the relatively poor.

15. Eusebius was commenting on a variation of this parable from the (now lost) “Gospel of the Nazoreans” (Eusebius, *Theophania* on Matt. 25:14ff, cited in Schneemelcher, 1990: 149; cited in Malina & Rohrbaugh, 2003: 386). Eusebius was one of the more renowned Church Fathers who became a bishop of Caesarea in Palestine in 314. Eusebius also suggests that the threat uttered at the end of the parable of the talents may not have been directed at the third manager who hid the talent in the ground.


17. Origen (1996). Origen also sees the good in the third manager when he likens him to one of the apostles (which he also does with the other managers; 218). However, in other writings Origen differs from the first-century interpretation described here, in that on one occasion he likens the pounds “to the grace of the Holy Spirit” (220), on another he seems to liken them to virtues (219), and in yet another he likens the nobleman to “Christ after the Ascension” (218).


19. Richard Wilkinson and Kate Pickett (2009) analyze data across nations, and within the United States across states. Their measure of income inequality is based on calculating how much richer the richest 20 percent are compared to the poorest 20 percent in a society. For example, in the United States, which has among the highest income gaps in the so-called developed world, the richest 20 percent are on average 8.5 times richer than the poorest 20 percent. In contrast Japan, which has a relatively low income gap, the rich are on average 3.4 times richer than the poor. In the United States over 25 percent of the population has been diagnosed as having some sort of mental illness, whereas that rate is less than 10 percent in Japan.

7 Passages about Managing Relationships *within Organizations* (*Oikonomia*)


2. Note that Luke never actually uses the terms “husband” and “wife” to describe Mary and Joseph’s relationship to one another.

3. Joanna is among several women who provide “resources” to Jesus. “Luke’s terminology implies that these women do not merely ‘provide,’ but what they do is an act of ‘service . . . Having service as their main task, many of the women in Luke-Acts exemplify in their lives the model of Jesus” (Moxnes, 1991: 263).

4. This includes 6 mentions of parent(s), 27 mentions of child(ren), 25 mentions of mother or daughter, 61 mentions of father, and 69 mentions of son. Note that 69 percent (130) of these 188 references are to “father” and “son,” a reflection of the importance placed on male-centrism in the first century. However, only 48 percent (63) of the 130 mentions of “father” and “son” refer to typical fathers and sons living in first-century Palestine. Instead, 27 of the 130 mentions (21 percent) of the words “father” or “son” are related to *God* (11 refer to a son of God, 16 to God as the father). An additional 16 of the 130 (5 percent) references are to *ancestors* (5 refer to a son of Israel/David, 11 to David/Abraham/ancestors as fathers). And in another 24 (18 percent) passages Jesus refers to himself as the Son of Man.

5. This includes all the passages in Luke that describe a verbal exchange or the dynamics of an ongoing relationship between parent(s) and their child(ren) in a first-century *oikos* setting. It does not include passages that mention both parent and child figures but where (1) the children are infants or even unborn (especially in the first four chapters of Luke); or (2) where the parent-child relationship is not described in any depth (e.g., several
passages describe the situation where a parent brings to Jesus’ attention a child who is sick or dying so that Jesus may heal them).

6. Lest the reader surmise that these words foreshadowed a tumultuous teen-parent relationship, Luke goes on to say that Jesus returned to Nazareth and was obedient to Mary and Joseph, and that he grew in wisdom and in years, and in divine and human favor.

7. Most commentators note that many common social conventions are broken in this parable, and Park (2009) emphasizes how doing so serves to dismantle the traditional norms of oikos, and thus prepares the way for an alternative way of managing enterprise.

8. For an excellent discussion on the pedagogical importance of breaking down existing norms, perhaps especially for peasants who are oppressed by those norms, see the analysis and application of Paulo Freire in Herzog (1994: especially chapter 1).

9. That is, life in a new life-giving era of oikoi—see chapter five, note 16.


11. In this context the word “hate” does not refer primarily to an affective quality, but rather it refers to a disavowal of one’s primary allegiance to their kin. This is consistent with Jesus’ other teachings that reinterpret the meaning oikos in a larger framework (Green, 1997: 565). Marshall (1978: 592) suggests “hate” in this context may mean “to love less.” Destro and Pesce (2003: 221) note that “[t]he logion seems to imply not just the obligation of a clear separation, but also a radical condemnation of the normal relations within the oikos.”

12. Note that the verses immediately following the three passages quoted here provide some hints regarding how this alternative oikos can be developed:

   Householders should take note of the larger trends happening around them, judge for themselves what is the right thing to do, and then act in countercultural ways (i.e., literally change their ways by 180 degrees, repent), lest they find themselves imprisoned by the status quo (Luke 12:54–13:5).

   Householders consider financial issues before they start a new building (root = oikos) project, lest their building contributes to the downfall of their oikoi (Luke 14:27–30).

   The son of man (inherently an oikos relationship) will suffer due to the dominant institutional structures and systems, and he will rise up on the third day (Luke 18:31–33).

13. For a more detailed analysis regarding the difference between adult children and their parents, see Destro and Pesce (2003).

14. The most notable possible exception is the shrewd manager in Luke 16.

15. Note that in each of these three cases the word “slave” (doulos) is translated in the NRSV as “servant,” perhaps aware of the negative (and misleading) connotations of the word “slave” to twenty-first-century readers.

16. These five passages do not include other passages that we have already looked at, perhaps most notably the parable of the ten pounds.


19. Adolf Juliuscher (1910, original 1898, 1899) provides a foundational treatise arguing that Jesus’ parables would not have been interpreted as allegories in their original form, nor should they be interpreted as allegories today. A more recent literature review of the various approaches to interpreting parables that have been utilized over the past century suggests that scholars still largely ignore the material world described in parables’ social scripts. The notion that the language used in a parable “once lived as part of a social, political, economic system, which gave it birth and provided its resonance” has been given “cursory examination” at best and still usually remains “foreign to the enterprise of interpreting the parable” (Herzog, 1994: 13).

20. Though it is unclear why God “went to another country for a long time.”

21. The Greek word for reject means to “reject as unworthy” (Liddell & Scott, 2000).

22. “[L]arge-scale viticulture was a costly and speculative enterprise . . . Textual evidence indicates that vineyard owners normally came from the population sector just below the class...
of the civic and political elite (the upper class cavalry, soldiers, officers and administrators)” (van Eck, 2007: 917, 921).

23. “[T]he parable opens with a description of a familiar process, the takeover of peasant land and its subsequent conversion into a vineyard” (Herzog, 1994: 104). When these farmers lost their land they also lost their oikos. “Losing land meant losing one’s Israelite identity which normally led to one becoming a day laborer or a beggar” (van Eck, 2007: 916).

24. Vineyards built on a large scale were “oriented towards exportation, rather than local consumption” (van Eck, 2007: 917). Archaeological and literary evidence shows that large estates were being increasingly created at that time. “Free smallholders farming with grain, olives and grapes aimed at local consumption were displaced by larger estates concentrating on monoculture dedicated to the production of export crops” (920).

25. Vineyards, being the most labor-intensive of agricultural activities at that time, had a severe effect on the structure and nature of labor: “It created and exploited a class of underemployed non-slave laborers, forced smallholders off their productive land to marginal land and drew on the labor inputs from underemployed non-slave labor and smallholders during certain key periods (e.g., cropping). Viticulture needed substantial capitalization, was uncertain and risky (a vineyard took 4–5 years to come into full production), and was usually associated with wealth and the wealthy” (ibid., 921).

26. Van Eck (2007) suggests that it has only been in the last 20 years or so that modern interpreters have recognized that the owner is not the hero of the story, but rather the villain, and that Jesus told the parable to warn other landowners (Kloppenborg, 2006: 131).

27. “[L]andowners despised hard labor, had neither the inclination nor the expertise to work their land and therefore turned to either slave-run estates or tenancies to skilled vine-dressers. Given the nature of viticulture, it was the rule rather than the exception for an owner not to be present on his property (Kloppenborg 2006: 314–316)” (van Eck, 2007: 921). In situations like this “indebtedness was systemic and violence and conflict were the norm rather than the exception” (917).

28. “[T]he son’s appearance made the tenants believe the landlord was dead, and—by killing the heir—they tried to appropriate the vineyard on the grounds of an existing law according to which the estate of an interstate proselyte could be appropriated by a claimant who was already occupying it (the law of adverse possession or usucaptio)” (van Eck, 2007: 913).

29. Herzog (1994: 113). Luke’s emphasis on nonviolent civil disobedience will become evident in part five when we look at the passages that describe how to move away from conventional and toward alternative ways of managing.

30. “The elites of Galilee and Judea imitated their imperial overlords” in the way they became absentee landowners taking land from the poor (ibid., 104).

31. See also ibid., 113.

32. There are “many indications in the psalm that point in the direction of explaining the experiences of the individual in this psalm as that of a group of people” (Botha, 2003: 210; see also Kwon, 2009: 52).

33. “In the psalm [118], use of builders as a term refers to the nations. However, Luke applies the term to the builders of Israel, meaning the leaders of Israel” (Kwon, 2009: 52, 54).

34. Just as the Hebrew people were marginalized and without a homeland in Psalm 118, so also the tenants in Luke 20 can be seen as lacking their own land and thus likened to the rejected stone. Note again how this lack of land is associated with a lack of oikos or “homelessness” (paraikos): “Whereas oikos connotes associations and impressions of home, belongingness, and one’s proper place, paraikos depicts the ‘DP,’ the displaced and dislocated person, the curious or suspicious-looking alien or stranger” (Elliott, 1981: 24; cf. 28).

35. Akin to the symbolic “individual” in Psalm 118, in Acts 4:11 Jesus is portrayed as a prototypical representative of socially marginalized people who exemplifies and ushers in the kingdom of God. Jesus’ crucifixion symbolizes the extreme case of being socially marginalized in the Roman empire.
37. This is in contrast with the common understanding that views closure of an organization (and perhaps especially of a religious organization) as a failure that is to be avoided at all costs. Rather, it embraces the idea of cycles of life, and provides opportunities for new generations to create places of worship that are grounded in their contemporary settings. Research is also clear that having supportive parent congregations is helpful, though not necessary, for the establishment of new congregations. This somewhat provocative view requires more study, and may represent a unique way to think about Jubilatory practices. For more on this, see Dyck (1997, 2003), and Dyck and Starke (1999).
38. The brief literature review and findings presented here are from Scuderi (2010); see also Bivins (2005) and Ming (2005).

8 PASSAGES ABOUT MANAGING MONEY (CHREMATISTICS)

2. Includes mentions of coin/s, denarius, denarii, pound/s, and silver (Luke does not mention gold or talents). Note also that, for the sake of reader-friendliness, the analysis in this chapter was done using the English NRSV translation of Luke. A rough and ready list of parallel keywords in Greek would include variations of: arguria/on/os, denarius, drachme, leptos, mamonas, mina, ploutou/ton/siois/sious, ptochos, stater.
6. This parable will be discussed more fully in chapter fourteen.
7. In particular, followers are called to leave behind their possessions and the traditional financial security (economic safety net) associated with their position in their conventional oikos, and to instead carry their metaphorical cross, knowing that this cross is countercultural and threatens the social order that is favored by the elite members of society.
8. Thus, this passage provides an explanation for the opening theme in Luke’s passages about money: rich people are too distracted by their riches to be receptive to the kingdom. This echoes and reinforces an earlier passage that described how riches are like thorns that choke and prevent the maturation of seeds of the word of God (Luke 8:4–15). The problem is that people who focus on financial prosperity are not rich toward God.
9. This contrasts with some twenty-first-century interpretations of Jesus’ teaching to “Seek first God’s kingdom and God’s and then things like food and clothing will be given to you as well,” which tend to emphasize that if people seek the “kingdom of God” as their destination in the afterlife, then God will give them material wealth in this world.
10. Note again how this community nurturing statement “From everyone to whom much has been given, much will be required; and from the one to whom much has been entrusted, even more will be required” (Luke 12:48) stands in stark contrast to the more negative reinforcing cycle attributed to the acquisitive economic nobleman in the parable of the ten pounds: “[T]o all those who have, more will be given; but from those who have nothing, even what they have will be taken away” (Luke 19:26). Again, one cycle reduces the gap between the rich and the poor, and the second widens the gap. In short, managers are called to be responsible stewards, to treat employees well, and to act as servant leaders.
11. Note that salvation does not come from believing that someone (in this case Lazarus) has risen from the dead, but rather from sharing resources with the poor.
12. This is typically interpreted as suggesting that the man became sad because he was unwilling to sell everything. It could also be interpreted to suggest that the man was sad because, in an instant, he realized how futile his previous wealthy lifestyle had been.
13. Note that an “urban myth” suggests that the term “eye of a needle” “actually refers to a narrow gateway into Jerusalem that a relatively unencumbered camel could, in fact, squeeze through. A camel that was heavily laden with a rich man’s goods, however, could not, and thus Jesus refers to our worldly possessions as excess baggage that we must be prepared to shed if we are to enter” (Gomes, 2001: 64). However, according to biblical scholars there is no historical evidence to support such an interpretation (e.g., Fitzmyer, 1985: 1204).

14. Which means that he had other “junior” tax collectors reporting to him.

15. Together worth about a day’s wage for a day laborer (Green, 1997: 728).

16. Scholars debate whether Jesus considers it to be praiseworthy, or it is a travesty, that the poor widow donated “all she had to live on.” On the one hand, it may be considered praiseworthy because she gives a greater proportion of her means than the extravagant rich people (Fitzmyer, 1985: 1230). Moreover, her having given “all she had to live on” seems to be consistent with earlier passages in Luke that call for Jesus’ disciples to leave behind or sell all their possessions (e.g., the rich young ruler, Jesus’ disciples), and is consistent with subsequent passages in Acts where followers do sell all their possessions (Acts 2:45).

On the other hand, where it is inconsistent with earlier passages is regarding what happens to the proceeds from the sold possessions—earlier passages suggest the proceeds are to be given to the poor so that everyone has enough. However, in this case they are given to a temple treasury that is run by leaders whom Jesus has condemned; e.g., see the passage immediately prior to this one—Jesus criticizes the leaders of the temple and thus its treasury, believing that it is being managed by people who use it for unjust purposes (Green, 1997: 729). It has been noted Jesus does not suggest that the widow’s actions are praiseworthy or exemplary. Rather, Jesus has come to champion structures and systems that save the poor from their poverty, not to celebrate practices that impoverish them further (728). In light of the overall propoor theme in Luke, it seems unlikely that Jesus is praising the actions of a widow who is going from poverty to destitution.

17. “And here is the very core of this issue and the emergence of Jesus’ ethic; wealth should not be generated or accumulated at the expense of another. When an individual acquires and holds wealth to the detriment of another individual, those activities are unacceptable to God. Which is not to say that wealth, even very large measures of wealth, are not to be generated and accumulated by individuals, but only that this cannot be done to the detriment and deprivation of others” (Tyson, 2006: 173).

18. This is not to suggest that Jesus wants everyone to be at the same economic level. For example, Jesus does not lament that King Solomon was dressed in glory, nor does he call the chief tax collector Zacchaeus to forsake his position and sell everything that he owns. It seems that some economic diversity is appropriate, so long as no one in society is impoverished. A clear implication of this is to reverse the widening gaps between the rich and the poor within organizations, within nations, and between nations.


9 Passages about Managing Relationships

BETWEEN ORGANIZATIONS


explicit that benefaction is in view. Those who are invited are invited precisely because of their inability to repay their patron. They have nothing to offer, and their very low status in society means that even any honor they attribute to the benefactor who is inviting them will not alter the honor status of the host” (Neyrey & Stewart, 2008c: 48).

3. “And you shall hallow the fiftieth year and you shall proclaim liberty throughout the land to all its inhabitants. It shall be a jubilee for you: you shall return, every one of you, to your property and every one of you to your family. That fiftieth year shall be a jubilee for you: you shall not sow, or reap the aftergrowth, or harvest the unpruned vines” (Lev. 25:10–11).


6. However, it can tempting to interpret passages like these (and others, perhaps most notably those where Jesus heals people) as suggesting that Jesus represents “a new-and-improved” patron, a patron whose indebted clients need not fear that they will be oppressed. For example, some scholars suggest that the ancient patronage model can be applied to the biblical story insofar as “God is the patron, Christ is the broker, and human beings are the clients” (Downs, 2009: 130). “In adopting (even re-adopting) the role of divine Patron and thus guaranteeing to meet those physical needs that many children were or would be unable to meet themselves, Jesus seems to be suggesting that God was hereby rendering those [earthy] patron-client relationships, which formed the very basis of the political-economy, redundant for His children” (Tryon, 2006: 183). While there may be some merit in viewing God as divine patron, this seems appropriate only if the meaning of patron-client relationships is totally transformed/reinvented; there is a danger that using it as an analogy will inadvertently lead to cooptation into conventional view. In any case, others have argued that “Luke presents Jesus primarily in terms prevalent in Hellenistic Jewish culture (reciprocity and friendship), secondarily as a benefactor, and not as a patron” (Marshall, 2009: 331).

7. See Danker (1982: 501–502). The three passages we look at here are ones that Danker refers to on more than ten pages in his analysis.

8. Even though the centurion is accustomed to commanding clients, he is clear that he has no intention of making Jesus into client (Malina & Rohrbaugh, 2003: 390). Recall that we have already taken a look at this passage in our earlier discussion about master-slave relations. By calling Jesus “Lord” the centurion seems to give Jesus the opportunity to be a “patron” while he accepts the role of the “client” (Moxnes, 1991: 253).


11. “There is, then, a break with the patron-client relationship at its most crucial point; a service performed or a favor done shall not be transformed into status and honor” (Moxnes, 1991: 261). As will be discussed in greater detail in chapter fourteen, the Luke 10 passage can be seen as describing peacemaking between Jesus’ followers (Jews) and the Samaritans in the villages into which Jesus sends the 70 followers. Samaritan and Jewish relations were strained at best (e.g., several verses earlier in Luke 9:54 two of Jesus’ disciples ask if they should command fire to consume a Samaritan village). In Luke 10 Jesus creates a situation where these Samaritan “enemies” essentially become the hosts of his followers, a variation of Ford’s (1984) idea that “My Enemy is my Guest.”

12. Note that the English word for “leader” appears only nine times in Luke, and this is the only passage in Luke where it refers to Jesus’ disciples. This is also the only time where it is translated from the Greek word hegoumenos, which means “to lead, consider, count, regard” or “to go before, to lead the way” (Liddell & Scott, 2000). In the other eight passages the “leaders” referred to either leaders within Judaism (Luke 8:41; 8:49; 13:14; 14:1) and/or to other civic leaders involved in Jesus’ crucifixion (Luke 19:47; 23:13, 35; 24:20). In each of these passages the Greek word for leader is archon (or archisunagogu), which also appears three additional other times in Luke where it is translated as “ruler” (Luke 11:15; 18:18) and as “magistrate” (Luke 12:58). Of all these other leaders, the only
one who is described in favorable terms is the religious leader Jairus, who showed humility (Jairus fell at Jesus’ feet, and begged Jesus to come to his oikos, where his 12-year-old daughter was dying—Jesus raised the daughter—Luke 8:40–56).

13. “The question [in this passage] is not how to obtain greatness, but how the great should behave. It is possible, therefore, to read Luke at this point as accepting structures of leadership, but emphasizing a transformation of their role and their status. The greatest and the leaders will have no different status from the young and those who serve at table, that is, they will have no special no power or special honor” (Moxnes 1991: 260–261).


IV New Way of Seeing

1. “Jesus thus calls on people to live as he lives, in contradistinction to the agonistic, competitive form of life marked by conventional notions of house and status typical of the larger Roman world. Behaviors that grow out of service in the kingdom of God take a different turn: Love your enemies. Do good to those who hate you. Extend hospitality to those who cannot reciprocate . . . Within the Third Gospel, the chief competitor for this focus stems from Money—not so much money itself, but the rule of Money, manifest in the drive for social praise and, so, in forms of life designed to keep those with power and privilege segregated from those of low status, the least, the lost, and the left-out” (Green, 1997: 24).

2. “In the New Testament period, neither religion nor economics had a separate institutional existence and neither was conceived of as a system on its own, with a special theory of practice and a distinctive mode of organization. Both were inextricably intertwined with the kinship [e.g., oikos] and political systems [e.g., patron-client relations]” (Malina & Rohrbaugh, 2003: 397).

10 The Kingdom of God is Enacted and Manifest in Organizational Settings

Many of the ideas in this chapter are drawn from and build upon Dyck and Sawatzky (2010).

1. “Voluntary commitment to a community distinct from the total society provides resources for practical moral reasoning of a kind which are by definition unthinkable where that option is not offered and where the only way to be an individual is to rebel” (Yoder, 1984: 25).

2. “The ‘Kingdom of God/Heaven’ is a subject of major importance in the Bible for two primary reasons: its frequency in the first three canonical (synoptic) gospels of the NT, and the conviction that it stands at the very center of the message of the historical Jesus. Its meaning, which is derived from a world of oriental monarchs and monarchies that is very different from modern Western democracies, has been interpreted in various ways. Historically it has been associated with the future state of the resurrected, immortal blessed; the Church; monastic contemplation; mystical ecstasy; pious religious experience; the progressively redeemed society inspired by love; the future transformation of this world; apocalyptic hope for the next world; and an open-ended symbol possible of many interpretations” (Duling, 1992: 49).

3. This is evident in a series of article I’ve written with colleagues (e.g., Dyck & Schroeder, 2005; Dyck & Weber, 2006; Dyck, Starke, & Dueck, 2009) as well other writings in
secular journals, which suggest biblical KOG teachings challenge the emphasis in contemporary management on materialism (Gomes, 2001: 64; Roels, 1997: 113; Rossouw, 1994: 559) and individualism (Johnson, 1957: 74, 75; Selznick, 1992: 479; Pava, 2002: 49; Campbell, 2008: 431). Even Weber (1958) himself suggested that the particular Reformational “Protestant ethic” that he described may be inconsistent with the biblical record interpreted in its historical context. As explained in Dyck and Sawatzky (2010), a review of references to “kingdom of God” in over 25 leading management journals, over 20 books on the general topic of “Christian management” (most were popular press books), and other publications with a primary focus on the “kingdom of God” (these latter sources provided the foundation for the analysis that follows; none of them had a sustained emphasis on management) found that there is a persistent view that (1) the KOG is relevant for management theory and practice; (2) the message of the biblical KOG is generally at odds with conventional (materialist-individualist) management theory and practice; and (3) there has been no attempt to develop a comprehensive and historically grounded understanding of the managerial implications of biblical KOG teachings interpreted via a first-century lens.

4. Though, as our analysis has shown, Luke has more references to oikos than to the “kingdom of God.” The idea of a KOG serves as a foundational concept in each of the three Abrahamic religions: Judaism, Christianity, and Islam.

5. “The key question is whether Jesus saw the kingdom as a future apocalyptic event or as a present mysterious reality. A majority of contemporary scholars hold a primarily or exclusively ‘present’ view, emphasizing those traditions in the Synoptics (Matt 12:28 = Luke 11:20; Luke 17:20–21) and Thomas (Gos. Thom. 3, 113) which speak of a present kingdom, understood in either or both of the compatible senses of a mysterious presence pervading reality or as a power presently active in the world. A few hold a wholly or primarily future understanding, and the remainder maintain a ‘both/and’ understanding. For those holding a partially or wholly future view, an important question is whether Jesus saw the future kingdom as coming in a dramatically objective and visible manner” (Borg, 1992: 811).

6. This points to what theologians refer to as an eschatological understanding of the KOG. Some biblical texts give the impression that the KOG is yet-to-come, while others suggest that the KOG is already at hand. Interpretations that focus only on its future coming and its other-worldly realm reduce the KOG to a “skyhook Second Coming” (McLaren, 2004: 267) that will save humankind by removing people from the earth and all their material problems (Sawatzky, 2006). Rather, a more accurate and balanced interpretation of the biblical text suggests that in Jesus the “eschatological order [had come] in advance of the eschatological event” (Ladd, 1974: 188); the full consummation of the KOG for humankind is still coming. Indeed, it is precisely knowing that the KOG is assured that gives Jesus’ followers the power to manifest it on earth. From this perspective the phrase the KOG is at hand means “God’s new benevolent society is already among us” (McLaren, 2010: 138).

7. Ever since Julius Caesar had been divinized by the Roman Senate subsequent Roman emperors proclaimed themselves to be “sons of God” and their empires became “kingdoms of God” (Reed, 2007).

8. The Greek word basileia relates most closely to the notion of a royal administration; a reign. Thus “kingdom of God” does not refer primarily to a territory that comes under God’s governance, but rather to the fact of God’s rule, God’s royal reign (Kraybill, 1978: 25). To enter the KOG, then, is not to exist in a new place, but rather to experience the kingly rule of God, or in more contemporary terms, to experience the particular management style favored (and modeled) by God.

9. Note that the KOG also extends beyond human relationships.

10. Recall that in first-century Palestine people who were sick and demon-possessed would not have had a place in a conventional oikos; when Jesus heals them they can again become full members of society. Whereas twenty-first-century readers tend to interpret healing passages as Jesus curing someone from a physical disease, people in the first century
would have been much more likely to see Jesus as restoring people into community. As Malina and Rorhbaugh (2003: 368–369) explain, anthropologists differentiate between “disease” (a physical malady) and “illness” (a socially constructed phenomenon, which results in a lack of social position). For an example of “illnesses,” consider Leviticus 21:17–20, which describes the attributes of people who are not permitted to approach the altar: “For no one who has a blemish shall draw near, one who is blind or lame, or one who has a mutilated face or a limb too long, or one who has a broken foot or a broken hand, or a hunchback, or a dwarf, or a man with a blemish in his eyes or an itching disease or scabs or crushed testicles.” The New Testament describes not so much the healing of “diseases” (i.e., physical ailments) as the healing of illnesses (e.g., allowing people with blemishes to draw near to God). See also Pilch (1991: 199) who notes: “[I]n the first-century Mediterranean world, the political dimensions [i.e., ‘political actions performed for the purpose of restoring correct order to society’] of Jesus’ healing activity would be self-evident to all witnesses, friendly and hostile alike.”

As will become even more apparent in Group #4 passages, this sharing of bread and wine among believers is not only enacting the KOG, but it can also be seen as an outcome of the KOG. Put differently, when followers share meals with each other, it also predisposes them to share meals with others who do not have an oikos to belong to. As Elliott (1991a: 103, 104) demonstrates: “Put briefly, food codes embody and replicate social codes . . . [For Luke meals represent] symbols of life shaped by the principles and values of the kingdom of God.” Thus eating together as an open-to-all fictive oikos is a powerful symbol of the KOG.

In the one passage where Jesus does not explicitly address the social elite, he talks to people on the way to Jerusalem about an elite group of past leaders (Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob) (Luke 13:28–30).

Note that the emphasis on oikos is least apparent in (1) Luke 17:20–21, which simply alludes to it by saying the KOG is evident in the relationships “among” Jesus’ listeners, and (2) in Luke 23:50–56 where Joseph of Arimathea places Jesus’ dead body in a tomb (his final “home” so to speak).

Moreover, this has some similarities to a parallel argument in Aristotle. For Aristotle, the polis (city) was where the fullest expressions of human flourishing and happiness (eudaimonia) could take place, and the oikos was expected to enshrine and inculcate the polis’s values. Oikoi were considered “good” if they “reflected the character of, and were productive of, the character of the polis” (Nagle, 2006: 9).

Even though Luke’s prologue states that he pays particular attention to the sequential order in which he presents his account (Luke 1:3), and even though biblical scholars encourage readers to attend to the order in which Luke places events (“[t]he sequence itself provides the larger meaning,” Johnson [1991: 4]), it may nevertheless seem surprising to find the evidence of the four KOG themes in this central passage.

This is true even for interpretations that appropriate these parables toward countercultural purposes. For example, the “weediness” of mustard is not mentioned in the Mustard Seed Conspiracy (Sine, 1981).

God’s kingdom is characterized by a new world order that embraces the marginalized in the salvific work of God. Such an understanding of the KOG is consistent with and provides the lens through which to interpret the laws of the Hebrew Scriptures (Green, 1997: 603).

Becoming a member of such an alternative form of oikos may also require selling all that you own and distributing the money to the poor (Luke 18:22–24) as you leave your conventional oikos (Luke 9:62; 18:29).

All the quotes in this paragraph are taken from Hamel (2009), mostly from page 94. Gary Hamel is one of the most-cited management scholars in the literature. Other scholars who call for the development of nonconventional management theory and practice include Dyck et al. (2011), Ghoshal (2005), and Giacalone (2004).
11 Salvation is Facilitated when People are Saved FROM Oppressive Structures and Systems, and are Saved FOR Work in Liberating Organizational Structures and Systems

1. See review in Kalberg (2001). Recent research in world religions indicates that the religious beliefs that have the greatest effect on economic growth are those related to an afterlife or lack thereof (McCleary, 2007: 71; Barro & McCleary, 2003; see also Graafland, Kapstein, & van der Duijn Schouten, 2007; Albertson, 2009). Note also that the early Christian literature made not infrequent “use of oikonomia for the divine plan of salvation.” For example, early church leaders like Ignatius (35–108) talk about the “the economy relation to the new man Jesus,” and “Origen [185–254] likewise uses oikonomia for the earlier ordering of salvation and the new covenant arrangement transferred to Christians” (cited in Reumann, 1959: 282, 283; though the meaning of oikonomia was drawn from rhetoric rather than from economics). “The word oikonomia originally came from the political-economic domain, and was taken over by Christian writers and given a new meaning, but remained connected with the political and economic until present time, so that today it has two qualitatively different meanings” (Richter, 2005: 2; my translation).

4. For example, Hamel (2009) essentially describes hallmarks of Management 2.0 that can “save” people from the shortcomings of Management 1.0.
5. “The concept of salvation is central to Christianity. From a historical perspective, the experience of Jesus as savior is the basis from which the Christian movement sprang . . . Yet despite this centrality and importance, the Church has never formulated a conciliar definition of salvation nor provided a universally accepted conception” (Haight, 1994: 225; emphasis added). Even so, there are several simple definitions that would probably get widespread support. For example, one detailed examination of the New Testament concludes that salvation can be summarized as “Jesus makes God present in a saving way” (229, citing Schillebeeckx, 1980: 463). Insofar as God’s presence is related to a lack of suffering, this New Testament understanding of salvation is consistent with Weber’s general idea that salvation is evident when God liberates humankind from suffering. Another definition suggests that salvation refers to how “[t]hrough Jesus, repentant humankind can enjoy a restored right relationship with God” (Dyck & Wiebe, 2012; drawing from McCleary, 2007: 57). A third definition is evident in what has become the most popular verse in the Bible: “For God so loved the world that he gave his only Son, so that everyone who believes in him may not perish but may have eternal life. Indeed, God did not send the Son into the world to condemn the world, but in order that the world might be saved through him” (John 3:16–17; considered most popular verse in Bible according to sites such as http://www.biblegateway.com/blog/2009/05/the-100-most-read-bible-verses-at-biblegatewaycom/ and http://www.topverses.com/).

6. M. Douglas Meeks (1989: 36) argues that “oikos also suggests itself as a soteriological/praxis key, that is, a way of speaking about access to the source of life, God’s righteousness. It encompasses the questions of inclusion in the household as well as solidarity with those who are excluded from the household, both of which are primary signs of liberation . . . Finally, oikos is an ecclesiological key for speaking of the church as the ‘household of God,’ existing for the sake of God’s liberation of the polis and kosmos through God’s liberation of the poor, the oppressed, the sinners and the dying.”

7. This is consistent with the rest of the New Testament, where the understanding of “salvation includes a practical concern here and now for needy people (Rom 12:8; 1 Cor 13:3; Heb 13:16; 1 John 3:17; Jas 1:27; 2:14–17)” (O’Collins, 1992: 911). Similarly, even in John 3:16, which is often interpreted as having a primary emphasis on the future eternal
life, it is clear from the grammar of the verse that its emphasis “has largely to do with the present/immediate circumstances of the ‘world.’ “The traditional stance on and kerygma of these words [in John 3:16] seem to enunciate the futuristic and eternal aspect of eternal life (which would support the ‘evangelistic’ thrust). But, however, while the futuristic and eternal should and cannot be denied, the life referred to here, and as it is indicated by the grammar, has largely to do with the present/immediate circumstances of the ‘world’” (Botha & Rousseau, 2005: 1153). Similarly, when it comes to questions of the Second Coming, there is some agreement among leading biblical scholars that New Testament writers were not anticipating the “end of the world” in terms of destroying the space-time universe, but rather they were anticipating “the end of the world as we know it” (McLaren, 2010: 197). Thus, “eternal life” refers to “the new way of KOG living” associated with Jesus’ teachings. For more on the meaning of eternal life, see chapter five, note 16.

8. Powell (1992) also makes this observation. For more on the relationship between healing and social restoration, see chapter ten, note 10.

9. Reed (2007) and Neyrey (2005). It is true that there was a decrease in warfare within the Roman Empire thanks to the presence of the Roman army and its systems of control and domination (including the operation of patron-client relations, which served the interests of the elite). But for the subjugated peoples this lack of active warfare was often experienced as institutionalized oppression rather than as living in peace.

10. For more on this, see Dyck and Wiebe (2012). Note that the Gospel of Luke never indicates that it is Jesus’ death itself that achieves salvation from sin (Ehrman, 2008: 166), though other Gospels do talk of how Jesus came to “give his life a ransom for many” (Matt., 20:28; Mark 10:45; see also I. Tim. 2:6; Rom. 3:25; and Heb. 2:17). The emphasis on Jesus’ death as an act of “atonement” or as a “ransom” for the sins of humankind was increasingly emphasized in the writings of theologians who came centuries later. Post-Constantine and into the middle ages era there was a transition from salvation coming via Jesus as (subversive) role model, to salvation coming via Jesus as sacrifice. Athanasius (293–373) serves somewhat as a transition figure. He is well-known for saying that “He [Jesus] was humanized that we might be deified” (Haight, 1994: 236). However, rather than focus on how Jesus accomplishes this by being a role model for humankind (as in the pre-Constantine era), “in Athanasius Jesus also saves by revealing and by undergoing sacrificial death” (ibid.). The theme of Jesus’ death having redemptive qualities is evident in Gregory of Nyssa (335–after 394), who “developed a mythic subtext to Jesus’ passion and death: Jesus was innocent bait for Satan’s lust for dominion, and, by destroying Jesus unjustly, Satan lost any justification for his hold on humankind” (ibid.). Augustine of Hippo (354–430) builds on this idea, referring to Jesus’ death as a redemption—a payment of ransom—and a sacrifice. Several centuries later, Anselm (1033–1109) develops this further via his theory of satisfaction: “Jesus took our place, he died in our stead” (237).

11. For example, drawing on Pauline writings, Irenaeus (?–202) argues that Jesus offers salvation via becoming a sort of new-and-improved Adam who serves as an example to show how humankind was intended to live: “Jesus repeats the role of Adam; the incarnate Word [i.e., Jesus] takes up and reenacts the entire pattern of human existence but this time ‘gets it right.’ He thus sets things back in their original created order” (ibid., 236). For early church leaders like Irenaeus, salvation came by way of Jesus’ incarnation (e.g., by imitating Jesus his followers can also overcome corruption and death), not by way of Jesus’ crucifixion (although his crucifixion was an important part of what it meant to live as the second Adam). Origen (185–254) has a similar emphasis on Jesus as a role model. Origen essentially described Jesus as serving as sort of a “replica” of God who helped people to better understand what God was like and thus helped lead humankind back to God: “Jesus is savior by revealing God and being an exemplar of human existence” (ibid.).

12. John Howard Yoder (1972: 97) underscores this social emphasis noting that “the cross” that Jesus’ followers are called to “take up” does not refer to internal things like “an
inward wrestling of the sensitive soul with self and sin.” Instead, in Luke the cross of salvation reflects “the social character of Jesus’ cross . . . the price of his social nonconformity . . . it is the social reality of representing to an unwilling world the Order to come.”

13. For example, an inscription found in Ephesus dating to 48 C.E. calls Julius Caesar “god manifest and common savior of human life” (Fitzmyer, 1970: 204). Soter also had a background in the Hebrew Scriptures, where it is used to describe God and God’s agents who deliver people from oppression (ibid.). Note also that the literal meaning of the name “Jesus” is savior, going back to the Hebrew words Yascha and Yeshua.

14. For example, “Israel’s restoration from international shame to a position of honour” has been identified the dominant theme of Psalm 118 (Botha, 2003: 195), which is referred to 24 times in the New Testament (11 quotations, 13 allusions) making it “the most frequently quoted Old Testament chapter in the New Testament [tied with Exodus 20, which contains the Ten Commandments]” (Kwon, 2009: 50).

15. For more on these dual meanings, see Powell (1992).

16. There is one important exception to this pattern, and that is the story of Zacchaeus, which will be discussed more fully later in this chapter, where Jesus says: “Today salvation has come to this oikos.” This is the only time Jesus himself uses the noun form, and also the only time he refers to salvation coming to an identifiable group of people (oikos).

17. The use of Greek words to highlight a Greek understanding of salvation is also evident the only time Luke refers to God as despotes (a Greek term for “master of the house”) when Simeon says: “Master [despotes] . . . my eyes have seen your salvation, which you have prepared for all peoples, a light of revelation to the Gentiles and for glory to your people Israel” (see Luke 2:25–32). The relative emphasis in this passage is on a Greek understanding of salvation, as “a light of revelation to the Gentiles”—clearly consistent with a Greek view of salvation—rather than as a redemption from enemies (though it is also noteworthy that this “light of revelation” is also important for Israel).

18. This linkage with physical healing is consistent with the Greek verb for “save,” meaning “to save from death, keep alive, preserve” (Liddell & Scott, 2000). Sometimes in Luke “to be saved” is translated as “to be made well.” For example, the NRSV translates the exact same Greek phrase as: (1) “Your faith has saved you” in Luke 7:50 (prostitute) and 18:42 (blind man), but as (2) “Your faith has made you well” in Luke 8:48 (bleeding woman) and 17:19 (leper).

19. Indeed, given that there were other people doing similar sorts of healing in Jesus’ time (e.g., Luke 9:49), the point of these passages is not so much that Jesus has some unique ability to heal people, but rather on the fact that: (1) the healing allowed the persons being saved to become full community members, and (2) Jesus healed people with “no strings attached” (e.g., contrary to the acquisitive economic and patron-client norms of first century, none of the healed were asked to become “clients” of Jesus or to make financial payment to him). This interpretation is entirely consistent with the emphasis on welcoming the marginalized into community that is evident throughout Luke.

20. The first of two exceptions to this active role for the individual being saved is when Jesus raises Jairus’s 12-year-old daughter, in which case it is the father Jairus who fell at the feet of Jesus and asked him to heal his daughter (Luke 8:42). The other exception is when Jesus heals a Gerasene man, the only Gentile in these passages, in which case the man simply met Jesus (Luke 8:27). Lest Luke’s reader be unaware of the social practices among Gerasenes with regards to the man’s status as an outcast vis-à-vis his community, the beginning of this passage explicitly states that the man “did not live in a house [oikos] but in the tombs” (verse 27), and that after the man is healed he is explicitly restored to community: “Go to your home [oikos], and declare how much God has done for you” (verse 39).

21. Note that there may be some overlap in the kinds of soils described in this parable, and the four groupings of KOG passages described in the previous chapter: (i) the trampled path may be associated with “crowds” to whom the KOG is proclaimed; (ii) the rocky
ground may be associated with potential “disciples” who fail to adequately become grounded in KOG teachings; (iii) the thorny ground may be associated with potential “followers” whose attempts to enact the KOG are overwhelmed by the acquisitive economic temptations around them; and (iv) the good soil may be associated with KOG outcomes.

22. It is important to note that the reference to the cross in this passage should not be read as a metaphorical allusion to the cross that Jesus will bear. Scholars agree that, unlike other writings, the Gospel of Luke does not link salvation to Jesus’ death on the cross. This passage may be as close as we get, but even here it is interesting that if verse 23 was intended to foreshadow Jesus’ own death on the cross, certainly a writer as skilled as Luke would have then later in his Gospel referred to Jesus explicitly carrying his own cross, yet Luke does not do this (Fitzmyer, 1970: 785).


24. They may fail to act because they feel some sense of entitlement as a group, or because of their earlier understanding about salvation.


26. The word “paradise” is a reference to “God’s garden,” which is “an eschatological image of new creation” (Green, 1997: 823). Moreover, the fact that Jesus says that this will happen that very day “signifies that the era of salvation has become a reality” (Marshall, 1978: 873). Note again how the saved from/for language fits into the four-phase “salvation history” often said to represent overall story-line in the Bible (described in chapter two): people are saved from the Fall, and are saved for the KOG.

27. This adds further meaning to the verse we looked at earlier: “If any want to become my followers, let them deny themselves and take up their cross daily and follow me. For those who want to save their life will lose it, and those who lose their life for my sake will save it” (Luke 9:23–24). John Howard Yoder (1972) noted that this is the only point at which Jesus calls others to follow his example: “Only at one point, only on one subject—but then consistently, universally—is Jesus our example: in his cross.” Yoder goes on to emphasize the countercultural socioeconomic nature to what it means for Jesus’ followers to take up their cross (Luke 9:23; 14:27). The believer’s cross does not refer to “any and every kind of suffering, sickness, or tension, the bearing of which is demanded. The believer’s cross must be, like his Lord’s, the price of social nonconformity” (96–97).

28. Zacchaeus is sort of like a “district manager” who has other toll collectors that work for him as subordinates (Green, 1997: 668).

29. Even though Zacchaeus has a “thoroughly Jewish name” (Marshall, 1978: 696; cf. Fitzmyer, 1985: 1221), as a tax collector he and others like him would have been despised by almost everyone in the first-century Greco-Roman world (Green, 1997: 669).

30. For Jews in general Jesus lodging “in such a person’s oikos” was “tantamount to sharing in his sin” (Marshall, 1978: 697).

31. This is consistent with such regulations as found in the Pentateuch (e.g., Ex 32:37: “four sheep for a [stolen] sheep”) (Fitzmyer, 1985: 1225). Note also that Zacchaeus is not using his wealth as a patron who wishes to gain clients. Rather, his almsgiving is consistent with the classic idea of benefaction in so far as he gives resources to others without expecting reciprocation (Green, 1997: 672).

32. It is striking how Zacchaeus, “even though he has become one of the ‘lost sheep in the house of Israel’” (Marshall, 1978: 698), seems to understand better than Jewish leaders what it means to manifest membership in the oikos of Abraham. Because his economic practices show a kinship to Abraham, Zacchaeus is not the lost outsider he was thought to be (Green, 1997: 672).

33. An allusion to Ezekiel 34:16: “I shall seek out what was lost and shall turn back what was going astray” (Fitzmyer, 1985: 1226).


35. More precisely, whereas this may be unexpected for twenty-first-century readers, it may not have been surprising for first-century listeners. They would have been more attuned
than twenty-first-century readers to the two salvific dimensions (i.e., to be saved from
and saved for), and thus may have noticed the patterns evident in tables 11.1 and 11.2
much more readily than modern readers do.

36. Note that the original verbs in Luke 19:8 could also be translated to be read in the present
tense: “I give away half of what I own to the poor. If I extorted anything from anyone, I
pay it back fourfold” (Fitzmyer, 1985: 1218). In either case, Zacchaeus “is presented in
this case as an exemplary rich person who has understood something of Jesus’ ministry
and message and concern for the poor and the cheated” (1222).

37. This is consistent with other “outsiders” in Luke who model what it means to man-
age their oikos in ways that are consistent with the kingdom of God. This includes, for
example, the Roman centurion of whom Jesus says: “I tell you, not even in Israel have I
found such faith” (Luke 7:9), and the Good Samaritan, of whom Jesus said, “Go and do
likewise” (Luke 10:37). To become members of Jesus’ oikos is to “hear the word of God
and do it” (Luke 8:21).

38. The remaining chapters will focus more on how to implement these new oikos structures
and systems, and what they look like.

39. For example, in Acts people are saved when they come into contact with KOG-inspired
structures and systems (e.g., Acts 2:44–47).

40. More recent examples using a similar nonviolent approach to challenge oppressive struc-
tures and systems include Mahatma Gandhi and Martin Luther King, Jr. A longer dis-
cussion of emancipation, and its historical association with salvation and its current
similarities and differences, can be found in Dyck and Wiebe (2012).

12 THE HOLY SPIRIT IS KEY TO SALVIFIC
KINGDOM OF GOD MANAGEMENT

3. Weber (1958: 113–114, 128, 130, 145) associated the “inward “view with Luther and the
“outward” view with Calvin.
4. Van Duzer et al. (2007: 115, see also 112; emphasis added here). They go on to say:
“While we would emphatically deny that the Christian scriptures support the conclusion
that good ethics always translates into profitable business decisions, empirical evidence
suggests that it often does so” (115). Pheng (1999: 126) points to the importance of the
Holy Spirit more specifically in an oikos setting, and describes how early Christians left
a wide variety of diverse oikoi and became members of a KOG oikos, where they would:
“walk and live with the Holy Spirit controlling their lives . . . living together. The attri-
butes of living a Spirit-controlled life are equally applicable in today’s households and
organisations as they were in the past.” Vasconcelos (2010: 609) suggests that the Holy
Spirit is involved in revealing the shortcomings of current social structures and systems,
including at the ecological, political, and organizational levels of analysis.
5. For example, Dyck and Schroeder (2005), and Hamel (2009).
which had long been articulated in religious language can neither be rejected nor simply
retrieved rationally” (cited in Harrington, 2007: 46–47). To be clear, at the same time,
the theological turn need not accept sacred scriptures normatively: “Post-metaphysical
thinking should be open to learning from religion and at the same remain agnostic”
8. Weber (1958: 182). To begin to understand how the theological turn has implications at
the most fundamental level, simply note its implications for everyday actions and relation-
ships: for Levinas, God “looks at me in the face of the Other”; for Derrida, God “humbly
hopes for my works of love and justice”; and for Chrétien, God “calls to me in the voice
and touch of the Other” (Simmons, 2008: 920). This results in concepts and ideas that transcend and are inconceivable from a secular perspective.

“For Marion, God is the absolutely self-given pure gift of love. This gift is not presented with the expectation of payback (i.e., according to an economic logic), but instead is an-economic. It is pure givenness (donation) without return. Henry claims that according to Christianity all humans exist in the condition of being ‘sons’ of God according to the ‘truth of life.’ This status requires a radical rupture of the power-relations that obtain according to the objectifying tendencies constitutive of the ‘truth of the world.’ In pure life, as sons, all beings are constituted in their relation to God/Life as such and not according to their socio-economic, gendered, raced, sexed, identity. This is not to say that these identity markers are not radically important, but merely that in relation to God, our relations to others are bathed in the light of other-service and not self-interest. Similarly, Lacoste proposes a ‘kenotic treatment of the question of man’ in which the self is established precisely in its being dispossessed from itself. This dispossession is a fundamental challenge to all egoism and arrogance. Overcoming these self-interested dispositions is hard work and Lacoste contends that our task is to live towards the ‘kingdom of heaven’ in which the relation of self, God, and others is able to come into absolute harmony” (Simmons, 2008: 919; italics in original, underlining added here).

11. Hur (2001: 41–42). “The MT [Old Testament] has 389 references to ruah, which have been generally classified in the following way: 125 referring to wind; 48 to breath; 97 to anthropological spirit; 21 to an evil spirit; 98 to the Spirit of the Lord/God” (38–39).
12. Turner (2003: 148, summarizing Menzies, 1991). The Spirit is the author of: (a) revelatory visions and dreams, (b) revelatory words or instruction or guidance, (c) revelatory discernment or divine wisdom, (d) invasive praise, and (e) charismatic preaching, witness, and teaching. However, the Jewish tradition did not understand the Spirit “as a gift a person needs to receive in order to experience salvation, nor as the source of spiritual/ethical renewal, nor as the power of miraculous activities in the physical realm (such as healings).”
13. Strecker (2002: 120). In short, the modern view often assumes that inspiration comes from within an individual, whereas the ancient view suggests that it comes from outside.
14. The fruit of the Spirit includes “love, joy, peace, patience, kindness, generosity, faithfulness, gentleness, and self-control” (Gal. 5:22–23) and with regard to gifts: “To one is given through the Spirit the utterance of wisdom, and to another the utterance of knowledge according to the same Spirit, to another faith by the same Spirit, to another gifts of healing by the one Spirit, to another the working of miracles, to another prophecy, to another the discernment of spirits, to another various kinds of tongues, to another the interpretation of tongues. All these are activated by one and the same Spirit, who allot to each one individually just as the Spirit chooses” (1 Cor. 12:8–11).
15. Actually the full term “Holy Spirit” only appears 13 times; the total of 17 here includes 3 mentions to “Spirit” where it is clear that the Holy Spirit is being referred to (e.g., see Luke 2:27; Luke 4:1,14), and 1 mention to a passage from Isaiah where the Holy Spirit is inferred (Luke 4:18). The full term “Holy Spirit” has 5 mentions in Matthew, 4 in Mark, and 3 in John. More generally, compared to Luke’s 36 total references to pneumatos, Matthew has 19 references, Mark 24 references, and John 23 references.
16. Two are mentions where death is described as “giving up one’s spirit” (Luke 8:55; 23:46), two are references to the risen Christ appearing as a “ghost” (Luke 24:37, 39), and the rest refer to someone’s inner vitality (Luke 1:17; 1:47; 1:80).
17. Vengeance is ill-suited to the period of salvation being inaugurated at this point (Fitzmyer, 1970: 533).
18. The “fire” could be as reference to purification, or simply an allusion to the fact that when the Holy Spirit comes in Acts in comes in the form of fire (Acts 2:3–4).
19. The term “Holy Spirit” appears a total of 89 in all of the New Testament, of which 54 (61 percent) are in Luke’s two volumes. Luke’s second volume, Acts, was not originally entitled “Acts of the Apostles”—the part in italics was added by others later.

20. Kuecker (2008: 214–215; emphasis in original). Perhaps the most striking difference between Luke’s community (alternative oikos) and most human social groups is that Luke portrays a community whose boundaries have been commandeered by the Holy Spirit, a figure who appears in the narrative as one determined to disregard (conventional) social barriers in order to create a singular tranethnic people for God. This is true both when viewed against Luke’s portrayals of other social groups in the text—both Israelite and non-Israelite groups—but also against basic data from social groups across contemporary cultures. The Spirit, for Luke, creates the possibility of loving the “other” and incorporating even the threatening “other” (while allowing the “other” to retain a large measure of ethnic particularity) in a way that simply does not occur very often in contemporary intergroup and especially interethnic situations (220).

21. As has been oft-noted, people who believe that they can save themselves by their own willpower are deluding themselves, and thereby unintentionally empower that from which they wish to be saved (Foster, 1978: 4). Foster describes at some length how spiritual disciplines can help people to escape the materialist-individualist paradigm that stifles the human spirit: “Superficiality is the curse of our age. The doctrine of instant satisfaction is a primary spiritual problem. The desperate need today is not for a greater number of intelligent people, or gifted people, but for deep people” (1). For more on how the four corporate spiritual disciplines can be applied to management, see Dyck and Wong (2010).

22. Luke 12:10 says: “And everyone who speaks a word against the Son of Man will be forgiven [aphethesetai, to free, to forgive]; but whoever blasphemes [i.e., whoever consciously rejects the saving power and grace God provides for humankind; Marshall, 1978: 517] against the Holy Spirit will not be forgiven [aphethesetai].” “The image being used in aphasis is derived from an economic and social background in antiquity, either from the remission of debts or punishment or release from captivity or imprisonment” (Fitzmyer, 1970: 223). This verse suggests that people cannot be freed (forgiven: aphasis) from oppressive structures and systems if they consistently reject the Spirit and thereby the saving power and grace that God provides humankind. “The unforgivable sin is not to be understood merely as the rejection of Christian preaching or the gospel, but the persistence in consummate and obdurate opposition to the influence of the Spirit . . . a mentality which obstinately sets the mind against the Spirit of God, and as long as that obstinate mindset perdures, God’s forgiveness cannot be accorded to such a person” (Fitzmyer, 1985: 964).


25. “The image is drawn from the ancient records of cities or kingdoms, which listed the citizens who belonged to them” (Fitzmyer, 1985: 863).

26. Consistent with this argument, research among a sample of self-professing Christian managers shows that there is a positive relationship between managers who: (1) emphasize spiritual virtues (e.g., prayer, striving to integrate faith in the workplace, consider God to be their ultimate Boss at work), (2) hold nonconventional values (e.g., less materialistic and less individualistic), and (3) adopt countercultural management practices (Dyck & Weber, 2006).

27. For example, see Agle and Van Buren (1999), Lecourt and Puachant (2011), and Sherman and Smith (1984). For a longer review of this literature, see Dyck (forthcoming).

28. Hopefully this exploratory analysis will encourage others to delve into these issues more deeply. For example, this might include an examination of the work of the Holy Spirit in Acts interpreted through a management lens. Or it might include using a managerial interpretive lens to look at other key themes, such as prayer, the way, prophets, prayer, grace, mercy, and so on.
V Institutional Change

The research in this section has benefitted from comments by Laurence Broadhurst (whose contribution in developing the chiasm presented here was invaluable), Dan Epp-Tiessen, John Kloppenborg, Gordon Zerbe, and David Schroeder (who first alerted me to the chiastic form of Luke’s Journey Narrative). I also thank Ian Brown, Katelyn Cove, Buffy Cowtan, and Glenn Sawatzky for their research assistance and contributions.

13 A Four-Phase Process Model Embedded in Luke’s Journey Narrative

1. Other scholars have also noted that this section of Luke has a focus on how to implement Jesus’ teachings in everyday life. For example, Gill (1970) highlights how Luke uses this section to convey teachings on discipleship, Resseguie (1982: 47) suggests that the purpose of the entire Journey Narrative is to highlight the contrasts between two “diametrically opposed ways of thinking,” and Flender (1967) argues that in this section Luke exemplifies the relation between the Christian message and the world, and shows how the disciples, through Jesus, became bound into a community over the course of the journey.


3. Recall that biblical scholars often encourage readers to attend to the order in which Luke places events (e.g., Johnson, 1991: 4).


5. Or, ABCBA’ if there is a midpoint. For more on chiasms, see Ernesti (1962, original 1795), Lanham (1991), or Anderson (2000).


9. The technical term for this written form that lacks punctuation and where words are not separated from one another is called scriptio continua. As a result “passages had to be studied very attentively. They were not only read aloud but also learnt by heart, recited in a sing-song manner, syllable by syllable. Little wonder that readers of that time were very alive to the configuration of a text [such as evident in chiastic structure]” (Stock, 1984: 25).

10. Sometimes the paired twin-passages essentially duplicate one another, and other times they mirror each other (i.e., invert left and right). Put differently, sometimes the paired passages say the same thing (e.g., Jesus is traveling on a road), and sometimes they present opposite sides of the same coin (e.g., Jesus is beginning, versus completing, his trip to Jerusalem).

11. The four-phase model depicted in figure 13.1 is never referred to explicitly in the Gospel of Luke. Nowhere does Jesus say: “Here is a four-phase process model of community discernment and learning.” However, this is not as troublesome or unusual as it may first appear. For example, Socrates also never explicitly spells out the steps of his highly influential dialogical model. Rather, just as the four-step Socratic method is implicit in the texts describing how he taught that were written after he had died by his followers (e.g., Plato and Xenophon), so also might there be a four-phase model embedded in how the Lukan text unfolds. Moreover, that the model would be embedded in a journey narrative is entirely consistent with the pattern of Hellenistic literature in that day, where “the story
of the travelling teacher or wonder-worker was a favourite theme,” and “[t]he imagery of life as a journey or as a road was often accompanied by motifs of ethical choice” (Baban, 2006: 81, 41). This tradition goes back to Greek classics; e.g., in Homer’s writings “journeying together brings ‘unity in thinking’” (40) and, “as illustrated by Plato, one of the recurring Hellenistic stories is that of a young person . . . [who] journeys alone or with company . . . needing to question others or himself on what is the truly good direction in life” (40, 41).

12. The three “keywords” associated with the first phase—rebuke, disciple, two—are consistent with this theme. As described more fully in appendix A, these “keywords” are terms that recur in phase 1 passages, but are rarely found in other Journey Narrative passages.

13. This sensitization to a problem can come from a variety of sources, including spiritual nudgings and Jesus’ example and teachings.

14. The three “keywords” for the second phase—find, give, parable—support the idea that the second phase deals with ways to respond to the issues raised in the first phase.

15. These themes are consistent with the keywords for phase 3—to hear and to see/receive sight. Many of the passages that describe Jesus healing people are found in the phase 3.


17. These themes are consistent with the keywords for phase 4—law/yer, rich/poor, place/position.

18. Note how this four-phase interpretation has some overlap with other commentators who also draw attention to the fourfold nature of this passage. In particular, Green (1997: 534) suggests that the passage turns on its “four statements of desire [which] dramatize the conflict at work throughout the Lukan narrative and are key to our appreciation of the role of this brief scene within the larger Gospel”: (1) Herod wants to kill Jesus (Luke 13:31); (2) Jesus continues his actions to help those who have been social outcasts (Luke 3:32–33); (3) Jesus wants to be seen as a mother hen who “gathers her brood under her wings” (Luke 13:34a); and (4) the people of Jerusalem do not want to be led by Jesus and his ideas (Luke 13:34b–35).

19. In one sense Jesus heading to Jerusalem is consistent with the Pharisees’ advice to “get away from here” because Jerusalem is in Judea, which is outside of Herod’s jurisdiction in Galilee. While this may seem to solve the immediate problem (i.e., Herod wanting to kill Jesus), Jesus is also reinforcing that he is doing this “my way.” And it is equally clear that Jesus’ is an act of civil disobedience vis-à-vis Herod’s desire to kill Jesus.

20. Fox would be understood in the first century as an “unflattering term” (Fitzmyer, 1985: 1029) meaning relatively “insignificant” and of “low cunning” (Marshall, 1978: 571).

21. Note that Jesus’ reply may also provide implicit support for the four-phase change model embedded in the Journey Narrative. In particular, Jesus twice refers to the three-day pattern where he will be doing his work (today, tomorrow, and the next day). Perhaps each day Jesus refers to—i.e., each 24-hour cycle encompassing morning, noon, evening, and night—corresponds symbolically with each four-phase cycle in the change model (i.e., problem recognition, action response, changed way of seeing, and institutional change). If so, then the first three “days” Jesus refers to might allude to the first three cycles through the model that come prior to this midpoint in the chiasm, and the second three “days” would allude to the three cycles in the second half of the chiasm. This interpretation helps to make sense of a puzzling double reference to three days, and is entirely consistent with Luke’s self-described attention to the order in which he presents his material.

22. An interesting exception is Taylor (1986: 201), who notes how striking it is that Jesus chose to see himself as a hen, rather than take other images from the Old Testament like a mighty eagle or a proud lion. Taylor adds that, upon further reflection, it seems entirely appropriate for Jesus to liken himself to a female hen, given his penchant for up-turning the social customs of the day, his ideas about servant leadership, and his sayings such as “the last shall be first.” Jesus paints a picture where he “is a mother hen, who stands between the chicks and those who mean to do them harm. She has no fangs, no claws, no rippling muscles. All she has is her willingness to shield her babies with her own body. If the fox wants them, he will have to kill her first.” Beavis (2003:14) adds that in Jewish
of the human soul.”

23. That is, they are in charge of some of the organizational structures and systems, the institutions and the practices, that shaped life in Palestine (Green, 1997: 539).


25. “There are therefore many indications in the psalm that point in the direction of explaining the experiences of the individual in this psalm as that of a group of people” (Botha, 2003: 210; see also Kwon, 2009: 52). For more information, see chapter seven and the interpretation the parable of the wicked tenants/oppressive landlord.

26. For more elaboration on these ideas, see Yoder (1972) on revolutionary subordination.

27. See Argyris (1990) and Nielsen (2001). Other similar four-phase organizational learning models have been developed by Crossan, Lane, and White (1999) and Nonaka (1994) (see also Dyck & Broadhurst, 2008).

14 Luke’s Three “Forward” Cycles through the Four-Phase Process Model

1. The disciples’ question alludes to a passage in the Old Testament, where the prophet Elijah calls down fire from heaven to consume 50 people representing the Samaritan king Ahaziah (2. Kings 1:9–12).

2. Note that the passage does not explicitly mention that Jesus sends his followers to Samaritan villages, but this seems to be a reasonable inference from the context of the passage (e.g., Luke 9:52–54; 10:30–37). Support is also evident in the allusion to the Old Testament text from 2. Kings 1:9–12 where fire comes down from heaven twice to consume representatives of the Samaritan king Ahaziah (verses 10 and 12), which is analogous to two parallel references in Luke: (1) Luke 9:51 refers to fire falling from heaven, and (2) Luke 10:18 refers to Satan falling from heaven “like a flash of lightning.”

Note also that an argument could be made that the followers are offering their services to oikoi in the villages to help during a busy harvest season (Luke 10:2), perhaps recognizing that the poor would be the first ones to suffer if there was a lack of food due to lack of laborers during the harvest. Jesus instructs his followers to ask the master in charge of the harvest if they can help with the harvest, aware that as relatively vulnerable foreign migrant workers they might be like sheep among wolves (Luke 10:3).

Finally, although this passage is often interpreted as Jesus sending out missionaries to convert other people, perhaps it is his own followers that Jesus wants to be converted. After all, it is the disciples whom he has rebuked for their bad attitudes toward the Samaritans. Consistent with this, in the very first verse where it says that Jesus “appoints” the 70, the Greek word for “appoints” could also be translated as Jesus wanting his followers to see more clearly something that has been hidden (Klassen-Weibe, 2001: 288), a translation that seems especially plausible in light of Luke 10:21 (as we shall see). Taken together, it seems entirely possible that Jesus is sending out his followers, at least in part, so that they can deal with their bad attitudes toward rivals like the Samaritans.

3. Apparently one lesson learned from the earlier (Luke 9:1–6) mission is evident in the updated instructions Jesus gives to the 70 (Luke 10:6), when he tells them to ensure that the oikos they stay in while visiting the villages has a member who is a “child of peace” (i.e., someone who, like Jesus’ followers, is open to listening to and learning from others). Note also that of the 13 mentions of the word “peace” in all of Luke, 3 (23 percent) appear in this passage, more than any other single passage. One of these mentions is where Jesus instructs his followers to say “Peace to this oikos” (note the parallelism in Jesus’ statement “Today salvation has come to this oikos” in Luke 19:9).

4. Jesus also challenges conventional norms about the role of women more generally, who would not normally be listening to a teacher as Mary was.
5. Jesus can’t be working for both because: “Every kingdom divided against itself becomes a desert, and house falls on house” (Luke 11:17).

6. The Greek word *makorios* is usually translated as “blessed”; in the Greek world this adjective referred to a person’s “inner happiness” (Fitzmyer, 1970: 632).


10. Jesus goes on to tell his listeners not to fear even conventional leaders who have the authority to “kill the body”—nor to worry about how they will defend themselves when brought “before the synagogues, the rulers, and the authorities”—because the Holy Spirit will reveal to them what they “ought to say” (Luke 12:4,11,12). To freely live a “good life” people cannot consciously and persistently reject the saving power and grace that God provides for humankind (Marshall, 1978: 517; Fitzmyer, 1970: 223; 1985: 964). For more on this passage, see chapter twelve, note 22.

11. Some relevant passages are found in Numbers 27:1–11; 36:7–9; Deuteronomy 21:16–17. Because these passages do not apply to every kind of imaginable situation, the kind of request the man makes is not unusual. Addressing Jesus as a “teacher” acknowledges Jesus’ authority to make such a decision. Jesus’ response echoes language from Exodus 2:14 (repeated in Acts 7:27)—“Who made you a ruler and a judge over us?”—thereby drawing attention to dysfunctional things that can happen when people act as judges and rulers (Fitzmyer, 1985: 968–69; Green, 1997: 488; Marshall, 1978: 522).

12. “‘Greed’ can denote the hunger for advanced social standing as well as the insatiable desire for wealth, though in Luke’s world these two images are inextricably related” (Green, 1997: 488–89).

13. This label of “fool” is sometimes used in Hebrew Scriptures to describe people who go against God; applying it to the rich man in this case is consistent with an understanding of “greed” that recognizes it “as a form of idolatry” (Green, 1997: 491).

14. Bill Gates (2007) quotes a letter from his mother when he explains why he and his wife Melinda became so involved in helping the world’s poor: “From those to whom much is given, much is expected.”


16. The example described here is from Plowman et al, 2007. Other examples include a description of the four-phase process of how the rower pump was developed and became the institutionalized norm for agricultural irrigation in Bangladesh (Dyck et al. 2000), and how the microfinancing movement spread in Bolivia (Dyck, 2002).

15 Luke’s Three “Reverse” Cycles through the Four-Phase Process Model

1. Institutionalized customs surrounding meals and food were of great importance in the first century, and in this passage Jesus challenges the norms of both Jews and Greco-Romans (Green, 1997: 542; Elliott, 1991a).

2. Just as people with dropsy are filled with fluid but desire more to drink, so also money-lovers loaded with money crave more of it—both to their own demise. The Pharisees are called lovers of money elsewhere in Luke (11:37–44; 16:14). It is unclear why this man with dropsy would have been at the meal, because he was clearly a marginalized person and would have also been too unclean to sit with Pharisees (Green, 1997: 546, 547).

3. This list is notable because its members were on the margins of society, and unable to reciprocate in kind.

4. “The behaviors Jesus demands would collapse the distance between rich and poor, insider and outsider; reverting to anthropological models of economic exchange, such relations would be characterized by ‘generalized reciprocity’—that is, by the giving of gifts, the extension of hospitality, without expectation of return” (Green, 1997: 553).
5. Some might argue that this story is not so much a call for what people should actually do, but more an allusion to God and the eschatological banquet. However, such a reading is problematic because it suggests that God did not initially invite the marginalized (ibid., 556).

6. Five yoke of oxen would be needed for a farm of one hundred acres or more, substantially larger than the three–six acres required per adult at the time (ibid., 560).

7. Ibid., 550.

8. This may have been a tower for a vineyard, a city wall, or perhaps some more elaborate structure (ibid., 566).

9. Ibid., 570. The term “sinners” is often used to describe people of low social status, without particular regard to whether they are especially guilty of having wronged God. For example, note people of higher status are seldom called sinners, even though they are strongly criticized by Jesus for misunderstanding Scripture and misleading people (though see Luke 6:34; 24:7).

10. At the end of each of the first two parables in this phase Jesus describes the great joy that is prompted in heaven when a sinner repents (Luke 15:7,10). It is not entirely clear, however, who the “sinner” is and what the “repentance” was. It seems odd to think that the lost sheep or the lost coin would be seen as “sinners” who “repented,” unless one argues that they are the ones who changed their “mind or purpose” (which is the meaning of the word “repentance” or metanoeo: Liddell & Scott, 2000). In this light there may be an irony in Jesus’ teachings, namely that although the conventional usage of the term “sinner” refers to the outcasts, the “real” sinners are the people who create and perpetuate social structures and systems that create outcasts in the first place. Thus, in this light Jesus can be interpreted to be saying that rejoicing is prompted in heaven when the “real” sinners (e.g., leaders who by their actions and religious rules about purity exclude marginalized people from community) change their minds, and begin to find and implement ways to restore these “lost” marginalized people to society. This interpretation is not inconsistent with Luke’s other mentions of repentance (Luke 11:32; 13:3,5; 16:30).

11. This passage has been described more fully in chapter seven, and the passage about Lazarus is discussed more fully in chapter eight.


14. Though, as the passage tells us, only God is good.

15. See ibid., 663.

16. See chapter eleven for more on Zacchaeus, and chapter six for more and the parable of the ten pounds.

17. For more on pax Romana, see chapter eleven.

18. For more on how the dominant theme in Psalm 118 is on the redemption of social outcasts, see chapters seven and thirteen.

19. For example, see Oliver (1992), Lawrence and Suddaby (2006), Hensmans (2003), and Heugens and Lander (2009). The example described in this paragraph is drawn from Summers and Dyck (2011).

VI IMPLICATIONS FOR TWENTY-FIRST-CENTURY MANAGEMENT THEORY AND PRACTICE


2. Note that the exemplars are not and need not be drawn from managers who claim to be followers of Jesus. Just as Luke’s Roman centurion had “such faith” that Jesus had not seen in all of Israel, just as Jesus told his listeners to follow the example of the Good Samaritan, and just as salvation came to the house of a chief tax collector (Zacchaeus) who had not been in good standing among the religious community, so also KOG management is by no means the exclusive domain of followers of Jesus. Nor should we expect it to be, given the popular alignment between conventional management theory
and the Protestant ethic and its conventional Catholic variation (Weber, 1958; Novak, 1982).

Readers interested in a more comprehensive analysis that contrasts and compares conventional management theory with an alternative approach may be interested in a book I coauthored with Mitch Neubert called *Management: Current Practices and New Directions* from which some of the material in part six has been adapted. Note that the alternative approach to management in the Dyck and Neubert (2010) book is not based on a religious or faith perspective. Rather, the book examines management theory and practice from two parallel moral-points-of-view. “Mainstream management” is based on a materialistic-individualistic moral-point-of-view that places emphasis on maximizing productivity and profits for shareholders. “Multistream management” is based on a moral-point-of-view that suggests management is all about balancing multiple forms of well-being (e.g., financial social, ecological, spiritual, physical) for multiple stakeholders (owners, employees, customers, suppliers, competitors, neighbors, future generations). As it turns out, the moral-point-of-view undergirding the Multistream approach has important similarities to the moral-point-of-view found in Luke.

### 16 Managing Relationships WITHIN Organizations: Organizational Structure, Motivation, and Leadership

1. This is an adapted and somewhat simplified interpretation of Weber’s ideas. A more detailed description of these four fundamentals and their theological implication, as well as theoretical and empirical support for the Mainstream versus Multistream approaches to the four fundamentals, can be found in Dyck and Schroeder (2005), Dyck and Weber (2006), and Dyck and Neubert (2010).
5. Ibid., 92.
6. Maslow’s (1954) work has been called a “classic of classics” and has been considered in the top ten of “the most influential management books of the 20th century” (Bedeian & Wren, 2001), and one of the most important (Miner, 2003).
8. Maybe one reason Jesus instructs his followers to pray for their “daily bread” is to remind those who can afford to store bread for much longer periods of time that they, too, have physiological needs whose being met should not be taken for granted.
9. See Despain & Converse (2003: 20, 142–143, 169; emphases in these quotes have been added here).
10. These two dimensions are drawn from some of the most important and influential leadership theories and research in the scholarly literature (Miner, 2003; Yukl, 2006).
12. This is evident in the parable of the fig tree, where a landowner asks his gardener to chop down a fig tree that hasn’t borne fruit for three years. Rather than obey the landowner, the gardener asks for permission to tend the fig tree for one more year, to dig around it and provide manure (Luke 13:6–7). Similarly, other subordinates who are better than their masters at enacting KOG ways include the shrewd manager and the third manager in the parable of the ten pounds.
13. See also chapter nine, note 12. Based on Luke, the hallmark of KOG leadership is regarding the views of others, serving others, and refusing to lord it over others.
14. And, from the perspective of Maslow’s hierarchy of needs theory, impoverished people will be motivated to meet their physiological needs, so meeting their needs for love or
esteem is not likely to improve productivity. Consider how this way of thinking may be evident in “sweat shops” in low-income countries.

15. “one who stands near, or by, a suppliant” (Liddell and Scott, 2000).

16. The only other occasion where this term is found is in Luke 17:13, when ten lepers call out to Jesus as “master” to have mercy on them (Klassen-Wiebe, 2001: 164).

17. The aforementioned passages where the disciples call Jesus “master” (*epistates*) could be added in this category.

18. The example described in this chapter is drawn from Nielsen (1998), which also describes how Greenleaf used the four-step method to reduce discrimination facing African Americans at AT&T. Greenleaf based his approach on the example of John Woolman, a cloth merchant and ethics activist in Philadelphia in the colonial era who “developed and used friendly, disentangling dialogue with merchants and farmers to address the issues of slavery, peacemaking with Indians and the British, farmer-banker relations, trading practices with Indians, and child labour” (ibid., 127). Woolman observed that this method “in different Places and Ages hath different Names . . . It is deep, and inward, confined to no Forms of Religion, nor excluded from any” (cited in ibid., 144).

Technically, rather than see the four steps of the friendly disentangling method as directly analogous to the four phases of the process model embedded in Luke’s Journey Narrative, it may be more accurate to see the steps as the “transitionary” activities that link one phase to the next, as follows:

1. the first part of the friendly disentangling model (i.e., to look for the source of current problematic behavior within the biased organizational norms rather than blaming individuals) bridges ideas from phase 4 and phase 1;
2. the second part (approach those involved in a friendly manner) bridges phase 1 and phase 2;
3. the third part (get input from the people involved regarding possible solutions that are consistent with a frame of reference that transcends a conventional perspective) bridges phase 2 and phase 3;
4. and the fourth part (support those who are willing to implement nontraditional behaviors/governing values) bridges phases 3 and phase 4.

19. This realization is not inconsistent with Luke, insofar as the individuals presented in the first phase of Luke’s cycles are often depicted as “stock characters” who represent society-at-large and its institutional problems.

20. Note that there is no language like “rebuke” in Greenleaf’s account. Thus Greenleaf’s approach may be more deliberately “friendly” than the approach described in Luke, or perhaps the Lukan use of the word “rebuke” would have been perceived less harshly in the first century than its translated word is today.

### 17 Managing Money: Economics, Finance, and Accounting

1. For a fuller analysis of these two passages, see chapters five and eleven, respectively.
3. For example, compared to students who were taught nonconventional economic theory, students exposed to only conventional economic theory are more likely to act in their own narrow financial self-interests (e.g., they are less likely to return “lost” money to its rightful owner, and less likely to point out an undercharge on a purchase) (Frank, Gilovich, & Regan, 1993; 1996). Similarly, management students tend to become more individualistic and materialistic during their programs of studies (Ferraro, Pfeffer, & Sutton, 2005; Krishnan, 2003).
4. For more on this research and general topic, see Dyck et al. (2011).
5. It is often claimed that it is “natural” for people to maximize their own material interests, and that it is naïve (or perhaps even irresponsible) to develop theories based on ideas that counteract this innate feature of the human condition. However, there is ample evidence
to suggest that people living in high-income countries have been socialized to accept a materialistic-individualistic moral-point-of-view, and to suggest that this is not innate to humankind. Indeed, research on ancient economies and on modern hunting-gathering societies suggests that sustenance economics is natural, and that it is innate to the human condition: share resources in community (e.g., because it would be impossible for one person to eat a gazelle before the meat would rot), work only until they meet their basic subsistence needs (which is about six hours a day, on average, even for hunting-gathering societies that live in harsh environments—why collect more berries if you already have enough?), and minimize their belongings (e.g., no one wanted to carry two or three spears from one place to the next if one spear would suffice). Thus, if we look through the lens of the history of humankind, then the present fascination in “self-interest with guile” economics in so-called developed economies seems to be an aberration of normal human activity (e.g., Sahlin, 1972).

6. This example is taken almost verbatim from Dyck and Neubert (2010), drawn from Batstone (2003) and others.
8. Malden Mills was in bankruptcy between 2001 and 2003. Feuerstein left the company’s board in 2004 (he still owned about 5 percent of the company). By 2006 its annual revenue was around $160 million, including $25 million from the US military for high-tech clothing. However, heavy debts forced the firm to declare bankruptcy again. It sold its assets to Chrysalis Capital Partners where the company reemerged as Polartec LLC in 2007.
9. Though, as has often been noted, commentators who invoke the imagery of the invisible hand often forget that Adam Smith describes at considerable length the “virtuous arm” that the hand is attached to (Dyck & Neubert, 2010: 14). Smith’s argument that everyone should be free to pursue their individual interests must take into account the contextual virtues described in his book The Theory of Moral Sentiments (1982 [1759]).
11. An important exception is for about ten months in 2008/2009, when the percentage went below 20 percent (Madigan, 2011).
12. Consider the “game” played by “derivatives” dealers, who bet on others’ expectations of prices of currencies, shares, and bonds in the future (e.g., three months to five years). The nominal value of contracts in over-the-counter derivatives in 2010 was approaching $600 trillion (McKenzie, 2010). Already by 1995 speculative investment accounted for 95 percent of all transactions, whereas as recently as 1970 trade and long-term investment accounted for 90 percent of transactions (Wilson, 2005; see also Martin & Schumann, 1997: 52; Soros, 1998: 141–146). Taken together, objective economic relationships are increasingly less significant in the flurry of money being traded around the world. What has become more important is the expectation of what others will do. The shortcomings of this kind of trading are well-known, but potential solutions to address them have not been well received. For example, already in the 1970s Nobel Prizewinner James Tobin recognized the difficulties associated with the deregulated flow of capital, which prompted him to suggest governments implement 1 percent tax on all foreign currency exchanges. This would encourage more stable financial decisions related to real production and changes in the market, rather based on the whims of financial traders. However this idea, though recognized as theoretically brilliant, goes against the dominant ideology of the free movement of capital (Martin & Schumann, 1997: 83). For a longer discussion on the shortcomings of conventional globalization and what alternative globalization might look like, see Dyck, Bruning, and Buckland (2003).

There are some changes that signal a slight shift away from acquisitive economics toward sustenance economics. For example, there has been an increase in the number of people making investment decisions based on criteria that go beyond financial performance. In the United States about one out of ten dollars under professional management are invested using some sort of criteria of social and environmental responsibility. This is called socially responsible investing (SRI), which has been
overall doubling about every 5 years, with SRI mutual funds doubling every 2.5 years (Dyck & Neubert, 2010: 81).

13. These axioms are taken from Keown et al. (1998: 11–23), who suggest that they are little more than statements of common sense. For a further discussion of a countercultural approach to these axioms, and others, see Dyck (2012b).


15. Studies like Miller and Sardois (2011) also turn conventional agency theory on its head by arguing that, instead of assuming that managers will opportunistically exploit a firm to serve their own financial self-interests, there are cases where managers may forgo their own interests and their owner’s perceived self-interests, choosing instead to serve the long-term interests of all stakeholders (including the owners). They provide a specific example where a manager deliberately reduces organizational profits. When he was CEO of Renault in the 1950s, Pierre Lefaucheux noted that the firm was likely “to make too much profit” and concluded that “it will be necessary to reduce profits by 2 billion francs per year . . . [and] discussed the possibilities of lowering profits by cutting prices, higher salaries, providing better incentives to dealers, and finding other expenditures to improve the business” (8).

16. Unless otherwise specified, the quotes in this section are drawn from Yunus (1996; emphasis added here).

17. At the time Yunus started, the membership of women in banks in Bangladesh was only 1 percent. In the beginning Yunus was aiming for 50 percent women, aware that women are more likely than men to make decisions that improve the long-term conditions in their community. This policy to provide loans to women prompted a negative reaction from some sectors of that Muslim society. According to Yunus, “[T]he first opposition came from the husbands, who thought we were insulting them. The second were the mullahs, who started preaching that [for women to be] taking money from the Grameen Bank was against religion and that they should leave it to their husbands.” Some even accused the bank of being Christian missionaries, forgetting that women had been businesspeople in Islamic history, including the Prophet’s first wife. The radical Left accused Grameen Bank of being part of an American conspiracy that was bringing capitalism to poor people, and the people on the Right thought the bank was organizing people to make them into a communist threat (quoted in Tharoor, 2006).

18. According to Yunus, each branch is a self-standing entity, made up of community borrowers and local staff, where relationships are based on trust: “There is no attempt on anyone’s part to outsmart anyone” (quoted in ibid.).


20. This discussion around accounting draws heavily from Christie et al. (2004). Thanks also to Janet Morrill for her feedback on this section and table 17.1.

21. For example, Kieso et al. (2002).

22. Roberts and Jones (2009). From a KOG-management perspective, the boundaries of the firm should be relatively porous, especially with regard to creating room for the marginalized. From this holistic view, the organization is seen as an essential means for nurturing the larger community. Just as for Aristotle the oikos should reflect the character of the larger ideal polis, so also in Luke the oikos is seen as enacting the character of the larger KOG. Such an enlarged understanding of the entity makes its managers more likely to see beyond conventional organizational issues and, e.g., to consider the well-being of larger ecological environment, of the unemployed, and of where to redistribute financial wealth.

23. Monetization can also lead to commodification. Money has a tendency to reduce qualities into quantities. It has the effect of flattening the world of things and stripping them of their color, taste, and texture. Akin to how the Romans used money to the disadvantage of the poor in first-century Palestine, it has been argued that monetarization was instrumental to the objectives of colonization and that it encouraged the appropriation of wealth by the colonials and the genocide of Canada’s First Nations (Neu, 2000).
Notes on Pages 175–176

24. The use of nonfinancial performance measures is becoming increasingly prevalent (Upton, 2001), with development of alternate performance reporting in the areas of sustainability and corporate social responsibility, and in research that is consistent with the idea of “radical accounting” and the triple-bottom-line (e.g., see Kaplan and Norton, 1992; Mitchell et al., 2012).

25. Ample anecdotal evidence testifies to the shortcomings of a conventional approach where employees are driven to make decisions that maximize their short-term bonuses to the detriment of the long-term health of the entity (and the larger community). The KOG approach recovers aspects of the concept of voyage accounting (akin to “journey” accounting?), accounting for actual work projects and “moments of truth” along with routine business events (Ramo, 2002).

26. Gold (2010: 52–53). A second institutional structure associated with the Focolare is its now 33 permanent “model towns” around the world, founded on a principle of daily lives of mutual love. These model towns provide a countercultural alternative to the dominant norms in social, economic, and religious spheres. But unlike previous attempts to build utopian egalitarian societies (e.g., kibbutz), these towns have more porous boundaries evident in the fact that they: (1) do not see themselves closed off from the rest of society; (2) have frequent turnover in the majority of their inhabitants; and (3) compete in global markets.


29. The first Focolare members wanted to solve the major problems facing people in Trent, and more generally sought to bring mutual respect and solidarity to all members of the human family (Gold, 2010: 71, 40). Because of the great physical devastation and human need during the war, many people were questioning and blaming God for allowing such atrocities to occur. However everything changed after Chiara Lubich, the founder of the Focolare, had the insight that God was “present everywhere”—even in the middle of suffering (65). Jesus suffered, and Jesus can be experienced by ministering to people who are suffering.

   For each person who has been touched in some way be the Focolare spirituality and lifestyle, the initial step is similar to Chiara’s—as a response to the discovery of God’s love, to move beyond comfortable or familiar horizons [e.g., their previous understanding of oikos] in order to turn with love to neighbors in need. They often face all over the world what war-torn Trent continues to represent—not only war and violence but also poverty, injustice, and discord of every kind, in families and between people of different religions and cultures. They work to bring love, to build unity (Uelmen, 2005: 54–55).

30. “Then came the night of 13 May 1944. That was the night when Chiara and her family saw their home destroyed from the hillside where they had gone for safety. That was the night when Chiara took the decision, through her tears, to leave her family, who had decided to quit the city, and go back down to stay with her companions . . . As well as having left her family, Chiara was now homeless. She needed somewhere to stay, and was offered a little flat adjoining the Capuchin church . . . It had two rooms and became known to the girls as ‘the little house,’ with its connotation of the little house in Loreto (‘reputed to be the house of the Holy Family of Nazareth . . . transported from the Holy Land by angels’”) [Gallagher, 1997: 12] (Gallagher, 1997: 35–36).

31. These actions were inspired by what had happened in the early church, described in Acts 4:32–35 (Gold, 2010: 68). According to Chiara, such sharing of possessions characterized the early church and in time helped to liberate people from “long-standing situations of institutional injustice” (taken from Robertson, 1993: 77; cited in Gold, 2010: 69).


33. Cited in ibid., 66. God was a benevolent God, and signs of benefaction were evident in the sharing of resources.

34. Gallagher (1997: 41). “When the war ended, people of the [Focolare] community traveled to other cities for work or study and carried with them their newly discovered lifestyle. Focolare houses were opened first in other cities in Italy, then throughout Europe,
and, starting in the late 1950s and into the 1960s, in North and South America, Asia, and Africa” (Uelmen, 3005: 56).

35. In other words, the Focolare’s understanding of the Gospel went far beyond a narrow understanding of spiritual edification.


37. Ibid., 84–85.

38. This discussion draws from ibid., 88–92.

39. For more on this, see ibid., 161, 165.

40. Drawn from ibid., 127–128; see also 121ff.)

41. This includes new ways of seeing the purpose of business, and new ways of seeing its employees, customers, and competitors (ibid., 130–31).

42. Ibid., 137. EOC firms also support no-layoff policies.

43. Whereas implementing EOC principles can lead to increased costs and thus decreased profits, they can also foster the development of unusually resilient networks of relationships both within and outside of the business that are reliable even during times of crisis (ibid., 59).

44. Insofar as EOC firms are owned by members, decisions are not driven by remote anonymous shareholders who demand quarterly increases in profits, share price or dividends (ibid., 156). This also tends to invert the so-called agency problem: in EOC firms managers and owners who have firsthand or face-to-face knowledge of the needs of their employees and other stakeholders are more likely to act on these interests, rather than merely in their own financial self-interests.

45. Ibid., 136–137.

46. See ibid., 147, 149. The term “externalities” refers to the “invisible” costs and benefits borne by the rest of society that are not reflected in the prices organizations pay for inputs or get paid for their outputs. For example, when a consumer purchases gasoline to drive their car, the conventional price of gas does not fully reflect the financial and nonfinancial “costs” borne by others (e.g., health costs associated with pollution, costs associated with climate change, reduced fossil fuels for future generations, and so on).

47. Ibid., 141, 144.

48. Quoted in ibid., 145.

18 MANAGING RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN ORGANIZATIONS: MARKETING, SUPPLY CHAIN, AND STRATEGY

1. Galen Lehman tells of seeing such a sign in Kidron, Ohio.

2. This quote is from Kent (1986: 153) who is one of the many critics of these four P’s, which were first developed by McCarthy (1960). Note also that some of the ideas described here under KOG marketing are consistent with view of contemporary scholars in marketing, including that: (a) the “product” includes the relationships and connections formed among organizations and people in the creation, distribution, and usage of the product; (b) “place” can go beyond seeing an organization “as a sole and self-sustaining operator in a competitive world but as a company that operates with loyal networks of partners”; and (c) promotion can involve cocreating products with outsiders (see Kotler, Kartajay, & Setiawan, 2010: 33, xii, 10, respectively). Note also that this draws from material in Dyck (2012b).

3. While it may seem crass to do so, consider the KOG to be a product that is being “marketed” in the Gospel of Luke. From the analysis in chapter ten, it is clear that this product is one that is designed to meet the needs of the larger community, rather than simply the needs or wants of a narrowly defined consumer. In terms of price, although the KOG demands giving up the perceived financial security associated with conventional oikos, it is clear that the KOG is “free” and cannot be purchased with financial
means. With regard to place, in Luke the KOG may be seen as competing with the kingdom of the (oppressive) Roman Empire, but there is little evidence that KOG is fostering competition among different religions (e.g., Jesus was born and died a Jew, Jesus spoke highly of the faith of the centurion, Jesus called listeners to follow the example of the Samaritan). And in terms of promotion, while the KOG may be communicated via one-to-one relationships, it is striking the passages that proclaim core KOG ideas are always addressed to crowds, and that the visible signs of the KOG are enacted by groups of people in oikos settings.

4. For more information on Shared Farming, see Dyck (1994a and b).
6. In terms of a first-century understanding, where it was a fixed sum economy, a powerful oikos continued to increase its profits thanks go smaller oikoi became poorer. In modern terms where the earth’s resources are considered a fixed sum, it means that using more resources to feed the profits of one business results in fewer resources for others.
10. The study goes on to describe what happened after these companies were purchased by larger corporations who followed a more conventional approach, where contracts were negotiated up front. An unintended consequence of this transition was that fashion became more of a mere product or commodity, with less time and less emphasis placed on ensuring its aesthetic beauty. For example, a supplier was less likely to make the costly changes required for unexpected characteristics of fabrics and to ensure that the cloth would “hang” the right way. The price of the clothes was lower, but to the trained eye the quality and artistic beauty had been compromised. And, the sense of interorganizational neighborliness and trust had been lost (Uzzi, 1997).
11. Similarly, pioneering organizations in the microfinancing movement are eager to share best practices with other banks and nonprofit organizations who wish to provide credit to microentrepreneurs.
12. A conventional approach argues that competitiveness is good for society because it motivates people and organizations to do their best, encourages continuous improvement, promotes efficiency, and reduces the opportunity for consumers to be taken advantage of. However, even proponents of competitiveness admit that it can go awry, most notably when people cheat in order to win (e.g., think of Worldcom or Enron). A “win at all costs” form of competitiveness can bring out the worst in humankind when people are willing to injure themselves (e.g., think of performance enhancing drugs) or others (e.g., tearing down an opponent) in order to improve their chances of winning.

From a KOG-management perspective competitiveness, even at its best, simply does warrant having a central role in organization theory. Rather than assume that the desire to compete brings out the best in humankind, why not assume that the desire to share, or to live sustainably on the planet, or to eradicate poverty, or to ensure that everyone is treated with dignity is more likely to truly bring out the best in people? What if organizational strategies and practices were designed toward these ends, instead of designed to out-compete an “opposition”? (a very similar point is made in Dyck & Neubert, 2010: 275).
13. This example is described in Chewning, Eby, and Roels (1990).
14. All these relationships happened spontaneously without direct government intervention or regulation. Initially these initiatives had acquisitive economic motivations, but over time sustenance economic motivators became more dominant, though they have nevertheless still yielded financial benefits. This example is taken from Hawken (1993: 62–63; see also description in Dyck & Neubert, 2010: 277).
Final Thoughts

1. For other research that explicitly develops an understanding of “radical” management consistent with a theology of management, see Dyck and Schroeder (2005), Dyck and Weber (2006), and Dyck, Starke, and Dueck (2009); see also Bell and Dyck (2012).

2. All quotes in this paragraph and the next are taken from the *Merriam-Webster’s Student Dictionary* (http://www.wordcentral.com/cgi-bin/student?radical).

3. Note that others have argued that documents about Jesus that are even more radical in terms of their rootage (e.g., they were written even earlier than the Gospel of Luke) are also more radical in terms of being countercultural (e.g., Gowler, 2007; Oakman, 1991, 2004). In any case, the radical approach developed from Luke is consistent with Charles Perrow’s (1985: 282; emphasis added here) call to describe what management theory and practice would like if it were based on the life and teachings of “the Man from Galilee and his radical social doctrine.”

4. For a paper where this point is developed more fully, namely, that a Protestant ethic approach to management is not consistent with how Jesus’ teaching were likely understood in the first-century approach, see Dyck, Starke, and Weimer (2012).

5. Luke’s radical institutional structures are precisely the sort being called for by leading contemporary business scholars and social movements like “Occupy Wall Street” (which is all over the media as these words are being written). The analysis provided in this book, then, seems particularly timely and relevant. I tip my hat to the committee of scholars at SSHRC who had the foresight to recognize this and prioritize this research by awarding a grant already in 2006.

6. I still remember the counsel of a business scholar, early on in this process, who advised me not to place my countercultural interpretation of the parable of the ten pounds so early in the book, explaining that it would cause some readers to close the book and read no further (and she thought there were enough other good ideas in the book that it merited reading). Perhaps she was right. Perhaps the message of this book is so countercultural that many readers deeply steeped in and committed to conventional interpretations of the biblical readings will simply refuse to read this book, essentially dismissing it as heresy. I have no doubt that my colleague was correct in her analysis, and yet I felt compelled to keep my countercultural interpretation up front. Why? Partly because of the response of a second colleague, a scholar in biblical studies. He told me that at first he did not accept my countercultural interpretation of the parable of the ten pounds. However, after reading through the rest of my manuscript he became convinced by the overwhelming consistency in the whole of the Gospel of Luke. So I realize that this book may be troubling for many, and that I may be considered a heretic by some, but nevertheless I did not want to water down Luke’s message to make it more palatable for readers unwilling to be open to an interpretation based on a first-century understanding of management.

7. This may seem difficult to imagine for those of who have been socialized to believe that acquisitive economics and competitiveness are natural human conditions. However, these norms are relatively recent in the history of humankind. For example, as described in chapter seventeen, note 5, a spirit of cooperation and community seems to be entirely natural in hunting gathering societies where success is almost never measured by maximizing production or by storing up wealth.

8. In today’s dictionaries *spiritual* is defined as “not bodily or material,” and *material* is defined as “physical rather than spiritual” (*Merriam-Webster’s Student Dictionary*). The holistic view of the first century is ancient history. This, coupled with the lingering suspicions raised by sentiments like Marx’s popularized “Religion is the opiate of the masses” have conspired to make it difficult for a radical connection between spirituality and the material world of management.

9. “In fact, it [the capitalist system] no longer needs the support of any religious forces, and feels the attempts of religion to influence economic life, in so far as it can be felt at all, to be as much unjustified interference as its regulation by the State” (Weber, 1958: 72).

10. Ibid., 181–182; see also Dyck and Schroeder (2005).
Notes on Pages 196–202

12. Ibid., 277–278.
13. “It was not for nothing that the first [pre-Constantine] Christians were attacked in the Roman Empire as dangerous anarchists, as agents subverting Roman order. They had conscientious objections against military service, against the administration, and against the emperor . . . We have to recognize that [the post-Constantine relationship between the church and the imperial power] perverted the first expressions of the incarnation of Christ in the church . . . Our only reproach against the [post-Constantine] church leaders and theologians is that they set about justifying and legitimating the powers by trying to show that there is no contradiction, particularly between wealth and Jesus Christ, using the (undeniable) strand in the Old Testament that treats riches as a tangible proof of divine blessing. The worm was in the fruit . . . Now from the fourth century onward, belonging to Christianity became the main trend. The words and teachings of priests and bishops were blindly accepted . . . Christianity became what one might call the structural ideology of the particular [Roman] society. It ceased to be an explosive ferment calling everything into question in the name of the truth that is in Jesus Christ, in the name of the incarnation . . . It serves as a framework and mold for individuals as well as for institutions. It has structural force because the empire did indeed need to gain its second wind and it found it here. But by this very fact Christianity suffers a radical change of character. Its prophetic proclamation, welcomed at first among the religions of escape, changes into a religion that give cohesion to society. We thus arrive at an astounding situation that has lasted some fifteen centuries and is only just beginning to be questioned” (Ellul, 1986: 13–14, 30–31, 33, 36, 39, 40, 41).
14. For more on this, see Dyck and Schroeder (2005).
16. For example, recall that Augustine (c.e. 354–430) was one of the first to argue that the term “eternal life” meant “endless” or everlasting life, whereas in the first century it would have referred to a life of “knowing, loving and serving God” and living according to the KOG (see chapter five, note 16).
19. The content in this paragraph is drawn from an excellent study by Gotsis and Drakopoulou-Dodd (2004).
20. The contrast between Weber and Paul described here draws heavily from Muthiah (2010).
21. Ibid.
23. Consistent with this, research shows that, at least among religious organizations, religious beliefs do influence management practices and organizational structures and systems. In short, people can and do implement the values that they believe in (Dyck et al. 2005).

Appendix A: Analysis of the Chiasm in Luke’s Journey Narrative

2. For example, see Baarlink (1992), Farrell (1986), Goulder (1964b), Kariamadam (1987), and Talbert (1974).
3. The five researchers had in total identified 180 different possible breakpoints within the Journey Narrative (on average, each researcher identified 36 breakpoints). Of the 180 total, over 60 percent (N =110) coincided with the 25 breakpoints that were used in the chiasm described in this study (on average, each breakpoint had been identified by 4.4 of the 5 researchers). In addition, closer inspection showed that several of the paired passages could meaningfully be subdivided into subcomponents within themselves, thus
creating another 24 “subbreakpoints” (this included an additional 37 of the 180 break-
points that had originally been identified). (Note that these subbreakpoints occur within
parallel passages. They cannot not considered to be an independent “full” breakpoint
because, due to the nature of the overall chiastic structure, doing so would essentially
“flip” their order and make them go “out of step” vis-à-vis their “twinned” passage.)
Thus, in the end only 33 of the originally identified 180 breakpoints (18 percent) were
not incorporated in the complete chiasm.

4. For example, it is assumed that Luke would have received a classical training, which
would have included Homer’s epic 24-chapter poem the Iliad, which is said to have been
written in a variation of chiastic form called hysteron proteron (Whitman, 1958). The
biblical book of James has also been argued to contain a chiasm with 12 paired passages
(i.e., a total of 24 passages) (Welch, 1981, cited in Lissner, 2007).

5. These data and analyses, not reported here, also looked at whether similar content is
found elsewhere in the Journey Narrative (or the overall Gospel). By way of quick sum-
mary, of all the different words in the Journey Narrative, 32 keywords were chosen that
seemed especially important for pointing the reader to which passages formed chiastic
pairs (e.g., three keywords were important for identifying the first chiastic pair, three
different keywords for identifying the second chiastic pair, and so on). Each of these 32
keywords could be found in both halves of their focal pair, but they were virtually never
shared within both halves of any of the other chiastic pairs.

6. We found that the longer the passages, the more difficult the pairing task seemed to be.
For example, the six shortest pairs (by total word count) were sorted correctly over 55
percent of the time, whereas the six longest pairs were sorted correctly only 38 percent
of the time.

7. Recall also the comments from scholars like Johnson (1991: 4) that in Luke “[t]he
sequence itself provides the larger meaning.”

8. Note that commonly used words that receive at least 20 mentions in the Journey Narrative
account for almost 60 percent of the total word count, so that the use of less frequently
used words is more striking than their simple numerical frequency would suggest.

9. The first phase is not unlike the first stage of the four-part Socratic method that will
be described at the end of this chapter: “The interlocutor [e.g., the person with whom
Socrates was discussing something] asserts a thesis, \( p \), which Socrates considers false and
targets for refutation” (Vlastos, 1994: 11). For the case of Socrates, he used this method
to refute theses such as the following: (1) in matters of justice, people should not follow
“the many” (but rather follow “the man who knows best”); (2) people should never
return evil for evil; (3) the just person will not harm their enemies; (4) the piety of an
action is not determined by whether it is god-loved (but rather pious action is god-loving
because it is pious); (5) a just person does not rule for his or her own benefit (but rather
for the benefit of their subjects); and (6) “it is better to suffer wrong than to commit it and
to suffer deserved punishment than to escape it” (taken from 11–12).

10. This emphasis on “dialogue” is not inconsistent with the emphasis on dialogue in
Socrates’s four-step dialogical method. Of the 420 verses in the Journey Narrative,
there are about 100 mentions of dialogue attributed to someone other than Jesus (i.e.,
there are 100 occasions where quotation marks are used to attribute a statement to
someone other than Jesus, which averages out to 0.24 dialogues per verse, or about
one dialogue for every four verses). About half the verses in the Journey Narrative
(201) contain material that is unique to Luke, and the other half (219 verses) contains
material that parallels/overlaps with at least one of the other Gospels. In the verses that
are unique to Luke, there are about 72 occasions where there is dialogue attributed
to someone other than Jesus (e.g., someone asks Jesus a question, Jesus tells a parable
where he attributes a quote to one of its characters); this averages out to 0.36 dialogues
per verse. In the verses that are shared with the other Gospels, there are only about 28
occasions where there is a dialogue attributed to someone else; this averages out to 0.13
dialogues per verse. (Note also that on about 6 occasions Luke’s material does not con-
tain a quote that is found in the parallel passage described in one of the other Gospels;
adding these six verses would increase the average to 0.15 dialogues per verse in the parallel material). Overall then, about every fourth verse in the Journey Narrative has a quote attributed to someone other than Jesus, and quotes are 2.5 times more likely to be found in material that is unique to Luke (versus content that overlaps with Mark and/or Matthew).

When comparing the total number of dialogues per phase, phase 1 has the highest frequency at 0.33 dialogues per verse, phases 2 and 4 each have an average of about 0.25 dialogues per verse, and phase 3 has 0.15 dialogues per verse. This suggests that there is a particular emphasis on dialogues in the first phase.

A more nuanced understanding of the nature of these dialogues can be obtained by examining who the dialogue partners are. Are these dialogues with Jesus (N=32), or among others (N=68)? The overall average ratio of “Dialogue directed to Jesus” / “Other dialogue” is 0.47 (=32/68). However, this ratio is quite different among the four phases. For phase 1 the ratio drops to 0.19, suggesting that the four-phase model often starts with dialogue among others. The ratios are closer to the overall average in phases 2 (0.33) and 3 (0.5), suggesting that these stages place greater emphasis on dialogues with Jesus than the first phase. The ratio jumps to 0.71 in phase 4, suggesting that dialogues in that phase place greater relative emphasis on dialogues with Jesus (in this phase, talking with the leaders). (Note that these counts comparing different Gospels are based on analysis using Aland, 1982.)

11. Note that this phase represents a qualitative departure from the second step in the four-step Socratic method. Rather than follow the Socratic method and try to argumentatively demonstrate a point, passages in phase 3 have an experiential learning focus. This points to the importance of trying different things, and then learning from them. Put somewhat differently, whereas the Socratic model may emphasize emancipation from wrong-headed ethical principles, the Lukan model seeks liberation via enacting and thus learning new principles (see Raelin, 2008: 534–535).

12. Note that this attention to social structures and systems is not evident in Socrates’s dialectic method, discussed at the end of this appendix.

13. “Just then a lawyer stood up to test Jesus” (end of first cycle, Luke 10:25); “While [Jesus] was speaking a Pharisee invited him to dine with him” (second cycle, Luke 11:37); “Now [Jesus] was teaching in one of the synagogues [where the leader became indignant]” (third cycle, Luke 13:10); “On one occasion when Jesus was going to the house of a leader of the Pharisees” (Luke 14:1, fourth cycle); “The Pharisees, who were lovers of money, heard all this, and they ridiculed [Jesus]. So [Jesus] said to them” (fifth cycle, Luke 16:14); “And a certain ruler asked [Jesus]” (sixth cycle, Luke 18:18).


15. Of course, there are other ways to divide Acts. This discussion is based on Goulder (1964a: 76ff).

16. This is implied in cycle 2 (Acts 6:1–9:43), but is explicit in the other three cycles.

17. Moreover, note that Goulder (1964a) suggests that the fourth cycle can itself also be divided into an additional four mini-cycles.

18. See Oster (2010) for a study that draws on four-phase organizational learning models (Crossan, Lane, & White, 1999; Nonaka, 1994) to interpret this passage. Also, note similarities between this cycle in Acts and the “Samaritan cycle” described at the beginning of the Journey Narrative (see chapter thirteen).

19. Elliott (1991a: 106) notes that this passage makes an explicit connection between “common and unclean” as it applies to both animals/food and to persons.

20. This is not to suggest that the Lukan four-phase model is identical to the Socratic model—in fact, there are significant differences. Rather, the goal in this section is simply to suggest that it is plausible that Luke and his educated readers would have been familiar with the idea of there being a methodical process to discover virtue. As should be expected, there are significant differences between Socratic method and the four-phase model consistent with Jesus’ teachings because of the epistemological (questions about “how we know”) differences between them (Hattersley, 2009: 1). One fundamental difference
is that Socrates placed much greater emphasis on abstract debate, whereas Jesus placed relatively greater emphasis on grounded experience:

“Jesus was concerned not with knowing the good but with being good. Thus where Socrates ends Jesus begins . . . Thus when Socrates made us know the Absolute Good, Jesus showed the way to identification [sic] with it . . . The ideal Socrates, as set forth by Plato, is the creation of the philosopher-king, endowed with all knowledge, virtue, wisdom and love of truth. The ideal Jesus is the creation of the saint, who would win salvation through love and service, and help others do the same” (Davar, 1972: 414–415; emphasis added here).


22. Note that people in first-century Palestine may not have recognized the Socratic method as the four-step process model we describe here, which builds on scholars who have stylized Socrates’s framework into a four (or three or five) step model (especially Vlastos, 1994, and Bolten, 2001).


24. Sandnes (1993: 22) describes the “extensive use of Socrates tradition in antiquity . . . Socrates was one of the best-known figures of Greek history. He is praised everywhere, as Lucian of Samosata (c. 120–180 CE) puts it (Somnium 13), and the early church is no exception, although there are some critical words against him.” Hattersley (2009: 56) posits that: “While it seems unlikely—though not impossible—that Jesus quoted Socrates, it’s certain that Paul, John, and the author of Thomas were aware of Socrates’ teachings.”

25. Quotes in this section are taken from Sandnes (1993: 21).
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