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PREFACE  Jerome H. Neyrey

1.0 Authors-Collaborators
- This book results from the 1986 decision of a group of historical-critical scholars to apply social sciences to the biblical text.
- They took a “systems approach” that seeks to understand a larger framework, i.e., the culture of those who produced the text.

- Luke-Acts is good for the application of social sciences because of its concern with social aspects of the gospel, its geographical and chronological scope, and because of its universal issues.
- The models applied to Luke-Acts can be applied to other NT documents.

3.0 A Different Kind of Book
- The aim of the book is to decipher the meaning of Luke-Acts in and through the 1st c. Mediterranean social context, and to understand how this context shaped the author’s perspective, message and writing.
- To do this, one must recognize the cultural distance between original and present readers; and read the text through a foreign model of the way the world works.
- This book is meant to be a handbook of “basic social scientific perspectives” (xi) for historical-critical study.

4.0 Social Sciences and Historical Criticism
- Rather than taking a purely historical approach, this book investigates the social and cultural patterns that shaped those who heard or read Luke-Acts.
- Whereas history looks for a linear storyline, social science looks for typical repeated social patterns in specific times and places in order to find particular and distinctive perception and behavior.

5.0 Social Scientific Perspective and Levels of Abstraction
- Whereas historical-criticism examines particular actions, events and people, social scientific criticism examines a broader social system that calls for greater abstraction.

6.0 Why such a Handbook?
- We tend to read our values, social systems, behavior and cultural assumptions back into a text.
- We need models that will help us to imagine how ancient Mediterranean people thought and acted.

7.0 What are we looking at? The Right Lenses
- Whereas historical-critical gospel investigation is concerned with chronology (from Jesus to the Christian community to the evangelists), this book is concerned also with the meaning underneath that chronology.
- Each chapter of the book begins with a methodological lense/social scientific model for examining the data, and then applies that model to Luke-Acts.
- Models are taken from anthropologists and social scientists concerned with cross-cultural comparisons.
8.0 Contents of the Book
- Contents reflect those of basic anthropology or sociology textbooks.
- The book focuses on societal institutions, social psychology, and value clusters (forms of behavior).

9.0 How to Read this Book
- Begin with the first chapter, then choose any chapter

10.0 The Benefits
- The book is meant to equip readers to approach Luke-Acts with greater sensitivity to its cultural setting, in order to read it more accurately.

1: READING THEORY PERSPECTIVE: READING LUKE-ACTS  Bruce Malina

1.0 Introduction
- Trying to understand the text of Luke-Acts is like trying to understand a foreigner speaking in his own language; only the reader of the NT is the foreigner.
- Meaning is not found in the simple translation of a text.
- Historical investigation answers “who, what, when, where” questions; social-cultural investigation answers “why” questions.
- Because meaning is found in the social systems, and not the wordings, of a text, we need to understand the social system in which the language functioned.
- Because communication through language happens through shared social systems, translation outside social systems leads to misunderstanding.
- Reading theory holds that words are abstractions and expressions of ideas, and that the locus of meaning lies beyond language systems.

2.0 Reading
- Malina discusses assumptions regarding nature of reading, language and text
  2.1 On language
    - Language is socially motivated
    - In 3 tiers: soundings/spellings realize words that realize meaning that comes from a social system
    - One understands the world according to a social reality, and the social world of Luke-Acts does not equal that of contemporary America.
    - Without the awareness of social forms, readers will appropriate texts according to their own experience.
  2.2 What is a Text?
    - “text” is “the unit of articulated meaning in language” (10).
    - An understanding of the social system in which a text originated is necessary to interpret it.
  2.3 Elements of Reading
    - To interpret a text, a reader needs access to its original social systems through social science models.
  2.4 Dimensions of Reading
    - Readers read as part of a social context that determines a mental setting.
    - A language setting is interpersonal and analyzed by sociolinguistics; a mental setting is intrapersonal and analyzed by psycholinguistics.

3.0 Intrapersonal Dimension: Models of Reading
Malina discusses the meanings imparted in the process of reading according to two models of reading comprehension.

3.1 Model One: The Propositional Model
- The text evokes a chain of propositions that are connected by means of a superstructure.
- Problem: this approach cannot be verified experientially; gets at wording, but not meaning.

3.2 Model Two: The Scenario Model
- The text evokes scenes or schemes in the mind of the reader, which the reader uses as a larger frame in which to set the meaning proposed by the text.
- This approach is verified by experiential psychology: readers bring ideas of how the world works to a text that invites the reader to rearrange those ideas.
- Considerate writers will have in mind the readers’ scenario of how the world works in mind, beginning with what is known and adding what is unknown.
- Since the author of Luke-Acts is considerate to 1st c. Mediterranean readers, contemporary readers must learn a set of scenarios typical of this culture.

3.3 Reading and the Interpreter
- Contemporary biblical scholars should give a set of scenarios deriving from the 1st c. Mediterranean world as the basis of interpretation.

4.0 Interpersonal Dimensions
- Reading is part of the social world of the reader.

4.1 Reading and Social Setting
- The setting and purpose of a text determines how reading happens: “who says what to whom about what, in what setting, and for what purpose” (18).
- Two social settings for reading are that of the author and the reader.

4.2 Reading and Societal Context
- “low context societies” produce detailed texts that do not assume a reader’s understanding.
- “high context societies” produce impressionistic texts because much is assumed about a reader’s understanding.
- Difficulty comes when a low-context reader (e.g., an American) approaches a high-context text (e.g., the NT), because he does not know what is assumed.

4.3 Contextualized – Decontextualized Reading
- Contextualized literacy derives meaning from context
- Decontextualized literacy derives meaning from the text itself

4.4 Keeping the Intrapersonal and Interpersonal Together
- Given that these elements must be kept together, Malina poses the question, what is the relationship between historical biblical interpretation and the contemporary church?
- If we recognize that both we and the 1st c. hearers/readers make meaning according to experience, then we can do comparative study.

5.0 Conclusions
- The essays in this book use a scenario model.
• In order to understand Luke-Acts, we must understand the author’s words and intended meaning for the 1st c. Mediterranean hearers in their social and cultural context.
• We must recognize two contexts of contemporary readers with different motivations for reading: educational institutions and the church.
• The aim of the scenario approach is to keep contemporary readers – whatever their motivation – from eisegesis.

2: HONOR AND SHAME IN LUKE-ACTS: PIVOTAL VALUES OF THE MEDITERRANEAN WORLD  Malina and Neyrey

0.0 Introduction
• “Honor” is a Mediterranean value attached to appearance.

1.0 Honor Defined
• “Honor” is “the positive value of a person in his or her own eyes plus the positive appreciation of that person in the eyes of his or her social group” (25).
• “Honor” itself is abstract, and depends upon a society’s understanding of power, gender and precedence in order to become concrete.
• What is honorable is variable according to place, situation, or vantage point.

1.1 Sources of honor
1.1.1 Ascribed honor: passive, e.g., through birth; can be endowed by a powerful person who can make others acknowledge it.
1.1.2 Acquired honor: actively sought and achieved; all social interactions in Mediterranean culture are potential contests for honor (agonistic culture).

1.2 Acquiring Honor: Challenge and Riposte
- “challenge – riposte” is a public, social honor game among equals in 3 phases: challenge (positive or negative), perception, and reaction that includes a public verdict.
- The challenge threatens to usurp the reputation of the other publicly

1.3 Replications of Honor
1.3.1 Honor and blood: Both ascribed and acquired honor are symbolized by blood (i.e., blood relatives). There is no honor contest with blood relatives, but with outsiders to the family.
1.3.2 Honor and name: The name of a family gives an honor rating, so that a “good name” ensures the ability to carry on social interactions (e.g., through contracts, covenants).

2.0 Honor Displayed
• Social boundaries provide socially shared maps for placing people, things and events.
• Honor and dishonor are associated with body parts because the individual physical body symbolizes the values of the social body.
• Honor is associated with maintaining boundaries of body and home (one’s space).

2.1 Recognition of Honor
- Honor and dishonor are displayed with regard to head and face
- Physical affront is a challenge to honor, because it invades physical space.

2.2 Challenges to Honor
The interpretation of a challenge to dishonor depends both on the individual and the public witnesses.
- Failure to respond is dishonor.
- Challenges can be direct or indirect/ambiguous, and swearing oaths can clarify intentions.
- Public speech challenges honor when issues of truth or falsehood are raised.
- To deceive an outsider is to withhold honor/respect, and is not dishonorable, but a challenge.
- Social groups have collective honor (e.g., family, nation); to dishonor an individual is to dishonor the whole group.

3.0 Collective Honor
- People participate in the collective honor of their social group, led by the head of the group responsible for its honor.

3.1 Honor and the Natural Group
- Natural groupings are like ascribed honor, because one is born into them.
- 3 degrees of honor challenges depend on whether the challenge is revocable; whether the boundaries are reparable; how complete the dishonor is.
- 1st degree is complete dishonor with no possible revocation (e.g., murder, adultery – the 2nd half of the 10 commandments).
- 2nd degree is significant deprivation of honor with possible revocation (e.g., restoration of stolen items).
- 3rd degree is interaction that requires social response (e.g., repayment of a gift).

3.2 Honor and the Voluntary Group
- Voluntary groups are like acquired honor because membership results from contract or competition.
- Whereas both internal and public opinion set the honor rating of the natural group, only public opinion does for the voluntary group.
- Those who hold leadership posts set and keep the honor of the group, and the head cannot be challenged from within the group.

4.0 Gender-Based Honor: The Moral Division of Labor
- On one level of abstraction, the honor of the natural group is divided into a sexual or moral division of labor: male = honor; female = shame.
- Shame for a male is the negative value of a loss of honor; for a female, shame is the positive value of the defense of honor.
- Male honor looks outward to the public sphere, while female honor looks inward to the domestic sphere.
- Male honor is symbolized by sexual aggression (going in) which is illustrated in the outward movement towards public space, while female shame is symbolized by sexual purity (keeping out) which is symbolized by staying in the domestic space.

4.1 Male Honor
- Male defends corporate and female honor.
- Loss of honor for the male leads to the experience of negative shame.

4.2 Female Honor
- The female exhibits the positive shame of corporate honor.
- When the female loses honor, she is called “shameless.”
5.0 Conclusion: Toward Defining Honor and Shame
- Honor is a person’s or group’s feeling of self-worth acknowledged publicly
- To “have shame” is positive, and expresses sensitivity to the honor rating of the group.
- The honor or shame of individuals only has meaning in relation to a group, and always depends on gender roles.
- On a lower level of abstraction, the male symbolizes honor and the female shame.
- On a higher level of abstraction, both males and females acquire honor by public validation of status, and are shamed when the public denies status.
- Women symbolize shame or ethical goodness, while men symbolize honor or social precedence or power. An honorable marriage that fuses the male and female creates a social inheritance for the family.

6.0 The Model Applied
- The words honor and shame are few in Luke-Acts, but many other words represent their concept.

6.1 Ascribed and Acquired Honor
6.1.1 Ascribed and Acquired Honor: Jesus is afforded both in Luke-Acts, e.g., through the genealogy, and through the bestowal of honor by God at baptism, transfiguration, and resurrection.
6.1.2 Acquired Honor: Challenge and Riposte: Jesus experienced constant negative challenges to his honor, which included claim, challenge, riposte and public verdict, e.g., Luke 13:10-17; challenges by public questions, e.g., Luke 10:25-37; and positive honor challenges in the form of requests for help and offerings of discipleship.
6.1.3 Replications of Honor: Jesus’ honor is upheld in the genealogy, in his blood ties with Zechariah, Elizabeth and Mary. His honor is replicated in blood through John the Baptist, who does not challenge Jesus’ honor, but makes his honor greater. Jesus is shamed when he is denied by his own townspeople and by the Jews before the Romans; however, God’s verdict and the titles given to Jesus grant him honor.

6.2 Honor Displayed
- Honor is displayed through the human body, e.g., through clothing.
- Jesus’ clothing is only mentioned once, with regard to the inappropriate clothing placed on him during his trial to shame him.
- Treatment of head and feet show honor or dishonor.
- Right hand signifies position of power, e.g., the repeated use of Psalm 110 to depict Jesus at the right hand of God to bestow him with honor after his dishonorable death.
- Physical touch can be a positive honor challenge, e.g., the menstruating woman’s touch in Luke 8:43-48. Jesus also initiates touch in healings.
- The Passion narrative illustrates honor and shame regarding Jesus’ body.
- Honor is also bestowed through giving gifts and invitations.
- Jesus is honorable because he does honorable things: benefactions (helping the needy) and acts of power (miracles, signs, wonders).

6.2.1 Interpretation of a Challenge: Challenges are clarified through oaths, e.g., Jesus’ “Amen, Amen, I say to you” functions like a word of honor.
6.3 Collective Honor

6.3.1 Honor and the Natural Group: The head of the group symbolizes the honor of that group publicly. The charges of blasphemy against Jesus are concerned with God’s honor. For Christians, those who reject Jesus dishonor God; when God’s agents are dishonored, God is. God was bound to vindicate Christ through resurrection and exaltation: this is God’s riposte.

6.3.2 Honor and the Voluntary Group: Leaders of voluntary groups defend the groups honor publicly, e.g., Jesus defends the honor of his disciples; chief priests bear the honor of the priests in the trials of Jesus, Peter and Paul.

6.4 Gender-Based Honor

- Luke names women in relation to their husbands.
- If a woman is introduced apart from her husband (e.g., Lydia in Acts), “the reader would be expected to wonder as to her ‘shame,’ that is, her defense of feminine sexual exclusivity and family virtue” (62).
- The honor and shame model leads the reader to expect to find women in the home; so, a close look should be given to women who appear in the public sphere.
- Widows face danger to their reputation, so they are protected and given sympathy.
- Luke’s emphasis that women of high-standing accepted the gospel could be a way of saying that women with spotless reputations accepted it.

7.0 Conclusions and Further Projects

- The honor-shame model helps us understand the agonistic culture and to give us a form (challenge-riposte) to interpret conflict.
- It helps us to identify the positive honor-challenges to Jesus.
- Suggestions for the use of the honor and shame model: investigate the language of status, the sources of honor, the challenge-riposte conflicts, and gender-based place and roles.

3: FIRST-CENTURY PERSONALITY: DYADIC, NOT INDIVIDUAL Malina and Neyrey

0.0 Introduction

- Neyrey aims to reconstruct the Mediterranean “modal personality,” or that society’s ideal human being.

1.0 Presuppositions

- Neyrey deals with presuppositions about which objections could be raised, i.e., making generalizations about the Mediterranean social-cultural context; retrojecting contemporary patterns back into the 1st c. setting; and using a high level of generalization in the interpretive process.

1.1 A Circum-Mediterranean Area as Unit of Analysis
 Reasons for seeing the whole Mediterranean as a single cultural setting include common illness theories, similar social processes and common institutions across the area.

To speak of the Mediterranean as homogenous requires a level of abstraction and generalization in order to facilitate comparisons.

1.2 Presumption of Constancy

People’s actions and choices are bound by hidden societal rules. Traditional societies without literacy and a sense of history remain stable in structure and values according to the hidden cultural rules, because they do not know of an alternative.

“Unless there is evidence of change in the historical record, there is a presumption of continuity” (71).

20th c. Mediterranean culture is not identical to 1st c. culture, but it is much closer than American culture.

2.0 Strong Group Person

- Mediterranean culture has an idea of a strong group, rather than an individual person.

2.1 Not Individual, but Dyadic

- Individualism is alien to Mediterranean culture; rather, it is “dyadic” or group-oriented. Everyone is connected to at least one social unit, particularly the family.

- Dyadic people live out the expectations and demands of others who give them honor and reputation. Identity, role and status are socially conditioned, as opposed to Americans who decide these things for themselves.

- “I” always connotes some “we” in Mediterranean culture (74).

2.2 Thinking “Socially,” not Psychologically

- Strong group/dyadic people figure out others by thinking “socially” or stereotypically. Basic stereotypes of 1st c. Mediterranean people are: family/clan; place of origin; inherited craft trade; parties/groups.

- The presumption is that human character is fixed and unchanging because it is tied to ascribed group status, and not to individual personality. The social body, e.g., what family you are born into or what gender you are, is designed by God.

2.3 Honor and Shame

- 1st c. Mediterranean people cannot be understood apart from the concept of honor and shame.

2.4 Morality and Deviance

2.4.1 (Group) Conscience

- Conscience is the attention to public image and the alignment of behavior and self-perception to it.

- Individual deviations are signs of deviation within the social body.

- All moral listings in the NT have a concern larger than the individual, with the health of the group. “Failure brings not guilt, but public shame” (77).

2.4.2 Deviance
- A deviant is one who acts against the social order. Whereas an American defines deviance psychologically and individually, Mediterranean culture defines it according to an abnormal matrix of relationships.
- The honorable person is concerned with the impressions of others, and tries to fulfill their expectations. Individual identities are proscribed by the group, and are seen as rooted in creation. Exhortations appeal to what is commonly known.

2.4.3 Social Awareness
- Dyadic persons have a strong social awareness, rather than a psychological awareness. Behavior is controlled by outside norms. Strong social inhibition, rather than personal inhibition, prevents certain behavior.
- Values that strengthen the group are positive, and those that tear up the group are negative.

2.5 Values and Virtues
2.5.1 Differing Cultural Values
- Malina and Neyrey consider a model for discerning cultural values by Kluckhorn and Strodtbeck, and applied by Papajohn and Spiegel, which focuses on how people act in crisis.
- Luke’s world would have focuses on being, on the group, the present and past, helplessness in the face of nature, and on human nature as mixed or evil. By contrast, Americans focus on doing, on individuality, the future and present, mastery over nature, and human nature as neutral.

2.5.2 Consequent Cultural Virtues
- The value of “being” plays out in the acceptance of status, suffering, obedience and contentment.
- The value of “collateral relations” plays out in belonging to a group, faithfulness and loyalty.
- A “present” orientation focuses on today’s needs, while a “past” orientation focuses on the importance of tradition.

3.1 Not Individual, but Dyadic
- Jesus, like dyadic people, would have understood his role and status according to the expectations of others; so, asking about his “messianic consciousness” is meaningless
- Jesus is told who he is – rather than deciding for himself – by angels, prophets, John, God, the disciples and demons.
- Jesus lets others say who he is, rather than promoting himself; however, he is ultimately accused of promoting himself.

3.2 Thinking “Socially,” not Psychologically
- Dyadic people think in stereotypes. People in Luke-Acts are understood in terms of their group: family/kin; clan/tribe; ethnic group; region/town/village; party/group; craft/trade.
The redefinition of the dyadic group “Israel” with the inclusivity of a new covenant family is significant.

Role and status had expectations and duties, e.g., if Jesus were holy, he was expected to act in a certain way, and he is evaluated accordingly.

3.3 Honor and Shame – see previous chapter

3.4 Morality and Deviance

- Obedience is a high value for dyadic people.
- Scripture is the primary basis for moral norms and customs of Jews, because it outlines the expectations of members of the covenant.
- Morality is also communicated in aphorisms, proverbs, parables, prayer formulae, blessings and woes.
- Christianity is called “the Way” (of Jesus) in Luke-Acts, because Jesus gives the group norms and customs for his disciples.

3.5 Values and Virtues

3.5.1 Cultural Values

- Review: These values include collateral relations, being obedient, subordination to nature, and human nature as mixed.

3.5.2 Consequent Virtues

- Obedience to one in authority is a prime virtue.
- Jesus embodies obedience to God in Luke; it would be shameful if he were not obedient, since God would be dishonored.
- Command and obedience belong to the realm of honor and shame, and to an embedded society.

4.0 Summary and Further Tasks

- Mediterranean people are dyadic, not individualistic; think in stereotypes; act according to gender based on honor and shame; follow a proper order that is socialized; and receive moral exhortation that is commonly known.
- Mediterranean values result in the primacy of obedience and loyalty.
- Modern readers must read the NT in this light since Americans are so different.
- Suggestions for further study: the names and titles of Jesus given by others; how people join Jesus’ group; how the apostles are portrayed.

4: CONFLICT IN LUKE-ACTS: LABELLING AND DEVIANCE THEORY

Malina and Neyrey

1.0 Introduction

- Mediterranean conflict is always practical, i.e., a means to an end rather than an end in itself. Accordingly, conflict in Luke-Acts is over how to realize the values of Israel.
- This essay will examine conflict in Luke-Acts through labelling and deviance theory.

2.0 The Model: Labelling and Deviance Theory

2.1 Labelling and Deviance: when Jesus and others are put on trial, they are labelled as deviants.
2.1.1 Labelling: Labels allow people to be evaluated positively or negatively, and allows conflict to be assessed.

2.1.2 Deviance: Refers to something or someone “radically out of social place” (100). Negative labels are accusations of deviance resulting from a violation of the social or moral order. Deviant behavior threatens those who do the labelling.

2.1.3 Ascribed/Acquired Status: Deviance can be ascribed (a matter of being, e.g., age, gender, physical features like blindness); or acquired (a matter of doing, e.g., acquisitions, marriage, occupation).

2.1.4 Master Status: The deviant label will place a person in a new role with new expectations and a new status.

2.2 The Deviance Process: Typical process includes the interpretation of deviant behavior, the definition of someone as deviant, and then the treatment of that person as deviant.

2.2.1 Agents of Censure: those who interpret and define deviant behavior. “Rule creators” create the rules and “moral entrepreneurs” apply them. Together, they form an interest group by drawing boundaries and declaring what is out of bounds.

2.2.2 Dissemination and Broader Respectability: The viewpoint is disseminated and respectability broadened through association with other people and groups.

2.2.3 Rule Enhancement: appeal to group intolerance creates a counter-ideology.

2.3 Activity of Deviance-Processing Agents: those who define deviant behavior and label deviants. For Jesus and disciples, these are the Jerusalem elite and the Roman government.

2.3.1 Denunciation: identification of perpetrator and trait as out of the ordinary, through appeal to the core values of a group

2.3.2 Retrospective Interpretation: Once a person takes on a deviant status, his whole past life is reinterpreted accordingly to validate that new status in a public process; this happens with the gossip of Jesus’ opponents during his trial. Through this process, the deviant comes to embody the deviant behavior.

2.3.3 Status Degradation Ritual: the effort to “publicly categorize, recast, and assign a moral character to deviant actors” (107), which results in a complete change of identity for the “deviant.” Jesus’ arrest and trial is such a ritual.

2.4 Interrupting the Labelling Process: Labellers do not succeed if they do not demonstrate that the deviant behavior is unconstrained and in violation of important social rules.

2.4.1 Neutralization: “deviants” can neutralize the process by making the moral issue unclear through an alternative retrospective interpretation. The synoptic gospels do this.

2.4.2 Alternative Retrospective Interpretation: Ways of neutralizing include denial of responsibility (e.g., “God’s will”), denial of injury; labelling the victim or condemners as moral deviants; appeal to a higher loyalty (e.g., Hebrew Scriptures)
3.0 The Model Applied: The Trial of Jesus

3.1 Labels applied to Jesus: one who pollutes or perverts God’s people; false prophet; false messiah. These labels became Jesus’ master status, and the labelers were seen as keepers of the Temple system. Deviance to Romans is defined as pretender to the throne or insurrectionist. At first, the attempt to label Jesus was unsuccessful.

3.2 The Deviance Process against Jesus

3.2.1 Agents of Censure: Temple elite and Roman governor; chief priests, scribes and elders are rule creators and moral entrepreneurs.

3.2.2 Dissemination and Broader Respectability: The moral entrepreneurs had trouble labelling Jesus, so they sought broader respectability through Judas, the crowd and mob. This led to the unanimous assessment of Jesus as a deviant.

3.2.3 Activity of Deviance Process Agency: The chief priests determine what is clean and unclean, and interpret Jesus as unclean.

3.2.4 Denunciation: The priests collect information to verify the label and build the master status of Jesus as deviant.

3.2.5 Retrospective Interpretation: Jesus’ identity as a prophet is reinterpreted as a false prophet, and claims to be anointed by God as false messiah.

3.2.6 Status Degradation Ritual: The Passion is the vehicle for Jesus’ change in status.


3.3.1 Neutralization: Jesus and disciples never accept the status of pretender or perverter.

3.3.2 Alternative Retrospective Interpretation:
  - Denial of responsibility: Jesus claims that it is God’s will for him to die
  - Denial of injury: Jesus’ deviant behavior did not cause harm but blessing
  - Denial of victims: No one could claim to have been harmed
  - Condemning the condemners: The Passion narrative shows how Jesus’ condemners acted unjustly.
  - Appeal to higher loyalty: Appeal to God’s will so that Jesus’ behavior is really faithfulness to God.

4.0 Further Examination of Conflict in Luke-Acts

- Not only the passion narrative, but other conflicts in Luke-Acts can be seen through labeling and deviance theory, e.g., the charges against Peter, Stephen and Paul.

5: THE PRE-INDUSTRIAL CITY IN LUKE-ACTS: URBAN SOCIAL RELATIONS  Richard L. Rohrbaugh

0.0 Introduction

- Luke-Acts contains ½ of all references to “city” in the NT. This essay seeks to use a model of the urban system and pre-industrial city to understand the role of “city.”
1.0 Using the Term “City”
   1.1 Ancient Understandings of the Concept
      ○ There is inconsistency in the gospels about what is “city” and what is “village”
      ○ In antiquity, “city” is associated with surrounding villages.
      ○ “city” is not defined in terms of size or population, but in terms of central places of various functions.
   1.2 Anachronistic Understandings of the Concept
      ○ We cannot use our modern concept of “city” to define the ancient city, e.g., concepts of information overload and social mobility that are issues in industrialized societies.
      ○ A better scenario is the model of pre-industrialized cities which have issues, e.g., losing connection to land and family.

2.0 A Model of the Urban System
   • Cities were not in isolation, but part of a region.
   • They were not closed systems opposed to rural areas, but part of a system.
   2.1 Model One: The Urban System as a Whole. A regional model of an urban system is more helpful than a universal definition of “city.”
      2.1.1 Horizontal Differentiation: A city is distinguished from a village as a collecting point for more specialized functions; thus, “urban” and “rural” are linked, not opposing, systems.
      2.1.2 Vertical Differentiation: There is a hierarchy between city and village, a pattern for organization according to class relations; e.g., the rural areas grow the food and the cities control the land and distribution.
   2.2 Model Two: The Pre-Industrial City
      2.2.1 Demography and Ecology: Pre-industrial cities were small in size and population (elite and non-elite who served them).
      2.2.2 Function: Chief functions that collected in cities were economic and political, with religious, educational and cultural functions integrated so that the temple and palace were the foci.
      2.2.3 Spatial Organization: Physical arrangements of cities mirrored social relations of the city. Elite were at the center, various groups in the periphery separated by walls, and outcasts outside the city walls.
      2.2.4 Patterns of Interaction: People associated with those of similar status and interest.
      2.2.5 Communication: facilitated by proximity, usually by word-of-mouth.

   • Luke’s parable uses features of the urban system to make its point; the application of modern city features is anachronistic.
   3.1 The Text Unit
      ○ Lk 14:15-24 has been seen as part of a larger unit, vv. 1-24; Rohrbaugh suggests that this unit is larger, vv. 1-33, and that chap. 15 relates as well.
      ○ The whole unit contrasts “exaltation orientation” that seeks public recognition with “humiliation orientation” that avoids it.
      ○ The parable deals with eating and associating with unexpected people of the Kingdom of God.
3.2 The Origin and Form of the Parable
   - We can’t be sure of the original form.

3.3 Luke’s Version of the Story
   - Rohrbaugh is interested in the present form of the story in Luke; Luke is unique in his use of urban features.
   - The host is “a certain man” like a king; the occasion is a “great supper;” the original invitation is a double invitation to which those invited give three excuses; the reaction of the host should be seen in the context of a problem within Luke’s community; the final invitation is made to those in the city streets and outside the city walls; Luke emphasizes a full banquet hall, and Luke alone ends with a warning to the addressees of the parable.

3.4 Luke’s Use of the System and City
   - The host is part of the urban elite because he has large means; the urban elite control social interaction and have great social obligation to their peers.
   - Jesus tells this parable while he eats at the home of a leading Pharisee, so that the host of the story is like him.
   - It is anachronistic to view the 2nd invitation as giving sufficient notice; rather, the 2nd invitation was a courtesy in urban society that allowed guests time to assess the nature of the invitation and decide whether to go.
   - The excuses are part of an honor-shame dynamic and show disapproval of the arrangements for dinner, though we are not told what. The 3 guests are part of an urban elite who could signal to others whether attendance was socially appropriate: either all or none would go. The excuses hide the real reason for the social disapproval.
   - Rohrbaugh reads the reaction of the host as speaking to the situation in Luke’s community of elite Christians refusing table-fellowship with the poor.
   - With the final invitation, the host brings non-elite people past the walls into the domain of the elite for a social occasion, something unheard of in Luke’s day.
   - Rohrbaugh takes this not as an eschatological statement, but one about participation in the Christian community. Here, a member of the elite breaks radically with the social system.

4.0 Luke’s Use of the Parable
   - Luke uses it to assert that maintaining elite social networks prevents one from becoming part of the Christian community that includes the non-elite.
   - At issues is table fellowship in the Christian community; the parable criticizes an old system of life.

5.0 Beyond Luke 14
   - Much of Jesus’ ministry happens outside cities, and leading cities are not mentioned.
   - For further study: Can we glean anything from what functions in Luke-Acts as a central place? What kind of central place is Jerusalem?

6.0 Conclusion
   - Using the model of a pre-industrial city helps us not to be anachronistic.
6: THE COUNTRYSIDE IN LUKE-ACTS  Douglas E. Oakman

1.0 The Project

- Luke gives considerable space and vocabulary to the countryside.
- Two questions to build a scenario for understanding the “countryside” in Luke-Acts: (1) What is Luke’s knowledge of it (real or imagined)? (2) Does Luke use the rural traditions thematically or out of necessity?

2.0 Conceptualizing the Countryside of Mediterranean Antiquity

2.1 A General Sociological Model for the Ancient Countryside

- There is not an absolute dichotomy between city and countryside, but there are differences. A functionalist approach sees societies as systems with needs and social behaviors as functional to meet them; a conflict approach looks at societies as the arena for competing groups or interests. This study assumes a conflict approach.

2.1.1 The General Nature of Agrarian/Peasant Society: The focus is on agriculture and land. The peasant society is a group of villages bound to a city with two classes: the elite, and the peasants who serve them.

2.1.2 Agrarian Economics: Economics are bound up in political or kinship contexts, not in independent social institutions. Exchange happens through non-market means: village exchange is through reciprocity, while elites operate through redistribution. Debt is used to create dependence and indebtedness leads to property control and tenant farming.

2.1.3 Typical Peasant Values: Peasants want little and are self-sufficient, and hold dear the right to subsistence.

2.1.4 Elite Control Mechanisms: Patronage developed bonds of loyalty between social unequals; rebellion was quelled by military action.

2.1.5 Peasant Religion: Embedded in kinship and political contexts, and aimed at agricultural success.

2.2 A Specific Model for the Countryside in the Traditions of Luke

- The scenario of the countryside is made up of a pattern of social stratification as a function of land control/tenure.

2.3 Imaging the Countryside through the Model and Luke’s Tradition

2.3.1 Who Controlled the Land?: Nominal control by Caesar and people of Rome; practical control by local elites. Landlords get control of land through debt manipulation; wealth, land and security of subsistence is in the hands of the elite.

2.3.2 Who Worked the Land?: Peasants who are subject to high taxation and not in direct control of the land.

2.3.3 Character of First-Century Village Life: Luke gives large estates, villages and fields as the main social setting of the ancient Palestinian countryside. The organization and economic exchange of villages are in family contexts.

2.3.4 Typical Economic Experience in the Village: Peasant villages are labor generalists, and particular villages would specialize in crafts because of the seasonal quality of agriculture. Agricultural experience is reflected in Jesus’ sayings in the Lukan tradition, e.g., Jesus’ words to trust in a providential God (Luke 12:22, 24, 19-21) reflect peasant anxiety over
subsistence. Luke reflects the over-taxation and debt experienced by the peasants, e.g., in the 4th petition of the Lord’s Prayer.

2.3.5 Peasant Disaffection: Luke reflects violence of peasant experience, e.g., extortion, fraud, robbery.

2.3.6 Peasant Victims: Victims of Roman agrarian order include the poor and widows in Luke, those who are sick or maimed, and liberation is characteristic of Jesus’ ministry.

3.0 Tensions within the Lukan Conception: How does Luke Represent the Countryside?

3.1 Preliminary Considerations
- “Interest criticism”: How does Luke’s conception of the countryside relate to its standard interests (in favor, against or in the middle)?
- Luke’s use of terminology (“city” and “village”) can indicate his unfamiliarity with Palestinian settlement, or that he knows it better than we do.
- In Luke, the gospel is preached regularly to peasants and villages.

3.2 The Politics of the Countryside: Violent Realism or Irenic Idealism?
- Examples of irenic idealism: (1) Luke gives the countryside as a region of peacefulness: the message of peace is pronounced to shepherds. Since shepherds and the countryside are prone to violence, Luke uses irenic idealism. (2) Jesus and John experience conflict in the “cities” and flourish in the villages.
- Luke does not take a pro-countryside position.
- Luke holds up an idealized countryside that does not mesh with peasant land interests; at the same time, the village is a place of refuge and where the gospel takes root.

3.3 The Economics of the Countryside: Place of Generosity or Stinginess?
- If Luke were overtly pro-peasant/countryside, one would expect a stronger stance over debt-forgiveness and land control; rather, his teachings are to draw morals for creditors.
- Luke urges reciprocity as part of the Christian movement, but does not say how this affects the social structure.
- The rural environment of Luke would find the parables of the Prodigal Son and the Good Samaritan difficult because of subsistence concerns: most would be stingy. These stories are to shame those with amassed wealth into sharing it.
- The destruction of the Temple is the destruction of a defunct political and economic redistributive mechanism to be replaced by a redistributive Christian community (e.g., Acts 2:44-45; 4:32-37).

3.4 Luke’s Elite-Directed Moralism
- In the ancient world, redistributive economy works against peasant interests.
- Luke addresses domestic concerns, but not political concerns of the peasant society.
- Luke takes Jesus’ radical social critique about the political-economic order and turns it into a “rather innocuous sharing-ethic ambiguous in its import for rural dwellers” (177).
Luke does not call for a dramatic social or political-economic reconstruction, and in this way he revises the intention of the Jesus movement. Peace will come for the whole community when landlords and creditors change.

Luke stands between the countryside and the city and does not endorse the interests of either.

4.0 Conclusions regarding this Sociological Method
- Luke refocuses the Christian life away from “redistributive temple religion towards household reciprocity” (178).
- Luke’s argument is directed toward the powerful and wealthy of his own community.

7: SICKNESS AND HEALING IN LUKE-ACTS  John J. Pilch
1.0 Introduction
- “Medical materialism” is the use of modern, scientific models to interpret health concerns of all cultures and times, and is an inappropriate model.
- We need to view Luke’s language of sickness and healing on its own terms: the key is to understand it in relation to fortune and misfortune.
- This essay seeks to apply cross-culturally developed methods, models and concepts regarding health care systems to Luke-Acts and to its taxonomy of healings.

2.1 Theory of Cultural Variations in Values
- Appropriate scenarios reject “medico centrism,” the belief that scientific Western medicine is the only truth for illness and health issues.

2.2 The Model
- We need to determine the values underlying the identification of illness, responses to it, and expected outcomes.
- Pilch lists common human problems and the range of solutions; each culture will choose one solution as primary (see p. 184 and the model applied below).

2.2.1 The Model Applied to the United States: In the U.S., the group of solutions includes an emphasis on doing, individualism, the future, mastery over humanity and nature, and human nature as good or “mixed.”

2.2.2 The Model Applied to Luke-Acts: Solutions emphasize being over doing, collateral relationships, the present, subjugation to nature, and a view of human nature as a mixture of good and bad.

2.3 Summary
- We would expect Luke-Acts to emphasize certain values that emphasize health as a state of being rather than a restoration to activity.

3.1 Defining Terms
- “Disease” relates to abnormalities in the structure or function of organ systems; the group-minded 1st century world has no concept of this, and so it is not a helpful designation in Luke-Acts.
- “Illness” reflects a perception of socially devalued states that may or may not be “disease” according to modern Western science.
Curing is to disease what healing is to illness; the latter set includes the personal and social. All Jesus’ dealings with the sick in the gospels are healings and not cures.

3.2 The Health Care System

3.2.1 The Professional Sector: Use of “physician” depicts Jesus as a prophet-healer concerned with helping people recover lives of cultural meaning.

3.2.2 The Popular Sector: Concern is for the maintenance of health rather than with sickness and cure. Levels of the healthcare system include individuals, family, social network, and community beliefs and practices. Spirit-possession is prominent.

3.2.3 The Folk Sector: Jesus is a folk-healer in the sense that he heals illness both associated with and not associated with a spirit. Jesus’ exorcisms give him social power. Demon-possession is a disvalued state of being, so exorcisms restore order to society. Jesus’ activity fits into the folk-sector of the health-care system.

4.0 The Taxonomy of Illnesses in Luke-Acts

- Taxonomy is a clustering of illnesses into culturally meaningful categories.
- 1st c. Mediterranean and taxonomy is different than modern Western taxonomy, so it is better to use Mediterranean and medical anthropology for a model.

4.1 A Taxonomy Based on Spirit Involvement

- 1st c. taxonomy is one in which the spirit is involved
- Illness is categorized as misfortune through gods or spirits.


- Demon and spirit activity are linked to illness prominent in Luke-Acts, and Jesus heals by the spirit of God.

4.3 A Taxonomy Based on Symbolic Body Zones Affected

- 1st c. Mediterranean people didn’t look at what goes on inside a person, but outside.
- Jesus heals because he can discern what is within a person, e.g., he can tell what spirit is present.
- Three symbolic body zones: “the zone of emotion-fused thought (heart-eyes); the zone of self-expressive speech (mouth-ears); and the zone of purposeful action (hands-feet)” (204).
- Look at Luke-Acts to see which body parts are ill: this may signify misfortune regarding thought, speech or action.


- Men are afflicted in all three body zones in Luke; only afflicted in heart/eyes and hands/feet zones in Acts.
- Women in Luke-Acts are afflicted in the hands/feet zone of purposeful activity. They are not afflicted in the mouth/ears zone in Luke (e.g., the canticles), but are in Acts 16.

4.5 A Taxonomy Based on Purity and Impurity

- Illnesses of the body zones can be considered “impure” (e.g., leprosy, bodily fluids)
Jesus’ healing restores purity and wholeness.


- “Being” and “being-in-becoming” are key in the taxonomies of the 1st c. Mediterranean world. Health is seen as an integrated whole.

5.0 Conclusion

- The emphasis on “being” in Mediterranean culture emphasizes healing as the restoration to a state of wholeness.
- Luke focuses on heart-eyes zone, but includes others as well.

### 8: TEMPLE VERSUS HOUSEHOLD IN LUKE-ACTS: A CONTRAST IN SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS

**John H. Elliott**

0.0 Introduction

- Luke uses the historical and social record to give shape to his message; he uses Temple and household prominently.

1.0 Institutions

- Luke does not have a concept of “institutions,” but they can be identified through an analytical perspective.
- “Institutions comprise social associations and processes which are highly organized, systematized in terms of roles, relationships and responsibilities, and stable over time” (212).
- Temple and household are different social systems, whose reference includes a wider semantic domain than just these two terms.
- Temple and household are opposed social institutions; only the household can embody the gospel.

2.0 Temple and Household: Aspects of Contrast

2.1 Temple and Household in Luke 18:9-14

- The parable of the Pharisee and tax collector begins in the Temple with hypocrisy and ends in the household with a justified sinner.
- Elliott notes Mottu’s view that the focus of the parable is a shift in space from Temple/alienated space to house/human space; but Mottu fails to note Luke’s ambivalence evident in his positive view of the Temple in Luke 1-2. Elliott wants to build on Mottu’s observation and look for a larger pattern of such contrasts between Temple and household.

2.2 Temple and Household in the General Structure of Luke-Acts

- The Temple provides the framework for the Gospel. Scenes in the household frame Acts.
- In Acts, the scene shifts from household to Temple in the first 8 chapters, reflecting the two areas of action and community.
- The Temple is the arena of conflict, while the household becomes increasingly important in Acts as the center of the Christian movement. It replaces the Temple as the locus of God’s activity and presence.


3.1 Temple Terminology, Semantic Field, and Scenes

The Temple begins as the holy place, e.g., the place of Jesus’ presentation, Mary’s purification, Simeon’s and Anna’s blessing. With Jesus’ public ministry, the Temple is presented more negatively and becomes the arena of conflict, at odds with God’s will for salvation.

- Various groups of the Temple network oppose Jesus: Sadducees, scribes, priests, Pharisees.

3.3 The Temple Purity System
- The Temple purity system controlled social identity, class and boundaries of the Jewish people.
- Jesus challenged the exclusivity of the Temple system, and is critical of the holy places and personnel.
- Jesus is accused of violating the purity system in his association with unholy people and his lack of boundaries regarding unholy behavior.

- For Luke, the Temple was a holy place that had lost its power to make holy. The Temple system promoted the powerful at the expense of the powerless.

4.0 The Household in Luke-Acts
- As opposed to the Temple system, the household upholds mercy and justice.

4.1 Household Terminology, Semantic Field and Significance
- The terminology oikia (house) and oikos (household) are prominent in Luke-Acts, as well as a wide range of related terms.
- The household is the favorite place of ministry for Jesus and his followers, and is the place of the gospel’s reception and church’s growth.

4.2 Household Settings
- These provide a setting for a wide range of events.

4.3 House Churches: Basic Social Organization
- House churches provide a social organization for the reception and advancement of the gospel.

4.4 Domestic Life in the Teaching of Jesus
- More than half of the parables have to do with domestic activity and household management.
- The sayings of Jesus regarding life in the Kingdom of God feature domestic life.

4.5 Household Blocks of Teaching
- Blocks of teaching on discipleship are organized around household concerns.

4.6 Household as Symbol of the Kingdom of God
- The household is a model for community, loyalty and obedience.
- Boundaries of the household are expanded to include outcasts and the marginalized.
- God is the father of the Christian household, and Jesus is the lord and householder. Those who share in the fellowship are stewards or servants.

4.7 Household and Mercy
- Acts of mercy are typical of the household; there are no purity boundaries.

- The gospel spreads through the institution of family, and not through politics.
o The household played a historical role in the advance of the gospel, but also a metaphysical role in providing Jesus and his followers with models for teaching life in the Kingdom of God.

o The activity of God moves from Temple to household.

5.0 Temple and Household Contrasted
- Elliot gives a chart that contrasts redistribution and generalized reciprocity in terms of the scale of groups, personnel, political relations, economic relations, social relations, and symbolic features.

6.0 Temple, Household, and Contrasting Sets of Social Relations
- Elliott has established the different social organization of Temple and household, and now asks why Luke organizes his narrative around these two poles. He uses a social-scientific model to analyze the function of thee institutions in relation to the typical social relations of the society. Household social exchange was based on reciprocity while Temple exchange was based on redistribution. Elliot argues that this difference is the basis for their conflict.

6.1 Comparative Model of Ancient Social Relations
- Elliot uses Malina, *Christian Origins and Cultural Anthropology* to clarify a model. He notes that social relations fall on a spectrum from reciprocity to redistribution.

- He uses a model that gives a scheme by which to conceptualize social relations in the ancient Mediterranean world, and that helps categorize and assess Luke’s description.


- Luke contrasts the Temple and its system of redistribution with the household and its reciprocity.

- The Temple was the base of a redistribution economy, controlled by priestly families in relationship with Rome. The system exploited the poor and powerless, and so it was destined for destruction.

- In the household, the social life was contained and the economy self-supporting. Resources were shared directly. The household was marked by inclusivity, humility, loyalty and mercy.

- Since the logic of the kingdom is that of generalized reciprocity, the household became the most natural image.

- The household emphasized mercy over cultic purity, pointing to the mercy of God.

7.0 Conclusion
- The Temple and household function both structurally and thematically in Luke-Acts, in a dualistic scene in which the Temple is unable to mediate salvation while the household is.
9: PATRON-CLIENT RELATIONS AND THE NEW COMMUNITY IN LUKE-ACTS  Halvor Moxnes

0.0 Introduction
- This essay is an exploration of the social institution of “patronage,” the relationship between patron and client, and how this clarifies episodes in Luke-Acts.

1.0 Patronage Defined
- In social relationships of unequals in status and power, the patron gives the needed resources and the client gives loyalty and honor.

2.0 “Universalist Societies” vs. Patron-Client Relations
2.1 “Universalist Societies”: Modern, Western-Style Democracies
- A modern society that expects equal rights and access to goods and services for all citizens has no room for patron-client relationships.
- In ancient societies, the patron-client structure was based on honor and the view that social and economic order was stable and unchangeable.

2.2 The Roman Empire: A System of Personal Relations
2.2.1 A Fusion of the Private and the Public
- In Roman ideology, there was no clear distinction between roles that showed preference and others that showed impartiality.

2.2.2 The Emperor and His “Friends”: Dio Chrysostom
- Dio Chrysostom was a town benefactor and broker. In his speeches, he speaks of the emperor Trajan as an ideal emperor who was a patron acting in friendship rather than impartiality. In return, the king counts on personal loyalties.
- The speeches of DC show a fusion of personal and political relationships that functioned as patron-client relationships.

3.0 Patronage as a Model
3.1 Usefulness of Patron-Client Studies
- Rather than a structural-functionalist approach that does not focus on conflicts, Moxnes follows Eisenstadt and Roniger to take an approach that focuses on interaction, negotiation and conflict in the development of institutions.

3.2 Characteristics of Patron-Client Relations
- These relations were marked by the “simultaneous exchange of different types of resources” (248), i.e., resources from the patron and loyalty from the client.
- Also, by solidarity based on honor and social responsibility.
- These relationships had a spiritual attachment, were binding, and unequal.

3.3 Brokerage
- Besides giving of his own resources, a patron could act as a broker to give a client access to the resources of a more powerful person, e.g., he could serve as a broker between local cities and the central government.
- Individuals or groups (e.g., priests) could be brokers.

3.4 The Benefactor-Patron
The benefactor is another form of a patron for a city or local community. He might build public buildings, pay for public festivals, or distribute food.

A benefactor would compete for public office.

3.5 An Example from Dio Chrysostom

- DC was a public patron-benefactor for a community.
- He speaks about honorable behavior for a patron, and motives of public welfare, reputation and honor.
- He gives examples of how benefactors were honored, e.g., with statues and inscriptions.


- Jesus and his followers are in the context of Jewish society, but Luke presents the actors in the story in a certain light (not neutrally).
- Moxnes cites Silverman who notes the need to investigate both belief and actual behavior, because there is a myth of patronage that reflects an ideal and a reality that does not match it. Emic analysis looks at peoples’ cognitive behavior; etic analysis looks at how they actually behave.
- For Luke: does he express a myth/ideal, or a reality regarding patron-client relations? Does he speak as a patron or as a client?

4.1 Patron-Client Relations in Luke’s Palestine

- There is a difference between the center/city/elite and the periphery/village.

4.1.1 Patrons, Clients, and Brokers

- In Luke 7:1-10, the centurion in Capernaum makes contact with Jesus through the elders of the Jews and friends.
- The centurion is a broker-patron of the town, but a non-Jew. The town elders were his clients whom he sent to Jesus.
- The centurion makes a positive honor challenge to Jesus, putting Jesus in a position of the more powerful patron.
- The patron-client relationship is also demonstrated in Luke 19:11-27; 16:1-9; 12:42-46, which show the dependence of villages on distant centers and the importance of middlemen or brokers.
- Luke speaks several times about the debt of villagers, which binds them in client-patron relationships.

4.1.2 Expectations of the Rich as Patrons

- Luke portrays the rich elite negatively with the expectation that they will be selfish and ungenerous, e.g., the rich man in Luke 16:19-31.

4.1.3 Community Leaders who Block Access to God

- In addition to the rich elite, there were priestly elite who were rich and through whom people had access to God.
- Leaders included heads of synagogues, Pharisees, and scribes. There were supposed to be “brokers” between people and God, but instead they blocked access to God.
- Jesus became the friend/patron/broker.
- Luke identifies the Pharisees with the rich elite and shows how they fail as brokers in their oppression of the poor and love of mammon.
Luke does not describe the historical situation and real expectations, but his own social system in which the people of Israel experience “negative patronage.”

5.0 God as Patron and Jesus as Broker

- Jesus combines two spheres of patron-client relations: center/city/Jerusalem and periphery/village/Galilee; as well as God and people.

5.1 God as Benefactor and Patron

- God was the ultimate patron who demanded exclusive loyalty. This brought conflict with the emperor.

5.2 Jesus as Broker

- Jesus is a broker-patron who mediates between Israel and God; his conflict with Jewish leaders is a power struggle over who will give access to God.
- Jesus brokers by preaching the Kingdom of God and through healing and exorcisms.
- Jesus identifies with the periphery rather than with the center, so he does not represent the center and is rejected by the elites. He makes tax collectors and sinners his clients.
- Jesus gives a new model of leadership and patronage in discussions of who is the greatest: servant and child. Patronage is redefined as service.

5.3 Apostles as Brokers

- Jesus calls the apostles and gives them a share of his power and authority. They become his clients, but also brokers for new followers. Jesus transforms their role as servant-patrons.

5.4 Women as Clients and Benefactors

- Women in Luke-Acts use their resources to care for Jesus and other male leaders, e.g., Lydia acts as a patron for Paul, and then Paul acts as a broker-patron between Lydia and God (Acts 16:14-15).
- Women serve in response to Jesus’ healing, and demonstrate the new model of the patron who serves.

5.5 Patrons without Clients: A Community of Equals

- The first Christian community in Acts depicts patrons who share with the needy in the community.
- Jesus transforms expectations in the system of reciprocity by urging the giving of gifts without the expectation of being repaid, which removes the power aspect from the patron side of the relationship (e.g., Luke 14:12-14). Power, wealth and status do not determine social relations in the Kingdom of God.
- Patrons are urged to give to the needy without expectation of a return; but they are promised a reward from God, who acts as a patron of the poor through human agents.

6.0 Summary, Conclusions, and Further Projects

6.1 Paradoxical Patronage

- Jesus’ claim to give access to God shows the broker-client model.
The patron-servant model is a radical transformation in which the greatest performs tasks of servants and women.

6.2 The Social Setting of Luke’s Community
- Moxnes suggests that Luke’s community was a non-elite group with social mobility.

- Possibilities include: an examination of prayer to God; references to God’s grace, mercy, and election as well as the gift of the Holy Spirit in light of a patron-client model.

10: THE SYMBOLIC UNIVERSE OF LUKE-ACTS: “THEY TURN THE WORLD UPSIDE DOWN” Neyrey

1.0 The Starting Point and the Project
1.1 A Question of Perceptions
- Early Christians were accused of destroying the order and structure of Judaism.
- From the Christian perspective, they were reforming, not destroying.
- The aim of the essay is to develop a model for understanding the 1st c. Jewish perception of the world, in order to make sense of the charges against the Christians and their apology.

1.2 Defining Oneself
- Human beings impose a symbolic view of the world in order to understand its structure and organization, and their place in it.

2.0 The Basic Model: Purity and Order in Israel
- Neyrey employs the work of anthropologist Mary Douglas.

2.1 What is Purity?
- “Purity” represents the order of a social system, as opposed to “pollution” or disorder.
- The core values of a society determine what is “pure.”
- In Judaism, “purity” and “pollution” and related terms are not just abstract, but apply concretely to specific places, times, people and things.

2.2 Order in Creation and Temple
- “Holiness” is a core value of Judaism.
- Holiness is reflected in creation: God arranged the world in proper order regarding time, things, place, diet, and role/status. This gives Israel a purity map.
- Holiness is reflected in the Temple: It embodied the value of holiness, replicating the patterns of Genesis 1 and expressing its order.

2.3 Order and Other Maps
- Map of places: Degrees of holiness are evident in a map with the land of Israel at the outer edge moving towards the Holy of holies at the center of the Temple.
- Map of people: Priests were at the top and people with damaged bodies at the very bottom.
- Map of uncleanness: There was a range from least to most unclean.
- Map of times: Days and seasons were delineated.
2.4 Maps and Boundary Lines
- People conscious of purity pay attention to boundaries: who or what is in or out, and a highly structured organization to classify everything, place and power.
- Things considered impure but difficult to classify were at the margins.
- "Purity," then, has to do with system, order and classification" (282).

2.5 The Map of the Body
- The map of the body is symbolic of the social body, including boundaries, structure and margins.
  2.5.1 Bodily Boundaries
  - The body is ordered and guards its boundaries.
  - Skin and clothing are boundaries of the body and are systems of classification.
  - Orifices on the skin (eyes, mouth, ears, genitals) are gateways to the interior, and like city gates keep out what does not belong.
  2.5.2 Bodily Structure
  - A hierarchy of bodily organs mirrors social hierarchy.
  2.5.3 Bodily Margins
  - Lines are clear about what is too much or too little regarding what it means to be a person, or to be male or female.

3.0 The Model Applied: Jesus and Jewish Maps
- Charges against Jesus and his disciples assume that a shared symbolic universe, but were perverting it; i.e., they knowingly did not respect the maps.

3.1 Maps of Places
- Jesus and his followers acted and spoke against the Temple, Jerusalem, and land of Israel.

3.2 Maps of Persons
- Jesus and his followers dealt with Gentiles, Samaritans, the dead, and the morally and physically unclean.

3.3 Maps of Times
- Jesus violated the Sabbath and days for fasting.

3.4 Maps of the Body
- Jesus had bodily contact with the unclean and did not guard his orifices.

4.0 Luke’s Defense of Jesus’ Purity
- Luke shows Jesus and his followers respecting purity maps.

4.1 Aspects of Jesus’ Purity
  4.1.1 Pedigree: Jesus belonged to a priestly and royal line.
  4.1.2 Observance: Jesus was circumcised and dedicated, made the Passover pilgrimage, and was a regular Sabbath worshipper in the synagogue.
  4.1.4 Sinlessness: Jesus is confessed as “holy One,” is acquitted by judges and proclaimed righteous by the thief at his execution. Finally, he is raised from the dead.

4.2 Jesus Untouched by Uncleaness
Luke portrays Jesus as having constant contact with the unclean, but Jesus himself imparts purity and life rather than becoming unclean and uncompromised himself. God authorizes Jesus to cross the pure/impure line.

4.3 Jesus and New Maps of Purity
- Luke 1-4 presents Jesus as staying within the purity maps, and from chaps. 5 and following, as crossing them.
- Luke shows Jesus as sharing a symbolic universe of the Jews, but then redrawing the maps to reform the purity system.
- New Map of Holy Places: The new holy place is not the Temple, but Jesus himself is the cornerstone of the true Temple. All holiness is measured against him, the new standard.
- New Map of People: The new map of God’s people is not restricted to Israel, but includes the Gentiles (esp. Acts 10:28).
- New Map of the Body: esp. with regard to diet and circumcision.
- Luke does not advocate no maps, but new ones.

5.0 Justification for Jesus’ New Holiness System
- A major issue in Luke-Acts is the right by which Jesus disregards aspects of Jewish holiness.

5.1 Christian View of the Scriptures
- The new perspective on reading scripture was the basis for new maps.
- Luke and the Christians saw the law as from Moses, but not from God.

5.2 The God of Jesus Christ in Luke-Acts
- Luke’s doctrine of God was the apologetic for new maps.
- God shows impartiality through mercy, which trumps holiness. This attribute of mercy establishes the importance of mission, hospitality, and inclusiveness.
- Luke reflects a view of salvation that begins with the promises to Abraham and not with the Exodus.
- God’s new actions are based on reversal: mighty and lowly; elder and younger; fruitful and barren. This upsets perceived maps.
- Jesus exhibited reversals by including the dishonored and unclean in the center of the map. Devout Jews perceive this as turning the world upside down.
- A different perception of God and of scripture is at the root of the conflict between the Jews and Jesus.

6.0 Jesus: Maker and Guardian of Boundaries
- Jesus created and defended new boundaries for what was “in” and what was “out” of the covenant.

6.1 Jesus Builds Boundaries
- Belief in Jesus became the boundary line.
- Acceptance or rejection of God’s prophets also creates a boundary line, particularly the acceptance or rejection of Jesus as the new prophet like Moses.
- In Luke, there is salvation only in Jesus, which creates a radical boundary line.

6.2 Church vs. Synagogue: Clear Boundaries
Christians separated themselves by not keeping scripturally mandated circumcision, diet and Sabbath observances.

A new map of self-definition arose that separated the church from the synagogue.

6.3 Jesus the Judge: Guardian of Boundaries

Jesus ultimately decides who is in and who is out.

7.0 Conclusion

- 1st c. Judaism perceived “purity” (i.e., sense of order and proper placement) in terms of holiness-as-separation, a concept expressed in creation and seen structurally in the Temple.
- Christians perceived purity not as holiness-as-separation, but valued God’s mercy-as-inclusivity/impartiality.
- This model explains where the conflicts lay for 1st c. people.

11: THE SOCIAL LOCATION OF THE IMPLIED AUTHOR OF LUKE-ACTS

Vernon K. Robbins

1.0 Introduction: Social Location

- The social location of Luke-Acts is important but debated.
- We can place Luke’s ideas within a plausible range of ideas suitable to his context; or, show unlikely ideas for this context.

1.1 Defining Social Location

- “social location” is a better term than “context” because it connotes “a position in a social system which reflects a world-view” (306).

1.2 Social Base of Knowledge

- The social base underlying the social location is distinguished by groups with identifiable boundaries (e.g., gender), or by social processes.
- A social location is a mental, socially produced structure; a social base is the context for interpreting ideas.
- “Social location” is distinct from “group” in that members of the former share similar experiences without belonging to the same organization of the latter.
- A limited range of beliefs can be posited for those who share the same social location.

2.0 Language and Socio-Rhetorical Criticism

- Language is constitutive of social communication and signifies social functions.
- Statements in documents are intratextual in that they presuppose a social arena.
- We must work with a scenario that gives a pre-industrial social context for interpretation.

3.0 A Model of the Social Location of Narrative Discourse

- Social science can give us a conceptual model for a framework of interpretation.

3.1 Social Science Model of Social Location

- Robbins uses a conceptual model to analyze the social location of Luke-Acts through 9 basic arenas of a social system: previous events, natural environment and resources, population structure, technology, socialization and personality, culture, foreign affairs, belief system and ideologies, and political-military-legal system.
3.2 Narrative Discourse Model
- Four intratextual functions of narrative communication include:
  3.2.1 Characters and Audiences: people in the story world who have a socially perceived audience.
  3.2.2 Narrator: Luke-Acts identifies the narrator in Luke 1:1 who tells the story; the narrate, like the narrator, is intratextual.
  3.2.3 Inscribed Author and Inscribed Reader: While the narrator speaks in the 3rd person, the inscribed author speaks in the 1st person. The inscribed reader is Theopholus.
  3.2.4 Implied Author and Implied Reader: The implied author is the overarching consciousness of the text, which includes the “competencies” of all the characters, narrator and inscribed author. The primary goal is to identify the social location of the implied author. The implied reader is the quality of the text marked by the unfolding knowledge of the story.

4.1 Previous Events
- The common social location has a common relation to previous events, e.g., the biblical history and the Jewish-Roman history from the turn of the 1st c. C.E. (but not Greco-Roman history).
- All the events in Luke-Acts from Zechariah on are previous events for its social location. Events about Jesus, John the Baptist, and Jesus’ followers are put in the context of the Jewish-Roman environment.
- Luke-Acts produces previous events in a text: the narrator and characters recount previous events, and the inscribed author refers to previous events from oral and written tradition.

4.2 Natural Environment and Resources
- This concerns the implied author’s view of the geographical space. The primary geographical space is between Jerusalem and Rome, but extends from Ethiopia and Cyrenaica east to Elam and west to Rome; and it includes land and water.
- The major resources on land are ports, cities and towns, and within these are houses. One of the highest values of the implied reader is hospitality.

4.3 Popular Structure
- Luke’s gospel focuses on young people with little space given to the old. In Acts there are no young children.
- Women have prominent roles.
- Ethnic variety stands out in Acts through the gathering in cities, scattering from persecution, and travel.
- The implied author has a mixed population in view, reflecting eastern Mediterranean cosmopolitan cities; however he does not reflect the elite who have access to Gaul, Spain or India, or ethnic groups who do not associate with a mixed population.

4.4 Technology
There is a lack of technology in ancient traditional societies. Any technology is focused in literature, military, and administration, but not in commerce or industry.


The implied author is knowledgeable in writing skills and administrative technology, but he is socially located among artisans rather than the elite.

4.5 Socialization and Personality

- The inscribed author is an insider to the story, communicating accurate knowledge to an inscribed reader.
- The information is a gift aimed upward towards a friend of social rank or a patron who might be expected to reciprocate.
- The social location describes a position in a social system that allows for material and time to write.
- “most excellent Theopholus” indicates a subordinate position.
- Robbins suggests that the inscribed author addresses Theopholus as a subordinate to a person of rank in Roman society; the possibility of addressing an equal or subordinate can be excluded.

4.6 Culture

- Writing is a product of culture, so we can learn something about the culture by examining the reading and writing in Luke-Acts.
- The poetry in Luke 1-2 is in the style of Septuagint Greek. Zechariah can write. The poetic speech is Holy Spirit inspired and an act of oral production.
- All poetic speech after Luke 3 is in the form of a written document with two intratextual arenas: the narrator quotes septuagintal verse, and the characters quote written poetic verse.
- Jesus is located in a reading culture, unlike the characters in Luke 1-2 who are oral performers.
- All major characters in Acts quote Jewish scripture verbatim. Paul also knows Greek poetry (Acts 17:28).
- The implied author has competence in septuagintal Greek poetry, and competence with regard to prologues, defense speeches, sea voyage narratives, historical biography and novelistic monograph. Thus, the implied author has a social location within a Jewish culture that has competencies beyond the Septuagint.
- Robbins contrasts this with the social location of the implied author of the Infancy Gospel of Thomas which depicts Jesus as refusing to learn reading and writing in Greek and who quotes no scripture.
- Paul is trained within Jewish culture, from where his knowledge of Greek poetry comes.
- Conclusion: Since Jesus and followers are educated in reading and writing from within Jewish culture, the implied author is bicultural, grounded in Jewish culture but competent in Greek.

4.7 Foreign Affairs

The Christian community grows as it is constituted by foreigners. Christians are the primary foreigners in Luke-Acts, and the implied author presents the foreign affairs of Christians to those above in the social order to gain acceptance within the affairs of Rome.

4.8 Belief Systems and Ideologies

- The basic ideology of Luke-Acts appears to be the belief that God has ordained a place for the ‘foreign affairs’ of Christianity within the affairs of the Roman Empire (327).
- The implied author demonstrates a change in the purity system of Judaism to show that God has cleansed diverse and mixed people.
- The key ideological verse is Acts 10:15.
- The thought of the implied author sees the foreign and mixed nature of the people of God as a blessing that brings confidence before the Jewish and Roman leaders.

4.9 Political-Military-Legal System

- Luke-Acts is often seen as demonstrating favorable relations between Christianity and Rome.
- Luke-Acts mentions emperors, but we never see them as characters.
- The emperors’ representatives appear as characters, and they are favorable towards Christians though socially distant.; however, centurions are actually members of the Christian community and not socially distant.
- The social location of the implied author is one at home with the political-military-legal system, but one also socially imprisoned (e.g., Paul in Acts 28).

5.0 Conclusion

- Main question: “What can we know about the social location of the thought of the implied author?” (331).
- Goal: To create a model for exploring the social location of the implied author of a document written in Mediterranean society during the Roman Empire, and then apply it to Luke-Acts. Uses model by Carney.
- Robbins summarizes the above results.

12: RITUALS OF STATUS TRANSFORMATION IN LUKE-ACTS: THE CASE OF JESUS THE PROPHET  Mark McVann

0.0 Introduction

- Rituals build and maintain identity, and can bring status change. They are fundamental building-blocks of a culture in that they help to maintain an ordered world and identity within it. Ritual is concerned with boundary lines and conditions for crossing them.

1.0 Ritual and Ceremony Distinguished

- A ritual is an irregular break from routine, presided over by professionals, which function to reverse or transform status.
- A ceremony is a predictable break, presided over by officials, which function to confirm roles and statuses.

2.0 Ritual: Definition and Overview

- Status change can happen up or down the social scale, or from inside to outside; can be voluntary or involuntary.
• Rituals mark important transitional moments in life, and include symbols to help participants understand the way their social group sees the world.
• According to Victor Turner, ritual includes separation from, marginality towards, and reincorporation into society.

2.1 Ritual Elements
  o Initiands: people who experience status transformation
  o Ritual elders: Those who conduct the ritual; they remove old ideas and instill new ones.
  o Ritual symbols (sacra): displayed during the ritual, they teach the initiands how to think and give a standard of reference.

2.2 Ritual Process
  2.2.1 Separation of people, place, and time experienced by initiands.
  2.2.2 Liminality-Communitas: Liminality is the period of separation from the ordinary, in which previous status is lost but new status is not yet attained; Communitas is the human bond formed among initiands undergoing the process.
  2.2.3 Ritual Confrontation: confrontation to test the initiand.
  2.2.4 Aggregation: the return of the initiand to society with a new role, status, rights and obligations that are acknowledged by society because of the ritual.

3.0 The Model Applied: The Prophetic Role of Jesus
• Luke 3:1-4:30 is a ritual transformation in which Jesus goes from the private to the public figure of a prophet of Israel.

  3.1.1 Jesus, the Initiand, and His New Role: This passage functions to tell us when Jesus assumed the role of prophet. John the Baptist is the model of a prophet for Jesus, the initiand.
  3.1.2 John the Baptizer as Ritual Elder: John introduces Jesus to the rite of passage. The stories of John and Jesus are parallel in Luke, to give the model of prophet in John, a pattern followed by Jesus and later by the apostles in Acts.
  3.1.3 Ritual Symbols:
    ▪ Act I (Luke 3:1-22) includes symbols of the prophet, the Jordan River as a cultural boundary, the Spirit and voice from heaven as manifestations of the divine.
    ▪ Act II (Luke 4:1-13) includes the novice prophet, the Devil, the desert setting, the mountain, Temple and scripture. This ritual confrontation demonstrates Jesus’ worthiness to bear the role of prophet, since the Devil represents the opposite of holiness and loyalty to God; each aspect of the setting represents places where Israel encountered God in history.

  3.2.1 Separation: of people, place and time in the separation from society and from Nazareth to the Jordan to the wilderness.
  3.2.2 Liminality-Communitas:
- Act I (Luke 3:1-22) has Jesus in an uncertain status, in which he enters into *communitas* with John and those who seek baptism.
- Act II (Luke 4:1-13) includes liminality as Jesus faces the Devil; he enters into *communitas* with prophetic figures of the tradition.

3.2.3 Ritual Confrontation: Jesus’ Tests: The testing is the narrative defense of Jesus’ role of prophet. The confrontation between Jesus and the Devil is a challenge-riposte. Jesus shows complete fidelity to God characteristic of a prophet, showing that he can function in this new role.

3.2.4 Aggregation: Jesus returns to Galilee in the power of the Spirit, moving from chaos back to order, from follower to leader, from private to public person, and from passive to powerful.

3.2.5 Living in the New Role: Jesus the Prophet: Like a prophet, Jesus heals the sick, casts out demons, preaches the Kingdom of God, shows his prophetic power in his knowledge of hidden things, experiences conflict and rejection, and is set apart from the ordinary.

- McVann suggests other passages to which the scenario of ritual analysis can be applied.

5.0 Conclusion
- Ritual analysis helps the reader not to overlook or misunderstand key elements of the text, helps the reader identify symbolic and function roles of elements in a passage, and helps the reader see the larger canvas of the narrative.
- The application of ritual analysis to this passage helps to place it in the context of a larger concern in the gospel: by what authority does Jesus act?

13: CEREMONIES IN LUKE-ACTS: THE CASE OF MEALS AND TABLE FELLOWSHIP Neyrey

0.0 Introduction
- Ceremony is ritual’s counterpart
- This essay focuses on Jesus’ meals and table fellowship, an overarching concern in Luke-Acts
- Food/meals encode the social patterns of a social system

1.0 Meals as Ceremonies
- Meals are not rituals but ceremonies, because they occur regularly and predictably, they are presided over by officials, and they function to confirm roles and statuses of the group.
- We must ask about the meals: when did they happen and how often, who ate, who presided, and in which institution.
- Meals/ceremonies are not concerned with change, but with stability and continuity.

2.0 Meals and Purity System
- Classification of persons, places and things is evident at meals.

2.1 Map of Persons
- People ate with those with whom they shared values, and this implies a shared world.
The order of who sits where, who eats and how much, who serves and who sits at table at a 1st c. Jewish meal specifies roles.

2.2 Map of Things
- Jews had a code of foods: foods that were unclean, that were necessarily prepared in a certain way; that were declared clean by tithes.
- Certain conversation was appropriate (the mouth as orifice for food and talk)
- Combining talk with food: bread is a common symbol for instruction and wisdom in biblical tradition.

2.3 Map of Places
- The place of the meal and arrangement of person and things was important. Seating arrangements were ranked according to the honor system.

2.4 Map of Times
- Particular times were set apart for ceremonial meals, e.g., Passover and Sabbath
- Neyrey gives the example from a later Jewish text that reflects seating, order of cosmos, hand washing and benedictions.
- In sum: meals mirror a group’s symbolic universe.

3.0 Meals and Body Symbolism
- “The individual physical body replicates the value, structure, and order of the social body” (368).

3.1 Body as Microcosm
- Neyrey builds on studies by Mary Douglas
- Norms that govern the purity of the social body also govern that of the physical body.
- There are concerns with boundaries and surfaces; with entrance and exit.
- A society with high purity concerns will have a map of the body that includes boundaries, structure and margins.

3.2 Bodily Boundaries
- The boundary of the body is skin and clothing.
- The skin has orifices/entry points (eyes, mouth, ears, genitals) and must screen out what does not belong.
- The concern of this essay is with the oral orifice for eating and speaking.

3.3 Bodily Structure
- A society with a hierarchy of social roles will have a hierarchy of bodily functions.

3.4 Bodily Margins
- Things, persons, places and times should be in their right place: the concern is not to have “too much” (e.g., hermaphrodite or effeminate males) or “too little” (e.g., bodies with damaged testicles or other physical deformities).
- At meals there is a concern for what goes in the mouth (food) and what comes out (speech).
- The right hand is the object of washing rituals because it holds the utensils that will enter the mouth.
- There are specific postures at meals.
- Luke 7:44-46 suggests washing guests’ feet, greeting guests with a kiss, and anointing their head with oil at meals.
4.0 Meals and Reciprocity
- Three forms of reciprocity in contracts and exchanges: generalized, balanced and negative.
- Meals and table fellowship were often contracts and exchanges, understood in terms of generalized or balanced reciprocity.
- Generalized reciprocity: for family; focus on the other party without expectation of return (implied, open-ended)
- Balanced reciprocity: for neighbors or trading partners; symmetrical concern for the interests of both parties.
- Negative reciprocity: for outsiders, strangers, enemies; self interest or interest of family or group at the expense of others.

5.0 Meals and Patronage
- Neyrey reviews points from Moxnes’ essay on the nature of patron-client relations.
- Jesus, as a patron, gathers and sustains/maintains his group through meals.

6.0 The Model Applied
6.1 Meals as Ceremonies
- Those who preside over the meals claim a position of leadership (Pharisees, Jesus, apostles) and the status of participants is confirmed.
- The meal strengthens the group identity: commensality equals the solidarity of the group.
- Group fasting also indicates shared values, or distinguishes those who do not hold them by their refusal to fast.

6.2 Meals as Purity Systems
- Luke sometimes affirms and sometimes contrasts/upsets the order pertaining to meals.

6.2.1 The System Confirmed
- The Passover meal in Luke exhibits the principle, “specific group :: specific foods :: specific talk.”
- Map of persons: specific people are present at the Passover meal, who are bonded together. There is a ranking in that Jesus presides, Judas is singled out as not belonging, Peter ranks highest; and the text suggests that only men are present.
- Map of things: Specific foods are eaten, and Jesus engages in specific talk.
- Map of Time and Place: The Passover was eaten at a certain time and in a certain space.
- Three other meals in Luke seem to reflect a symposium form in which the Pharisees preside.

6.2.2 The System Turned Upside Down
- Jesus draws new maps concerning meals.
- New map of persons: Jesus shares table fellowship across lines of status (sinners, foreigners), which reflects the inclusiveness of God’s people.
Some meals in Luke reinforce rank and status (e.g., Luke 17:7-10; Acts 6:1-6).

Many meals in Luke-Acts reverse rank and status (e.g., Luke 12: 35-37). The servant becomes master, and the master becomes servant; one rises higher to go lower, and lower to go higher.

Jesus emphasizes inviting not equals, but those of lower and outside status to meals.

At the Passover, Jesus reverses his own role and puts it forward as an example.

New map of places: Jesus feeds the 5,000 in the chaotic, unclean countryside, with no explicit concern for purity, preparation or who is present.

New map of things: All things are declared clean; food and people are woven together in Acts 10-11, where clean and unclean food symbolizes clean and unclean people.

Christian unity is threatened by issues of table fellowship between Jewish and Gentile Christians. Dietary restrictions are introduced in Acts 15 in order to ensure commensality.

6.3 Meals and Body
- Pharisees sought to practice temple purity through meals in their homes.
- The Pharisees were concerned with orifices (esp. the mouth) and surfaces (dishes), and saw the physical body as a symbol of the social body.
- From the Pharisee’s perspective, Jesus was unconcerned about what enters the mouth, with not washing his hands, and with surfaces and orifices (he ate with sinners).
- Table fellowship concerns of the Pharisees replicate larger social concerns, and affirms their role and status. Jesus turns this upside down by eating anything with anyone at any time.

6.4 Meals and Reciprocity
- Generalized reciprocity: Luke 11:11-12; 14:21; God’s messianic banquet

7.0 Conclusion
- This investigation shows that many models are needed to develop a scenario, and that they replicate each other. In this case, the models are: the symbolic world of Luke; notions of the countryside; land and food production; the institutions of family and politics; patron-client relations; and the honor-shame code.