

PURSuing VERNON ROBBINS' METHODOLOGY ON THE JERICHO ROAD:

A SOCIO-RHETORICAL ANALYSIS OF LUKE 10:25-37

BY

TEDDY KALONGO

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the award of the degree of

Master of Arts in New Testament studies, to the Department of Religious Studies at

the University of Cape Town, under the Supervision of

Associate Professor Charles A. Wanamaker

March 1999

The copyright of this thesis vests in the author. No quotation from it or information derived from it is to be published without full acknowledgement of the source. The thesis is to be used for private study or non-commercial research purposes only.

Published by the University of Cape Town (UCT) in terms of the non-exclusive license granted to UCT by the author.

Abstract

This study analyses the nature and basis of Vernon Robbins' socio-rhetorical criticism and its applicability to Luke 10:25-37. The main purpose of the study is to highlight the usefulness of socio-rhetorical criticism to parabolic interpretation through an assessment of its implications for the analysis of Luke 10:25-37. A comprehensive study of Robbins' approach and its applicability to the parable of the Good Samaritan (10:25-37) is conducted in three parts, in an attempt to derive a more precise understanding of the nature of the approach, and the manner in which Robbins grounds his thought in this interpretative process.

Part I elucidates the theoretical basis of the study and its assumptions. Also included is a discussion of previous major trends in parabolic interpretation. This survey is important because it is not possible to commence a study of a parabolic text without presenting a brief chronological orientation of methodological approaches employed by scholars over the years. This section concludes with a consideration of Robbins' socio-rhetorical criticism as a significant innovation by moving boundaries and calling for dialogue among diverse disciplines.

Part II gives a demonstration of socio-rhetorical criticism as it explores Luke 10:25-37. Using tools of analysis from different disciplines as suggested in socio-rhetorical criticism, this study attempts to detect and emphasise a relationship between various approaches that have been applied to the parable of the Good Samaritan (Luke 10:25-37) in an interdisciplinary manner. In the first section, attention is drawn to the relationship of various segments of Luke 10:25-37 to other texts, culture and history. It has been concluded that Luke set out to write his own version of a story which is not found elsewhere in the Synoptic Gospels, though a possible relationship exists between Luke 10:25-28 and Mark 12:28-34 (parallel Matthew 22:34-40) and parts of the Old Testament. In the second section, the language in Luke 10:25-37 is described covering the frequency of items, characterisation and voices, structure of the passage,

and argumentation. The language employed contrasts the care of the needy and oppressed shown by the Samaritan with the negligence of the leaders of Israel. In the third section, the question of ideology as portrayed in Luke 10:25-37 is discussed in order to understand the political forces, personalities and institutions that shaped the lives and common destiny of the people in the first-century. In the fourth section, Luke 10:25-37 is analysed in the light of eastern Mediterranean cultural values by highlighting the concept of 'hospitality' which is closely related to the social value of 'honour-shame.' It is argued that Luke underscores the honourable position of Jesus as against that of the lawyer and the Temple hierarchy who are depicted as people who possessed great honour but lacked compassion. In the fifth and final section, the concept of the sacred in Luke 10:25-37 is discussed in order to explain the manner in which readers employ texts to convey the relationship between the sacred and the human. Thus, by exploring different methods of reading Luke 10:25-37, this study is concerned with the challenge of developing an integrated, relevant approach towards the understanding of Gospel texts in general and parables in particular.

Part III covers the evaluation of the approach and the conclusions that can be drawn. The issues discussed in the evaluation include a critique of socio-rhetorical analysis in the context of its application to Luke 10:25-37, showing its strengths and weaknesses. On the basis of these findings, it has been concluded that, while some weaknesses may be detected in the approach, on the whole the useful insights it provides may be of great value in the understanding of Gospels in general and parables in particular. A final chapter draws some of the themes together from the three parts in formulating a conclusion.

Dedication

To

MY WIFE

Darling and friend

Emelia Mwanza Kalongo

Contents

Title Page.....	i
Abstract.....	ii
Dedication	iv
Contents	v
List of Tables.....	ix
Abbreviations.....	x
Acknowledgements and preface.....	xi

PART I**ON AIM AND METHOD.....1****Chapter One: Introduction2**

1. Introduction	2
1.1 Methodology and problem analysis.....	2
1.2 Previous scholarship on parables.....	5
1.2.1 Historical eschatological dimensions: Dodd & Jeremias	6
1.2.2.1 Charles Harold Dodd	6
1.2.2.2 Joachim Jeremias.....	9
1.2.3 (Historical) Aesthetic dimensions: Jones	10
1.2.4 Existential dimension of parables: Linnemann and Via	11
1.2.5 Historical-literary dimensions: Crossan	13
1.2.6 Literary cultural dimensions: Bailey	14
1.3 Justification for employing socio-rhetorical criticism to Luke 10:25-37.....	15
1.4 Sources	16
1.5 Limitations to the study	17

1.6	The Plan	18
Chapter Two: Methodology.....		19
2	Introduction.....	19
2.1	The development of socio-rhetorical criticism.....	19
2.1.1	The context for engaging Robbins' socio-rhetorical criticism.....	20
2.1.2	The influence of Wilder on Robbins.....	22
2.1.3	Dissatisfaction with the limitations of historical-critical approach.....	24
2.2	The goals and nature of socio-rhetorical criticism.....	25
2.2.1	The goals of socio-rhetorical criticism.....	26
2.2.2	The nature of socio-rhetorical criticism.....	31
2.2.2.1	Strategy 1: <i>Intertexture</i>	31
2.2.2.2	Strategy 2: <i>Inner texture</i>	34
2.2.2.3	Strategy 3: <i>Ideological texture</i>	39
2.2.2.4	Strategy 4: <i>Social and cultural texture</i>	42
2.2.2.5	Strategy 5: <i>Sacred texture</i>	45
2.3	The implications of socio-rhetorical criticism to the interpretation of parables today.....	48
2.4	Summary.....	49
 PART II		
APPLICATION OF SOCIO-RHETORICAL CRITICISM TO LUKE 10:25-37.....		50
 Chapter Three: A Socio-rhetorical analysis of Luke 10:25-37.....		51
3.	Introduction.....	51
3.1	Intertextualities in Luke 10:25-37.....	53
3.1.1	Introduction.....	53
3.1.2	Interactions of Luke 10:25-37 with both internal & external Biblical	

and non-Biblical data.....	54
3.1.2.1 Relation of Luke 10:25-37 to other Synoptic Gospels.....	55
3.1.2.2 Is Luke 10:25-37 based on Mark 12:28-34?.....	55
3.1.2.3 Literary borrowing.....	59
3.1.2.4 Major differences between Luke 10:25-37 with other Synoptic Gospels.....	60
3.1.3 Why the inclusion of Luke 10:30-35?.....	64
3.1.4 Summary.....	65
3.2 “Inner texture:” Unmasking the inside of Luke 10:25-37.....	67
3.2.1 Introduction.....	67
3.2.2 Frequency of items in Luke 10:25-37.....	68
3.2.3 Voices in Luke 10:25-37.....	71
3.2.4 The Structure of Luke 10:25-37.....	73
3.2.5 Rhetorical argument.....	77
3.2.5.1 The rhetorical genre.....	78
3.2.5.2 The structure of the argument.....	79
3.2.6 Summary.....	83
3.3 Ideological settings that shaped the world of Luke 10:25-37.....	84
3.3.1 Introduction.....	84
3.3.2 The social classes depicted in Luke 10:25-37.....	85
3.3.2.1 Lawyer (Pharisees).....	86
3.3.2.2 Priest and Levites.....	88
3.3.3 Political and religious institutions.....	90
3.3.4 Communities: Jews and Samaritans.....	94
3.3.5 Summary.....	96
3.4 “Social & cultural texture:” Mediterranean concept of hospitality as observed through the cultural value of honour-shame in Luke 10:25-37	97
3.4.1 Introduction.....	97
3.4.2 Understanding Honour-Shame in the Eastern Mediterranean region.....	98

3.4.3	'Hospitality' and Honour-Shame in the Eastern Mediterranean region....	100
3.4.4	Application of the Eastern Mediterranean Concept of hospitality to Luke 10:25-37.....	103
3.4.5	Summary.....	107
3.5	"Sacred texture:" Sacred and profane in Luke 10:25-37.....	109
3.5.1	Introduction.....	109
3.5.2	Understanding sacred and profane.....	109
3.5.3	Jesus and religious Authorities: sacred and profane.....	110
3.5.4	A code of conduct.....	114
3.5.5	Summary.....	117
3.6	Conclusion.....	118
PART III		
EVALUATION AND CONCLUSION.....119		
Chapter Four: Evaluation.....120		
4.	Introduction.....	120
4.1	Achievements of a socio-rhetorical analysis of Luke 10:25-37.....	120
4.2	Limitations of the socio-rhetorical approach	126
4.3	Relevance of socio-rhetorical criticism today.....	127
Chapter Five: Conclusion.....130		
APPENDIX: Letter of permission from Vernon Robbins to employ socio-rhetorical criticism in this study.....135		
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....136		

List of Tables

1. Narrative employment of dialogue between Jesus and the lawyer.....69

2. Structure of Luke 10:25-37.....74

3. The rhetorical structure of Luke 10:25-37.....81

Abbreviations

A.D.	In the year of our Lord since Christ was born
Ant.	Josephus, Antiquities of the Jews
BC	Before Christ
c.	Cognate with
ca.	About
CBQ	Catholic Biblical Quarterly
C.E.	Christian Era
cf.	Compare
co.	Company
ed.	Edited
eds	Editor
e.g.	For example
et. al.	And elsewhere
etc.	Etcetera
f(f)	Following verse(s)
GK	Greek
Heb.	Hebrew
i.e.	That is
INC	Incorporated
ITS	Information and Technology Services (a department of the University of Cape Town)
IVP	Inter-Varsity Press
JBL	Journal of Biblical Literature
Jr	Junior
JTS	Journal of Theological Studies
JW	Josephus, Jewish War of the Jews

Ltd	Limited
LXX	The Septuagint (Greek translation of the Old Testament)
M.A.	Master of Arts degree
n.d.	No date/ No further details
no(s)	Numbers
OT	Old Testament
n.d.	No date
N.J.	New Jersey
NT	New Testament
“Q”	German <i>Quelle</i> meaning source
Rev. ed.	Revised edition
2 nd ed.	Second edition
SCM	Student Christian Movement Press
SPCK	Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge
Trans.	Translation
UCZ	The United Church of Zambia
UNISA	University of South Africa
&	And
vs(s)	Verse(s)
viz.	Videlicet (=namely)
Vol(s)	Volume(s)
WTJ	Westminster Theological Journal

Acknowledgements and Preface

There are a number of people I would like to thank, although I hasten to exempt them from any responsibility of how I have used their stimulus, help or encouragement. For the inspiration to become creatively involved in socio-rhetorical criticism I owe a debt of gratitude to two very special people: Professor Vernon K. Robbins and Associate Professor Charles A. Wanamaker. Professor Robbins is the architect of socio-rhetorical criticism. His lecture at a seminar in the Department of Religious Studies at the University of Cape Town in August 1996 inspired me to adopt his approach for my thesis. I am grateful to him also for the provision of his two 1996 books upon which this study is based. Furthermore, I am indebted to him for his permission to allow me use his methodology for this work (see appendix).

I am thankful for the exemplary scholarship, perceptive criticisms, and gracious friendship of Associate Professor Wanamaker, and for his constructive supervision of this thesis. The hours spent with him in personal consultation over my work contributed substantially not only to the completion of this study but also to the quality of my life. Discussions with him have continued to clarify my thinking. His inspiration had a major impact on me when he ran a course "Studies in Paul" (1996), in which I participated as a student and made a reading of Philippians from a socio-rhetorical perspective. The interdisciplinary nature of this study meant that I needed advice from a number of people in different fields other than that of my supervisor. Among them, Professor Chidester and Dr. Kwenda. Needless to say any errors of substance or style that remain are my own responsibility.

I wish also to acknowledge the financial assistance provided by the Church of Scotland's World Mission. I especially wish to express my appreciation to Rev. James L. Wilkie, the Area Secretary for Sub-Saharan Africa in the World Mission Department of the Church of Scotland, whose encouragement, understanding and support helped me greatly. I am forever grateful for the World Mission Department's generosity in making it possible for my family to join me in Cape Town in the final year of my course. I acknowledge their support with

sincere appreciation. I am grateful to the United Church of Zambia's Theological College for granting me study-leave to pursue this course with the University of Cape Town. All opinions expressed or conclusions arrived at in this thesis are those of the author, and not to be regarded as those of the Church of Scotland's World Mission or the United Church of Zambia's Theological College.

My deepest gratitude is expressed to my spouse, Emelia, for her love and her willingness to give me the space in which to complete my work with joy and confidence. In recognition and appreciation of the caring support, encouragement and love of my wife Emelia, I dedicate this work to her. My children, Teddy Jr and Lambert, also contributed to this work. Precious time spent with them in Cape Town cleared my mind and refreshed my heart. The birth of Lambert in Cape Town in July 1997 brought tremendous joy to us as a family. With special appreciation I recognise my mother and my parents-in-law for the constant interest and encouragement with which they followed the course of this investigation.

The technical production of the thesis owes much to myself as I typed and organised the final copy, as well as battled to type rough drafts from my own excruciating, hand-written pages. I have done all this work myself. Again thanks to the Church of Scotland's World Mission for the provision of a computer, which enabled me to work at home. I wish also to thank the copy Shop in Rondebosch for the bindery of final copies. To Libby Downes for her friendly competence and patience in sorting out the administrative requirements of the University. My appreciation go to Asia A. Brey and Zubaida Z. Hattas for providing a friendly working environment in the Department and assisting with many practical requirements and details that I needed in the preparation of the materials. To ITS, for the assistance to clean most of the defective discs and generally ensuring that it finally got done.

It has been my intent to avoid sexist language, even though such is not always possible in quoted materials. However, it must be understood that the issue of inclusive language was not important at the time of the writings cited were published. In the body of the thesis, however, more inclusive language has been used. My goal has been to make this study accessible to a broad range of persons who study the Gospels (seminary and theological students, clergy and the laity). I hope that this study will stimulate students of the Bible in Robbins' socio-rhetorical approach and provoke deep reflections on the parables once more.

PART I

ON AIM AND METHOD

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

1. INTRODUCTION

Two basic interests have shaped and underline this investigation: (1) I seek to trace the rise of Vernon Robbins' approach, to examine its aims and presuppositions and to consider the implications of such an approach for Biblical scholarship and interpretation; (2) I wish to apply the socio-rhetorical strategies of Robbins to the text of Luke 10:25-37 and to features that were characteristic of the first-century world in which Luke 10:25-37 was written, in order to demonstrate the value of Robbins' approach.

1.1 METHODOLOGY AND PROBLEM ANALYSIS

This investigation has been very much inspired by a comparatively new phenomenon within Biblical scholarship, the socio-rhetorical analysis of New Testament material espoused by Robbins, most recently in his two books: *The Tapestry of Early Christian Discourse* (1996a) and *Exploring the Inner Texture of Texts* (1996b). Yet, interest in the rhetorical analysis of early Christianity is not a recent development. Although Robbins (1996a:2, see also 1994:165-166) talks of a much earlier influence from Amos N. Wilder (1955), Burton Mack (1990:12; see also Gene M. Tucker 1994:viii) attributes new interest in rhetoric to the speech delivered to the Society of Biblical Literature in December 1968 by James Muilenberg. There is a sense in which the address of Muilenberg could have been inspired and influenced by an earlier speech of Wilder to the same society in 1955, and his subsequent book, *Early Christian Rhetoric* (1964). In spite of challenges raised by both Wilder and Muilenburg, it was not until the late 1970s and the early 1980s that interest by New Testament scholars in rhetorical studies began to surface.

The disciplinary orientation of this investigation is socio-rhetorical analysis. It will be seen that the approach adopted in this study differs from previous approaches that have been employed in the analysis of New Testament parables in that it is somewhat broader. A detailed discussion on the methodology is offered in the following chapter (2). The term ‘parable’ (Greek, *parabolē*) is an ambiguous term and is being employed in this study to refer to a form of communication that possesses rhetorical features of argumentation. Dodd (1961:16) defined a ‘parable’ as “a metaphor or simile drawn from nature or common life, arresting the hearer by its vividness or strangeness, and leaving the mind in sufficient doubt about its precise application to tease it into active thought.” This definition highlights various features of the parables of Jesus, bringing to light their metaphorical nature, their portrayal of reality, and their amazing ability to involve the listener and provoke her/his active participation in the story. Bailey and Broek (1992: 111) who submit that “a parable creates meaning by inviting the hearer to participate in that creation” further confirm this. Therefore, the term ‘parable’ is further being used in this study to refer to the comparative sayings and stories attributed to Jesus that engaged everyday phenomena or contexts, which were then compared to the Kingdom of God (for an excellent update on the scholarly understanding of parable since the time of Dodd see Bernard Brandon Scott [1989:8] who identifies parables as a particular type of *mashal*, one that “employs a short narrative fiction to reference a transcendent symbol”). In the Septuagint parable represents the Hebrew *mashal*, which designates a wise saying or a taut song (see also Findlay 1951:2).

A survey of present historical-critical approach in section 1.2 shows that our knowledge of the parables is severely limited because of the failure of these methods, except for a few recent works (e.g., Crossan 1976). Scholars have largely neglected the inclusion of “literary, rhetorical and semiotic modes” (Robbins 1996a:14) in their analysis of the parables (my emphasis). Robbins (1996a:14) has observed that present Biblical methods have for a long time now tended to “reduce New Testament texts to forms of only historic and theological discourse” and worse still, have culminated in disputes and disagreements among Biblical scholars. Since the seminal study of Adolf Jülicher (1910) near the turn of the century, the paradigmatic controversy within parabolic interpretation has been the

main focus of academic debate (Tolbert 1979:18). Jülicher's (1910) two-volume work marked a decisive break with the tyrannical tradition of allegorical interpretation of parables that, with few exceptions, had dominated the scene since the patristic period. According to Scott (1989:43) Jülicher's strategy for blocking allegorical interpretation stems from rejection of its "multiple points" in favour of his "single point" methodology. The assertion by Jülicher that parables are not allegories (1910:148) made a tremendous distinction between parables and allegories. Allegory is sustained metaphor, that is to say, the words used do not refer to their normal meanings, but to something else that they indicate. A.M. Hunter (1960:77-81) provides an adequate review of the allegorical method and its history, which dominated the Church previously but this need not concern us here. Suffice to say that Jülicher is the modern architect of this era of parabolic interpretation, and his book of 1910 was a decisive turning point because he showed the limitations of the allegorical method, though, he too could not offer an alternative (one of the finest books available on the analysis of Jülicher's methodology is provided by Via (1967:2-27).

Throughout this century parable scholars have disagreed on the appropriate strategies for interpreting the parables. Even when scholars employ the same approach to the same parable they often emerge with diverse and conflicting results. One such example is that of Dodd (1961) and Jeremias (1963), who use the same historical method to interpret the parables, but in spite of this fact, the results of their interpretation differ, due to their a priori view of eschatology (Greek, *eschatos* – the term refers to the 'doctrine of the last things'). The failure to reach consensus on the way the text of the parable should be interpreted and understood underscores the importance of discussing and evaluating the previous and current methodological approaches in section 1.2.

The differences of opinion about parable interpretation are such that in the *mêlée* scholars lose sight of the nature of parables. This diversity in the understanding of the parables as recorded in the Gospels inevitably breeds corresponding differences of opinion concerning their nature, purpose and interpretation. One reason for these conflicting interpretations is the lack of attention given to the fundamental issues that the language in

a text raises. What can be said, however, is that the diversity of interpretations of parables, and the fact that various approaches have been applied to the parables, have worked against dialogue among analysts.

Scholars are divided on the interpretation of parables (see also Dodd 1961:13, Kissinger 1979:xii-xiii, Tolbert 1979:15-17), and the problem is how to find an operational strategy that will accommodate analysis of the divergent methods that have characterized parabolic interpretation since the time of Jülicher. This convinces me of the need for an approach that can examine a parable from the perspectives of different methods. Such an approach would lead to an examination of a parabolic text from diverse perspectives. It is the contention of this thesis that Robbins' socio-rhetorical criticism is one strategy that can bring different sets of approaches into dialogue. While I investigate Luke 10:25-37 from a variety of perspectives, it is not my intentions in this study to attempt to solve what are probably insoluble problems in parabolic interpretation. This means that no paradigm is being presented here as providing the only approach to interpret parables, because social-rhetorical criticism is a broad-based interdisciplinary approach. Lukan scholarship on the parable of the Good Samaritan (10:25-37) has been extensive, but to my knowledge very few comprehensive literary studies have been undertaken which seek to incorporate contemporary methods of socio-rhetorical analysis.

1.2 PREVIOUS SCHOLARSHIP ON PARABLES

A brief survey of the paradigm shifts in parabolic interpretation since the time of Dodd would doubtless highlight the developments of the debate so far. In the following paragraphs a few summarising remarks will introduce some of the main previous investigations into parables, giving special attention to the parable of the Good Samaritan (10:25-37). I will underline what these approaches have to say and their limitations. As far as parabolic interpretation is concerned, in the twentieth century the discussion on parables has mainly taken place within four rather radically opposed schools of thought: (1) historical-eschatological (Dodd, Jeremias); (2) [historical] aesthetic (Jones); (3)

historical-existential (Linnemann); (4) existential-aesthetic [historical] (Via) [Bailey 1976:23]. In addition to these four major schools of thought, I have added the following: (5) historical-literary model (Crossan); and (6) literary-cultural model (Bailey). The list of methodological approaches selected is not exhaustive, for the purpose is to identify certain methodological trends in the current debate. The list for the exponents of each method is neither exhaustive nor complete; only the leading exponents are cited in most cases.

1.2.1 Historical-eschatological dimensions (Dodd, Jeremias)

Charles Harold Dodd (1884-1973) and Joachim Jeremias (1900-1980) are the chief proponents of the historical-eschatological approach, which they applied to parables. I will discuss the two separately below.

1.2.1.1 Charles Harold Dodd (1961) provides an extensive analysis of the parables along the lines of a historical-eschatological interpretation. In his analysis, Dodd showed that Jesus taught that the Kingdom of God was already present during his ministry. The term 'eschatology' (Greek *eschatos*) in the theology of Dodd refers to the rule of God present in Jesus himself (Dodd 1961:29-61). According to Dodd (1961:36) the reign of God was inaugurated in the words and actions of Jesus: "Something has happened, which has not happened before, and which means that the sovereign power of God has come into effective operation." Dodd (1961:84-114) endeavored to discover the original setting of the parables in the life and work of Jesus, a contribution that has been greeted with enormous criticism. It must be put on record here that he was the first to pursue a historical-eschatological analysis of the parables. He was comfortable with Jülicher's rejection of allegorical interpretation (Dodd 1961:14). However, Dodd was the first to question the categories introduced by both Jülicher and Bultmann to the parables. For instance, Jülicher (1910:153) classifies parables as falling into three categories. The first is *similitude*, for instance, in Luke 15:3-7 and Matthew 18:12-14. The events in these parables are narrated in the present tense. The second category is the *parable proper*. This type basically takes the form of a story and is told in the past tense as in Luke 15:11-

32. The third category is the *exemplary story* (illustration) that belongs to the third type. Although in the course of Dodd's analysis he ended up distinguishing between parables and similitudes, he nevertheless indicated that the distinction between them was not highly accurate (Dodd 1961:54).

Dodd managed to provide a new perspective on various characteristics of Jesus' parables, highlighting their metaphorical features and their original context or *Sitz im Leben*. He insisted that the parables were uttered in an actual situation in the life of Jesus and where concerned with the situation of conflict that came into being following Jesus' own presence (Dodd 1961:115-130). An important aspect of the contribution of Dodd to parabolic interpretation is his situating them in the proclamation of the Kingdom that was realised in Jesus' ministry: "The inconceivable had happened: history had become the vehicle of the eternal; the absolute was clothed with flesh and blood" (Dodd 1961:147). There is a sense in which Dodd was responding to Johannes Weiss (1971:57-60), Albert Schweitzer (1931:353-358) and others who had introduced the eschatological feature to the parables of Jesus. Schweitzer popularized Weiss' theory of the extreme futurist eschatology, "consequent eschatology" (see also Vermes 1983:37). Both Weiss (1955: 60-90) and Schweitzer (1960:34-55) maintained that Jesus' understanding of the Kingdom was apocalyptic and otherworldly and that its dawn in history was soon to come.

In the years that followed, there was no reason why the interpretation of parables was going to overlook the eschatological nature of Jesus' proclamations as proposed by Weiss and Schweitzer (Breech 1982:1; see also Kissinger 1979:117-118). In his reaction, Dodd (1961:41) coined the term "realised eschatology." According to this position, Jesus taught that the Kingdom and eschatological salvation were realised in his own ministry: "This world has become the scene of a divine drama in which the eternal issues are laid bare. It is the hour of decision. It is realised eschatology" (Dodd 1961:148; for a fuller account of how the early Church's eschatology developed from the teaching of Jesus see J. A. T. Robinson 1957). In order to balance his argument, Dodd (1961:96-105, 122-139) argued that in the event of parables portraying Jesus speaking of a future apocalyptic

Kingdom (for example in the Lord's Prayer – Luke 11:2-4, Matthew 6:9-13, Didache 8), such language should be taken to refer to a realised Kingdom of God. He contends that since Jesus proclaims that the Kingdom of God has already dawned with his own presence, the parables should not be taken to portray a message different from that (Dodd 1961:133). He views parables as "...the natural expression of a mind that sees truth in concrete pictures rather than conceives it in abstraction" (Dodd 1961:16). Therefore two major points sum up his work: (1) reconstruction of the context of the parables historically, and (2) eschatological perspectives of the Kingdom of God in Jesus' proclamations (Dodd 1961:5-9).

Dodd's analysis has merits, but it also has serious weaknesses. It can be argued that he went too far in attempting to put words into the mouth of Jesus that the Kingdom of God proclaimed by him was a realised one and in the process playing down its futurist aspect. For one thing it is somewhat misleading to reduce the entire ministry of Jesus to a single point concept, that is, the Kingdom of God (Westermann 1990:158). As Westermann (1990:158) observes:

This limitation makes it inevitable that the author is particularly interested in what all the parables have in common: they all refer to the crisis which occurred in the ministry of Jesus – even where the later reworking no longer allows us to recognise this.

Moreover, the implications of the conclusion Dodd (1961:146-156) draws in his book, that a parable contains a single point of meaning that he argues was manifest in the entire ministry of Jesus, are misleading because he fails to account for the abundant diversity exhibited in the individual parables of Jesus. However, Dodd will always be remembered as one who laid the foundation of the twentieth century recovery of the historical-eschatological setting to the parables and made a lasting contribution to New Testament scholarship. It is important to indicate that, although Dodd initially did not expect any future apocalyptic event, later he modified this position (Dodd 1950). Dodd's recognition of "realised eschatology" was a necessary reaction to an earlier over-emphasis on "futurist" eschatology.

1.2.1.2 Joachim Jeremias also pursues the parables from a historical perspective thereby continuing the work of Dodd. In stating the problem in Part One of his book, he endeavours to recover the original parable and the situation in which Jesus told it (Jeremias 1972:22). The significance of Jeremias' contribution to the interpretation of parables is the distinction he made between the context in the life of the early Church and the context in the life of Jesus (Jeremias 1947:113f, 1972:23, see also Bailey 1976:17). Through this approach he was able to situate the meaning of the parables in the life of Jesus by employing their Palestinian context (1972:11-12). Jeremias (1972:21) maintains that parables "were mostly concerned with a situation of conflict – with justification, defence, attack, and even challenge. For the most part, though not exclusively, they are weapons of controversy." This is significantly true of the parable, that of the Good Samaritan (10:25-37) under investigation, because it meets most of the observations made by Jeremias. Like Dodd, Jeremias (1947:91) erroneously describes parables as images when in actual fact they are narratives (see also Westermann 1990:159, Bailey & Broek 1992:108). Unlike Dodd's, the attempt by Jeremias to categorise the parables has been applauded because it has helped in the understanding of the types of parables. It has also helped to shed light on the context that the author of a particular Gospel addresses in relating a parable. He does not, however, concur with Dodd on the aspect of "realised eschatology;" instead Jeremias argues for "eschatology that is in the process of realisation" (Jeremias 1972:230). Jeremias (1977:16) attacked Jülicher for overlooking the eschatological feature of the message of Jesus because eschatology to him (Jeremias) was in the process of realisation. He equally attacked Dodd for stressing too much the realised eschatological character of the Kingdom (Jeremias 1977:18). However, at the centre of this whole debate was the subject of the 'historical Jesus.' The term 'historical Jesus' refers to the life and teaching of Jesus as reconstructed by historical methods. What is of great interest here is the fact that both Dodd and Jeremias pursue the same methodology on the parables and come up with conflicting results. Jeremias made a detailed analysis of the language, style and contents of the parables in which he held that it is possible to create the original parable and the situation in which Jesus told it.

1.2.2 (Historical) aesthetic dimensions: Jones

Following the 1960s and the early 1970s there was a new turn in the interpretation of parables. More and more scholars began to move away from Dodd and Jeremias and attacked them for their limited single-sidedness in their attempts to reconstruct the parables historically. They claimed that the approaches of Dodd and Jeremias had also been negligent of the existential and literary aspects of the parables. Jones (1964:167-205) pursued the parables along the lines of the historical-aesthetic approach. The essence of Jones' historical-aesthetic approach was to move out of the bounds of history and introduce a timelessness characteristic to parables as works of art. According to Jones (1964:122, 123) parables are not simply assertions "about how one should behave or how God acts," but they are "independent of time." Jones' (1964:125, 141) major contribution to parabolic interpretation is the realisation that parables address the existence of humanity in relation to God "regardless of the passage of time or the changing environment." In this regard, he called for a broader application of the parables that transcends the historical approach (Jones 1964:165).

Jones's contribution to parabolic interpretation was an important achievement in re-emphasising the fact that parables are not only works of art but possess the potential to be regarded as channels of communication. Jones (1964:x) saw the parable as a literary genre and form of art, culturally embedded in Hebrew art forms. Jones (1964:141-143) categorizes some fifty parables into three groups: (1) those whose relevance is confined to first-century Palestine; (2) those parables which are didactic in nature and were intended to instruct or teach a moral lesson that can be employed outside their original context; and (3) general parables capable of wider application, like the parable of the Prodigal Son (Luke 15:11-32).

Unfortunately, Jones is not helpful here, as his categorisation of parables into three classes is limited. Via (1967:90) offers a good critique of the classification of parables by Jones, arguing that Jones categorises parables in line with what he perceives to be their content instead of their form. Although he lays emphasis on the three-fold

categorisation of parables, his actual delineation of the parables as art form is contradictory [this contradiction is as a result of the fact that Jones (1964:39) does not entirely do away with Dodd and Jeremias, nor does he entirely omit historical dimensions of his parables]. Although his method plays down the historical aspect of parables, historical dimensions of analysis inform Jones' aesthetic approach. He concludes that interpretation of parables is hampered by narrow presuppositions employed by many scholars (Jones 1964:109) as they overlook the fact that parables are works of art not limited to time or history (Jones 1964:123-125).

1.2.3. The existential dimension of parables: Linnemann and Via

Linnemann and Via are the two architects of the recent existential approach to parables. Linnemann (1966) relies heavily on the methodological approach of Jeremias coupled with her own interest in the historical as well as existential perspectives of parables. She has been greatly influenced by Bultmann, Jeremias and Fuchs (Linnemann 1966:xiii). Linnemann submits that the parables of Jesus arose out of conflict situations, and were intended to obtain agreement from the opponents he encountered (1966:23). She argues that the contribution of the narrator of the parable should not overshadow the "ideas, images and evaluations" which were at play in the audience of the parable: "In the parable the verdict of the narrator on the situation in question "interlocks" with that of the listener. Both evaluations of the situations go into the parable" (Linnemann 1966:22f, 27). She further submits that attention must be paid to identifying what the "opposition between the narrator and his listeners consisted of," (Linnemann 1966:22) and the impact that such words had on its audience.

On the other hand, Via criticize both Jones and Linnemann, pointing out their deficiencies. Via (1974:105-133) employs the existential-aesthetic approach to parables, drawing heavily from both Jones's aesthetic and Linnemann's existentialist approaches. His approach diverges from the strictly historical and diachronic approach by demonstrating the literary qualities of some parables. Via (1967:39) views the

hermeneutics of a text as an active process in which its new meaning becomes constituted through the act of interpretation in which the “language of the text becomes an event.” He identifies parables as works of art (1967:76). However, Via (1967:70) views parables not only as works of art but also as aesthetic objects which should not be confused with illustrations. While acknowledging their existential-theological perspective, Via (1967:70) nevertheless views the parables mainly as aesthetic objects. Via (1967:81) observes that the meaning of a parable is implied within itself and also beside itself. Elucidation as to what he means by this expression is afforded in his summary when he points out that: “In this chapter it has been argued that a work of literary art means both in and through itself but that the inner, non-referential meaning is dominant” (Via 1967:86). Via has made use of tools of analysis from literary criticism with his major objective being a literary existential approach. It is on the basis of this model, that Via (1974:x) proposes to interpret the parables. Via was more sensitive to the aesthetic character of parables. What is of interest, however, is the fact that although both Via and Jones apply the same method to the same parable, they emerge with dissentient results as was the case with Jeremias and Dodd, discussed in sub-section 1.2.1.

A further criticism of the historical approach to parables is found in Via’s (1974:ix) major study on the parables in which he observed that the historical approach leaves the parable in the past with absolutely nothing to convey to the current situation; as it overlooks the aesthetic and existential characteristics of the parable (see also prominent scholars who have brought the severely historical paradigm under critique such as Cadbury 1960:118; Käsemann 1964:45; Bornkamm 1960:69). While I agree with Via that we cannot be certain as to what the original situation was, I do not share his view that the historical approach to parables has nothing to offer to the present. This is the reason why he (Via) fails to do justice in his analysis because his aesthetic approach to parables is not informed of the literary forms prevalent in the historical setting in first-century Palestine. I would further argue that parables can be and are recontextualised each time they are read and interpreted.

1.2.4 The historical-literary dimensions: Crossan

Crossan is one of the leading scholars in the area of parables and the historical Jesus in America. One of his major contributions has been the introduction of literary techniques to parabolic interpretation. This was an interdisciplinary approach in which he applied tools from philosophy and poetry to the study of parables (Crossan 1976:30; see also Brown 1976:530). The growing conviction that a Biblical text demands both diachronic and genetic study of its causes and effects as well as synchronic and systematic study of its thematic or generic parallels informs his theory of analysis (Crossan 1979:1). Crossan's approach is clearly a historical-literary analysis of the parables of Jesus. He seeks to reconcile the historical and the literary critical methods which were exclusively set apart by years of parabolic research. Crossan's approach depends heavily on studies into the quest for the historical Jesus, which he regards as coherent and relevant in Gospel analysis (Crossan 1976:46). According to Crossan (1973:xiii), the term "historical Jesus" is employed "to remind us that we have literally no language and parables of Jesus except and insofar as such can be retrieved and reconstructed from within the language of their earliest interpreters."

Crossan (1974:11; see also Brown 1976:531) situates parables in the context of poetic metaphor by using tools from the literary critical techniques of poets like Brooks and Eliot. He appears comfortable with the use of the term "metaphor" to describe parables: "Any good teacher knows the value of metaphor in explaining to a student something which is new to one's experience" (Crossan 1974:11). The purpose of the parables is to metaphorically "present the Kingdom of God as the advent of a radically new world of possibilities, the reversal of ordinary expectations, the call to action that is yet unspecified in detail" (Crossan 1976:53). Crossan (1963) draws a distinction here by maintaining that the term 'parable' refers to a literary genre. He further goes on to indict Bultmann's categorisation of parables into three categories. These are (1) *similitude* (narrated in present tense), (2) *parable proper* (takes form of a story) and (3) *exemplary story* (illustration). Crossan rejects Bultmann's categorisation of certain Lukan parables as exemplary stories (10:29-37, 12:16-21, 16:19-31, 18:9-14; see also Breech 1983:160-161

who identifies the same parables as ‘example parables’ in Luke), and it could be argued that the author reshaped them along the lines of ‘example stories.’ This classification shows particular interest on the part of the author in upholding good moral behavior in the community in line with Christian life through the use of “example stories,” furthermore, this strengthens the suggestion that Luke wrote for a Christian Gentile audience (Breech 1983:160-163). However, the classification of the four Lukan parables mentioned above into “exemplary story” or “parable proper” remains problematic.

1.2.5 Literary cultural dimensions: Bailey

Kenneth E. Bailey (1984) undertook a lengthy examination of the parables in Luke along the lines of what he calls a literary-cultural approach. Through this approach, Bailey has made a contribution to analysing the poetic structures of the parables in the light of the culture that shaped the text. He proceeds on the premise that knowledge of the oriental culture, which shaped the parables, is important for their interpretation. His methodology seeks to get rid of the “foreignness” of the parables because the cultural location of the Church, which was originally Palestine, has changed (1976:27). In order to do this he engages in three distinct tasks. (1) He seeks to analyse the parables within the cultural context of eastern Mediterranean peasants who still inhabit the various areas of the Middle East and who have preserved their culture (Bailey 1976:14-16). The importance of this analysis according to Bailey is to enable the interpreter to understand what the parables mean in their own setting. (2) He also seeks to analyse ancient literature that has relevance to parables (Bailey 1976:56-60). The significance of analysing ancient literature is that it affords the interpreter an opportunity to observe the progression of translation of a text. (3) He seeks to consult surviving ancient versions of the Gospels to illuminate the meaning of parables in their original context (Bailey 1976:80-102).

Bailey has made an important step in the right direction for interpreting parables by stating his two-fold desire to understand the culture as well as the cultural context of the literary structure of the parables. Although his work at the time seemed to have gone

beyond the works of Jülicher, Jeremias, Dodd, Jones and Via, it is important to point out here that the methodology of his investigation does not show how the literary structure and the cultural milieu relate to each other (see Tolbert 1979:22). Bailey's study reflects the limitations of the literary-cultural approach, which is restrictive to a large extent as it overlooks the fact that the peasant first-century culture that informs the parables has not remained intact. Although he has brought significant insights to parabolic interpretation, such as "the discovery of literary types and poetic forms," his analysis is limited by the fact that he has not worked out how those elements relate to each other (see also Tolbert 1979:22).

1.3 JUSTIFICATION FOR EMPLOYING SOCIO-RHETORICAL CRITICISM TO LUKE 10:25-37

Cumulatively, this survey has shown that we lack a comprehensive understanding of the parables. I will show that, of the different Biblical approaches to parables, none stresses more fully the unique attributes of an interdisciplinary approach than the socio-rhetorical analysis. None of the approaches reviewed in section 1.2 above succeeds in clarifying the parable along the lines of socio-rhetorical analysis which integrates the diversity of these approaches (Robbins does not deal directly with parables hence the bias towards parables in this thesis is mine). The statement by Kelley (1971:127) that "each major emphasis has brought a corrective to the situation that was inherited and then has had to be corrected itself" is true of the events that unfold in this survey. Parabolic interpretation has seen many disputes arise with little offered that draws attention to the criteria for settling these disputes. In the course of this history, disputes themselves have become items of controversy on which further research is dependent. Robbins is right to call for an interdisciplinary approach that seeks to integrate conflicting methods into dialogue because more lies in our Biblical differences than is at first apparent (Robbins 1996a:98). In this analysis, I shall not pretend that the very diverse perspectives on parables can be reduced to a fundamental harmony. There are common preoccupations and methods that lend parabolic interpretation a loose working consensus. Despite their

disagreements, one parabolic interpreter can still recognise and talk to another, but the consensus is rudimentary. It is sensible to acknowledge unity in diversity by the way in which I have reviewed the divergences that mark the discipline of parabolic interpretation.

This study does not in any way suggest that the other previous approaches are invalid. More recently, however, the situation has begun to change. There is a greater awareness of the literary form of the parables. Wilder, Muilenberg, Robbins, Burton, Gowler, and others have begun to spell out the ideas and assumptions underlying the different approaches to New Testament material. In particular, Robbins has performed a valuable service to New Testament scholarship in spelling out both the normative and explanatory theories embedded in his socio-rhetorical approach (Robbins 1994, 1996a, 1996b etc.). As I argue in this study, this particular approach, in terms of its prescriptive strategies and integrated nature, has great potential for the discipline of New Testament in general, and parables in particular. At the very least, these strategies offer a terrain that is relevant to the interpretation of parables and can be explored systematically to uncover new insights in the parables today.

1.4 SOURCES

This study has drawn on a variety of materials. In addition to the literature that has already been cited, certain other works have provided important background information for the theme of this study. These have been cited in the thesis and listed in the bibliography at the end. It is however, upon Robbins' materials that this study rests heavily. I shall express a personal view on matters that he raises, yet my study will remain very much within Robbins' perspective, with my basic assumption being rooted towards an investigation of the parable of the Good Samaritan in Luke (10:25-37). Although the parable does not occur in any other Gospel, reference will be made to the other Synoptic Gospels and Pauline literature. These writings are undoubtedly the most informative concerning the text under discussion. This study will not only confine itself

to the Gospels in their final form, but will seek to investigate the traditions, which are earlier than the written texts.

1.5 LIMITATIONS TO THE STUDY

In pursuit of such an interest one has to face limitations. This study has been confined to the parable of the Good Samaritan contained in the Gospel of Luke (10:25-37). What this means is that I deal only with one small portion of the New Testament. The inclusion of other material from the Synoptic Gospels as well would have been of great interest. But in order to keep the present study within a reasonable limit, I have had to refrain from doing so. This parable is only found in the Gospel according to Luke, but I am aware that the narratives contained in this Gospel, like other Gospel narratives, were composed from a larger body of oral material. It is recognised, however, that material from oral sources can be unreliable.

This work is a study of both the narrative context (10:25-29, 36, 37) and the parable (10:30-35) because I must examine the Lukan setting that is provided to the parable in order for me to generate the Lukan worldview. Luke places the parable of the Good Samaritan within the framework of a dialogue between Jesus and an expert in the Jewish law (Luke 10:25-37). Contrary to the views held by Bultmann (1968:178; see also Evans 1990:468 who argues that the Lukan presentation is muddled) that the context provided by Luke lacks natural quality, I find the Lukan setting of controversy a literary unit. Although Evans (1990:33) talks of inconsistencies between Luke 10:29 and 36, it is the submission of this thesis that the corresponding nature of verses 29 and 36 is valid on grammatical grounds (for a detailed analysis of the consistency in grammar of verses 29 and 36 see Young 1992:62). Therefore, throughout the discussion in this thesis, I will refer to the unit Luke 10:25-37 as the parable of the Good Samaritan.

1.6 THE PLAN

This study comprises three major parts. The three parts each have a different focus but are not mutually exclusive; often argumentation in one section has relevance for others. Part I covers the introduction to and methodology of this study. In Chapter Two, I outline and analyse the methodology of socio-rhetorical criticism by tracing its origins, examining its aims and presuppositions. Part II applies the methodology of socio-rhetorical criticism to Luke 10:25-37 in an attempt to indicate how it may be applied to New Testament exegesis. I will also observe the methods in use and kinds of results obtained in this interdisciplinary approach. Part III, which is the final section, has two chapters and covers the evaluations and conclusions drawn from the study.

CHAPTER TWO

Methodology: Principles underlying Socio-rhetorical Criticism for Analysing Luke 10:25-37

2. INTRODUCTION

The aim of this chapter is three-fold: (1) to trace the rise of Robbins' approach, socio-rhetorical criticism; (2) to outline and examine the aims, nature and presuppositions of the approach; and (3) lastly, to consider the implications of such an approach to the interpretation of parables with particular reference to the parable of the Good Samaritan (Luke 10:25-37). Clearly, to attempt such a task within the confines of a single chapter means that often I may do little more than outline analytical perspectives or make an important point briefly without fuller discussion or documentation (for a complete discussion on socio-rhetorical criticism see Robbins 1984, 1994, 1996a, 1996b, etc.).

I am convinced that a thorough analysis of New Testament material in general and parables in particular requires an integrated approach that shows the use of different methods in practice. For pragmatic reasons, I argue that socio-rhetorical criticism seems to offer a practical solution of including material from widely alternative interpretations that use different sets of questions and different strategies for interpreting the text. While I investigate Luke 10:25-37 from a variety of perspectives, it is not my intention in this study to claim to solve problems in parabolic interpretation, but this, in my view, is the right direction for finding solutions.

2.1 THE DEVELOPMENT OF SOCIO-RHETORICAL CRITICISM

The purpose of this section will be to try to give Robbins' personal as well as his professional account of his motivation towards this approach, describing briefly its historical development. David B. Gowler (1994: xv-xvi) has earlier attempted to provide a description of the development of socio-rhetorical criticism, which he claims, has been done from his own (Gowler's) ideological perspective. In compiling and editing ten articles by Robbins,

Gowler (1994:1-4) chronicled the progression and maturation of socio-rhetorical criticism, which he traced back to 1975 when Robbins undertook a study of the “we-passages” in Acts. The significance of this study was the disclosure that “a well-known social convention could greatly influence the rhetoric of a literary narrative” (Gowler 1994:3). However, three factors have contributed significantly to the development of Robbins’ socio-rhetorical approach. These are his own context coupled with his many years of working as Professor of New Testament in the Department of Religion and his interaction with colleagues in the Department of Classics at Emory University, the influence of Amos Wilder, and dissatisfaction with the limitations of the historical approach. I will take each of these in turn. Such an overview of Robbins’ background can usefully serve to provide a foundation for understanding the role-played by these influences and dynamics in shaping his socio-rhetorical approach to texts.

2.1.1 The context for engaging Robbins’ socio-rhetorical criticism

In both of his books, *The Tapestry of Early Christian Discourse* (1996a), and *Exploring the Texture of Texts* (1996b); Robbins does what I perceive every Biblical scholar and interpreter should do at some point in the course of his/her development, namely, give an account of his/her cultural and social background and the prime influences which have moulded his/her thought. The significance of tracing such background information is to provide insights into the kind of ideological orientation that informs the interpreter and its implications for his/her analysis of a Biblical text. Demarest (1988:295) rightly argues that “the aim of the interpreter is to re-discover the ‘you’ in ‘me’... the life experience of the interpreter provides a point of contact, or of pre-understanding; with which to approach a text.” The point Demarest is advancing agrees well with Robbins (1996a:24-27, 1996b:95-99) when he challenges every interpreter, including himself, to interrogate their individual ideologies and evaluate himself/herself as to how those ideologies shape their interpretations. Fiorenza (1988:5) observes that the context of an interpreter is a major factor that shapes the way in which he/she “sees the world, constructs reality or interprets Biblical texts.” Going by this assertion, I would say that the underlying personal ideologies to a large extent shape the understanding the interpreter makes of New Testament material. Therefore, the autobiography provided in Robbins’ two 1996 books is intended to explain why and in what way Robbins has proposed socio-rhetorical criticism as an interdisciplinary approach to New

Testament studies, and how Christian thought should grapple with the particular challenges it represents.

Although reasons are always difficult to find when it comes to explaining academic trends in a scholar, Robbins (1996a:24-27, 1996b:95-99) claims that socio-rhetorical criticism, stems from his own personal and professional life. As Demarest (1988:296) put it, “understanding is never value-free, for both author and interpreter are historical persons whose horizons are shaped by their place in history.” According to Demarest’s assertion, readers and interpreters bring to influence upon the text their own different experiences, and these begin to have a cumulative effect.

Robbins (1996a:24-26, 1996b:96-99), was born and raised on a farm in Nebraska, without electricity, newspapers, radio and television; he has ended up in a city as a Professor of New Testament studies at Emory University, Atlanta, in the United States of America. His studies in the Jewishness of the New Testament, contemporary literary theory, rhetoric, philosophy and English literature (Robbins 1984:xiii, 1994:4) have greatly influenced the development of his theories of socio-rhetorical criticism, particularly one of his strategies that he calls ‘ideological texture.’ Robbins (1996b:98) says “I have become more and more conscious of the multicultural nature of my existence, and this experience of multiple social and cultural locations has influenced the manner in which I interpret texts.” It is clear from this assertion that the approach he is proposing is a result of his multiple locations in society coupled with its diverse culture. He also notes that he is of Christian evangelical background (Robbins 1996b:96).

Further he goes on to establish the fact that he underwent a crisis in his search for a methodological approach to New Testament interpretation as he observes: “I sought new methods, and with them came new boundaries” (Robbins 1994:xi). Robbins (1994:xi) states that the discipline of New Testament study has a “prestigious heritage,” he claims he was inducted into the system with its “boundaries” already set by the discipline itself. Referring to the crisis in New Testament study, he observes that “boundaries” are “being built,

protected, and assaulted,” and he claims that this has come about because of “a thriving discipline of research and productivity” (Robbins 1994:xi). Obviously this is a positive development in Biblical scholarship because research is an enabling process in Biblical studies, and is one that is being stressed more today than ever before. For instance, Biblical scholars studying parables are recognising the need for adequate answers to numerous questions that characterise parabolic interpretation, which can only be attained through research. Robbins (1996a:96-99) reads Biblical texts against a background of the diverse American society and with a sense of the variety of thought and expression that he encounters in Biblical scholarship today. This agrees well with Ingrid Rosa Kitzberger’s (1994:192) observation that whenever she encounters Biblical texts she brings to them her own already inscribed text, comprising her own “socialisation and history, as well as everyday experience....” This reality has helped Robbins to apply a wide range of techniques and tools of analysis derived from diverse disciplines to Biblical texts. Methodologically, Robbins’ socio-rhetorical criticism suggests an interaction between various methods; that is combining social-scientific and literary-criticism approaches to read New Testament material (Robbins 1996a:1-3, 1996b:1-2). He rejects the notion of one correct single method in which the New Testament can be read.

2.1.2 The influence of Wilder on Robbins

In his address to the Society of Biblical Literature in 1955, Amos Wilder raised several issues for Biblical interpreters which Robbins (1996a:2) terms the “embryonic form” of his approach. Three major points were raised in the address of Wilder (1956:1-3, see also Robbins 1996a:2): (1) the nature of religious symbol and symbolic discourse, (2) New Testament eschatology, and (3) employment of anthropology and folklore to interpret Biblical materials. In the vision of Wilder (1956:25), he saw that the integration of approaches such as rhetorical, literary, and linguistics would help to do justice to the interpretation of early Christian texts. He called on Biblical scholars and interpreters to engage these approaches because of the value he saw in language and communication as an interaction that involved all phenomena: “how primal an activity speech is in the human being, and how deeply linked it is with all that identifies our very being and ‘world’” (Wilder 1982:122). This shift to rhetoric influenced Robbins (1996a:2, 77-89, 1996b:1) to view

language as persuasive, and this has helped him to re-discover how the theory of and practice of Greco-Roman rhetoric has influenced the material now in the New Testament.

Wilder's challenge sparked off considerable research into the inner nature of New Testament texts with diverse results. This call by Wilder (1955) for a change from disciplinary to interdisciplinary approach in the analysis of Biblical materials is one that has had tremendous impact on Robbins to develop his interdisciplinary approach. Subsequently, the work of Wilder, *Early Christian Rhetoric* (1964), raised significant landmark points which underlie most Biblical interpretation in general and socio-rhetorical criticism in particular (for a good introduction to classical rhetoric see James Muilenburg 1969, George A. Kennedy 1984; Mack L. Burton and Vernon K. Robbins 1989, Mack L. Burton 1990). Wilder (1964:34, see also Robbins 1996a:7) discussed the phenomenon of language, including speech, communication and rhetoric, in early Christianity. Of greater significance in this study was his analysis of "genres" such as dialogue and story, parable and poem, in Biblical literature which set the stage for future research. The impact of these studies on Robbins stimulated his interest in style and textual structure of Biblical texts such as is demonstrated in Robbins' inner *texture* method, which subsequently led to his publication of *Jesus the Teacher* (1984). Although Wilder's interest is confined only to the rhetorical aspect of the analysis of Biblical data, I am justified in indicating that this had played a major role in shaping the rhetorical aspect of socio-rhetorical criticism in the form we have it now. In fact, Robbins (1996a:2) himself confirms this when he admits to being influenced by Wilder.

One major contribution of rhetorical studies, according to Robbins, is the insights provided about the rhetorical patterns practised in the Hellenistic environment in which the Gospels and Acts were written. The significance lies in the focus on the rhetorical argument that distinguishes a major argument by providing reasons and supporting proof (Robbins 1996a: 239; see also Kennedy 1984:29f). The importance of rhetorical analysis is that it informs the interpreter of the function a particular saying plays in the argument contained in a given text. Robbins (1984:201-206) outlines a very interesting pattern of argumentation in the Gospel according to Mark. This study, *Jesus the Teacher* (1984), is of tremendous importance to New Testament analysis because it traces parallels between the Jewish and the Greco-Roman

world in the first-century by suggesting an integration of “religious traditions, folklore, and ethical pronouncements” in respect of the “religio-ethical teachers” (Robbins 1984:201-206). This study (Robbins 1984, reference here must also be made of his later works in which his approach has been developed even further – such as 1994, 1996a, 1996b, etc.) shows how Wilder influenced the development of Robbins’ theories of socio-rhetorical criticism.

2.1.3 Dissatisfaction with the limitations of the historical approach

As expounded in his own work, socio-rhetorical criticism is best understood as arising out of Robbins’ (1996a:1-2, 13-14) dissatisfaction with the limitations of the historical approach in the analysis of New Testament material. The move towards historical critical study of the Gospels nonetheless produced a diversity of and often conflicting approaches “which overemphasise a single dimension of a Biblical text” (Robbins 1996a:14). Biblical methods have multiplied in the present century and have become more critical, pluriform and diverse. In contrast, Robbins (1996a:2-17, 1996b:1-4) argues that it is advantageous to integrate methods of reading a text by stimulating an interaction between different approaches. According to Robbins (1996a:1), Biblical materials should be analysed in the light of socio-rhetorical criticism that highlights the “literary, social, cultural, and ideological” dimensions of a given text.

Robbins’ (1984, 1994, 1996a, 1996b, etc.) work indicates the range and depth of the exegetical, classical, and philosophical abilities he brings to New Testament interpretation. Specifically, this potential can be considered through the suggestion that he makes to other scholars pursuing historical enquiries that they should not close doors to tools of analysis from other disciplines (Robbins 1984:xii, Robbins 1996a:40-43). He argues that we can never adequately appreciate the meaning of Biblical texts without the realisation that our world-view is made up of relational structure of the reality of things to each other (Robbins 1996a:18-24, 1996:4, 132) – and that Biblical approaches are not an exception. In this regard, an appreciation of the complex relationship is involved in the whole interpretative endeavour because:

....written discourse is a highly interactive and complex environment. Interpreting a biblical text is an act of entering a world where body and mind, interacting with one another, create and evoke highly complex patterns and configurations of meanings in historical, social, cultural and ideological contexts of religious beliefs (Robbins, 1996a:14).

Robbins' work attempts to go beyond the exclusive theorising of the historical approach and he invites his fellow scholars to be aware of the abundant reality of meaning that lies behind Biblical materials of such magnitude. Through this, Robbins' major contribution could be seen to be a call for an interdisciplinary analysis of the New Testament material (Robbins 1996a:13-17). He maintains that in order to understand the crisis in Biblical interpretation adequately and to contribute to its solution, it is necessary to understand the wider context of a text by not only opening dialogue between interpreters but also with other ancient narratives (Robbins 1992:10-23; 1996a:159-158). Robbins has continued to develop his socio-rhetorical criticism along the lines of an interdisciplinary approach of reading texts. Insights that can feed Biblical interpretation, Robbins (1996a:2-17, 1996b:1-4) argues, may come from a variety of sources, such as the social sciences and linguistics. Biblical scholars and interpreters must be aware of the diversity of sources that they can use in interpreting Biblical texts. Although the contributions of historical enquiries are able to acquaint New Testament scholars with the historical materials outside the New Testament, nonetheless they remain restrictive and limited; hence the need to "move boundaries" (Robbins 1996a:67).

In this sub-section I have discussed the factors that gave rise to Robbins' socio-rhetorical criticism whose influence and dynamics shape the development of his approach. The realities of his own context coupled with his interaction with the Department of Classics, influence from Wilder, and dissatisfaction with the historical approach motivated him towards an interdisciplinary analysis of a text. I shall now continue by discussing the goals and nature of socio-rhetorical criticism.

2.2 THE GOALS AND NATURE OF SOCIO-RHETORICAL CRITICISM

Comprehension of the nature and goals of socio-rhetorical criticism is crucial for understanding the approach. An important feature of socio-rhetorical criticism is its interdisciplinary nature in which multiple methods of interpretation are employed in a

pragmatic manner to investigate early Christianity (Robbins 1996a:1, 3, 13, 1996b:2). Before I discuss its goals and nature, it is necessary to provide a formal definition of socio-rhetorical criticism. I must therefore clarify the hyphenated configuration, “socio-rhetorical criticism” – the methodological approach being employed in this study.

The three components of this configuration are closely related and cannot be separated. Nevertheless they may be distinguished as follows. The prefix “socio” indicates that it is primarily concerned with utilising the tools and resources of anthropological and sociological methods for understanding a text, as they allow the reader to reconstruct the political, religious, economic, and social features reflecting individuals and how they are grouped (Robbins 1996b:1). The specific emphasis of “rhetorical” in this configuration is related to the manner in which language functions as a mode of communication when individuals and groups interact (Robbins 1996b:1). In ancient Greece, the term “rhetoric” signified the “art” of discourse, written as well as oral, that in due course became a complex system of communication (Burke 1931:49-55; see also Ernst Robert Curtius 1953:62-72). According to Robbins’ (1984:6) description, socio-rhetorical analysis “emphasises the wide range of strategies, both overt and covert, that constitute persuasive communication.” He introduces the hyphenated configuration ‘socio-rhetorical’ to indicate how “a well-known social environment in the culture could play a key role in the rhetoric of a literary narrative” (Robbins 1994:3). The term ‘criticism’ simply refers to a critical analysis and evaluation of a text, written or oral. Therefore, socio-rhetorical criticism is a study of New Testament material, which is inherently based upon the concept of interdisciplinary. By interdisciplinary I mean the bringing together of two or more separate tools of analysis from different disciplines for a concerted investigation of a text. In the course of the discussion, this approach will be clarified where necessary, but it will be self-explanatory most of the time.

2.2.1 The goals of socio-rhetorical criticism

There are three goals underlying socio-rhetorical criticism. Each of them has a direct bearing on the interpretation of a text in general and the parable of the Good Samaritan (Luke 10:25-37) in particular. The following are the goals of socio-rhetorical criticism. (1) As its name

suggests, socio-rhetorical criticism seeks to bridge the gap between diverse approaches in New Testament analysis with socio-linguistic, sociological and anthropological studies (Robbins 1984:13, 1996a:11-17, 1996b:1-2). (2) The approach seeks to encourage dialogue among interpreters (Robbins 1984:5, 1994:1-3, 35, 1996a:3, 9, 42). (3) It is concerned with discovering the cultural influences of ancient society and texts upon the New Testament material (Robbins 1994:34). I will briefly elaborate on each of these below.

First, socio-rhetorical criticism seeks to bridge the gap between traditional exegetical methods and those of other disciplines, as it is by nature based upon the concept of the interdisciplinary approach. As an interdisciplinary approach, its goal “is to bring practices of interpretation together that are often separated from one another” and “to integrate skills people use in ordinary life with exploration of the intricacies of language in a text” (Robbins 1996b:2). As such it can count as an integrative approach which seeks to merge diverse distinct approaches in their own right in order to achieve rich insights from many dimensions of reading a text, while at the same time providing for a centralising synthesis of these independent perspectives (Robbins 1996a:45, 1996b:26).

To study parabolic texts, using a range of methods can yield the best results that an interpreter would have otherwise missed had he/she confined himself/herself to one approach. In this way, socio-rhetorical criticism brings methods of diverse fields of interpretation into interaction with one another in Biblical analysis (Robbins 1996a:1-3, 13 and 14). Of crucial importance in this analysis is the attention given to the nature of language, meaning, communication, and understanding of a text (1996b:1-2, 7-36). Robbins (1996a:9, 1996b:1-2) perceives the role of language in social interaction as complex and a creative process that requires the interpreter to enter into a dialogical relationship with other diverse disciplines. This is so because language is a product of society while at the same time it is seen as creating attitudes or values within a particular society (Malina 1981:1, 5, see also Vorster 1988:104-110). Interpreters and scholars of parables today should avoid confining themselves to traditional disciplinary analysis. In my view, socio-rhetorical criticism is a more creative Biblical tool of analysis because it allows for a proper treatment of the complexity of a text.

Commenting on the achievements of this approach as opposed to other limited approaches, Robbins (1996a:41) observes that “the difference is the range of insight brought to the conclusions the interpreter draws.” This yields valuable contributions, full of insight from different perspectives of understanding the Biblical exegesis of a parabolic text (my emphasis). This approach (socio-rhetorical criticism) focuses on the manner in which things relate to each other in written texts (Robbins 1996a:38). This goal is realised through the employment of other Biblical and contemporary methods in their own right: “various disciplines engage in conversation with one another on equal terms, rather than dismiss one another through their power structures” (Robbins 1996a: 41). Through this procedure, socio-rhetorical criticism achieves more than traditional Biblical criticism and opens new avenues of interpretation.

Robbins (1994:xii) argues that his “goal is to create an environment where people’s boundaries can be respected for what they are.” But he warns that “accepting only one person’s boundaries creates a form of tyranny; accepting multiple boundaries is an admission that we humans are created by God in diverse forms for diverse purposes” (Robbins 1994:xii). Therefore, Robbins is calling for the re-opening of genuine discussion between interpreters to bring together phenomena from literary, rhetorical, historical, social, cultural, ideological, and theological findings to Biblical texts (Robbins 1996a:3-17, 1996b:1-4). The importance of this interdisciplinary approach is that it introduces very interesting tools for use in the analysis of the New Testament materials. Socio-rhetorical criticism incorporates accomplishments of past scholarship and will continue to depend not only on older historical-critical method but also on social science approaches.

There are, however, two objections to the employment of social sciences in New Testament analysis. (1) The social sciences are reductionist, since they claim to give all the answers to New Testament material while at the same time overlooking the religious aspect of it. Emile Durkheim (1964), one of the architects of reductionist criticism, argued those social science models could explain religion in its totality. (2) The dependence of social sciences on contemporary cultural models makes them have no relevance for analysing first-century texts. One of the proponents of this view was E. A. Judge (1980:201-217) whose work was further

championed by W.A. Meeks (1983). This situation has changed today as most sociologists have realised that this kind of analysis can only explain one aspect of the phenomena. Malina (1982:237) making a defence and description of the application of the social sciences had this to say of such disciplines as methods that seek to:

...explain sets of data – and not models – from the perspectives of biology, sociology, political science, economics, and the like is not reductionistic. Rather such varied explanations pushed to their limit simply reveal how much can be known and explained by using a given model. The data set, the range of information remains intact.

Following this assertion by Malina, Robbins (1996a, 1996b) is justified in engaging socio-linguistic and anthropological models in the analysis of New Testament materials as these models shed more light on the context in which Biblical texts were written. I hope to show through my analysis of Luke 10:25-37 in Chapter Three how useful these models are as they illuminate the contents of a text. Further, the justification for the use of these models, as has been pointed out before in this study (see sub-section 2.1.3), is the inadequacy of the traditional historical-critical approach to engage concepts and dimensions from the social sciences in order to deal adequately with New Testament material.

Second, another goal of Robbins' socio-rhetorical criticism is his call for dialogue between interpreters, which is the means by which interpreters will be able to extend and improve their analysis of New Testament data (Robbins 1996a:3, 9). As a procedure, discussion is a technique that can bring together even the most conflicting interpreters. Robbins (1994:xi) seeks to attain a situation in New Testament analysis where barriers are removed and information flows from one interpreter to another. Socio-rhetorical criticism has awakened awareness among interpreters of Biblical texts of the necessity to respect the other person, listen carefully to them, and struggle to understand them because there can be no dialogue without respect. Gowler (1994:35) correctly noted that Robbins "seeks to encourage a more open discussion among those who presently push for more limited agendas" (an attempt among some interpreters to close doors to new ideas). Socio-rhetorical criticism attempts to remove walls that divide interpreters by encouraging interpreters of diverse "specialised" results to enter "into active dialogue with one another" (Robbins 1996a:41).

Setting disciplines into discussion with one another is not at all intended “to attain agreement among interpreters” but to “nurture co-operation in the gathering, analyzing and interpretation of data even among people who disagree with one another” (Robbins 1996a:2). What Robbins envisions is a situation whereby instead of interpreters destructively criticizing each other, they will co-operate in the light of the evidence to gain further insight into a text. I agree with Gowler (1994:1) that “dialogue is mandatory, because the texts themselves are dialogues, and the readers’ imaginations and understandings should adapt to that reality.” However, it would take time for some interpreters and scholars to come out of hiding in their particular corners because they are frightened of the interdisciplinary character of socio-rhetorical criticism which they suspect may undermine their control over the study of the New Testament from their particular ideological dimension. Nevertheless, embodied in Robbins’ approach are acceptance and tolerance of one another and a commitment to use our differences to broaden the scope of interpretation. Demarest (1988:296) observes that “all interpretation is open to correction and revision should ... promote greater tolerance between persons.” Nevertheless, how should interpreters resolve the tensions and differences that will come out in the process of carrying out this approach? Robbins (1996a:35) has made a very interesting suggestion that “tensions and conflict will be the data-base for analysis and interpretation.”

Third, socio-rhetorical criticism challenges interpreters to broaden the scope of their analysis of Biblical data by including materials from the eastern Mediterranean region in which early Christians lived. In this way it “seeks to establish links between texts and the cultures that helped to produce them, as well as cultures that seek to interpret them” (Robbins 1994:2). The availability of this data enables interpreters to broaden their area of social and cultural analysis by paying greater attention to “customs, behaviours, and attitudes of people in eastern Mediterranean society, and widening the ideological boundaries beyond a culture of the mind” (Robbins 1992:102). Indeed the ancient Near East has much data that relates to Biblical texts. Therefore, there is need in Biblical interpretation today to go beyond the limits of the traditional historical-critical method and analyse New Testament data within the context of the eastern Mediterranean culture because it is the context in which the early Christians lived and the New Testament texts were originally proclaimed (Robbins 1994:2, 34, 102).

In closing this sub-section, I agree with Gowler (1994:35) when he concludes that:

...we need to enlarge our boundaries of discussion. Therefore, interpreters also should continue to explore our ancient narratives both Jewish and Greco-Roman, in order to learn more about first-century literary and cultural conventions, similarities and dissimilarities.

2.2.2 The nature of socio-rhetorical criticism: Strategies employed

This section discusses strategies that Robbins (1996a, 1996b, etc.) employs in his socio-rhetorical approach. Broadly speaking, Robbins (1996a) outlines four strategies of socio-rhetorical criticism with varying degrees of overlap, correspondence, and dependence among them: (1) *intertexture*, (2) *inner texture*, (3) *ideological texture* (4) *social and cultural texture* (I am using Robbins' terminology which is italicized throughout this thesis but the order is mine). However, in his other book published the same year, he introduces a fifth category, the *sacred texture* that explores the religious dimensions of the text (Robbins 1996b:120-131). In the following chapter, I apply and demonstrate the value of these strategies for the analysis of Luke 10:25-37 but before doing so, I will explain briefly each strategy in the sub-section which follows, highlighting how they function, what they are intended to achieve, and why this is significant for New Testament analysis in general and parables in particular.

2.2.2.1 Strategy 1: *Intertexture*

The first strategy of socio-rhetorical criticism that Robbins introduces is intertextuality. As the name implies, intertextual analysis is based on the premise that texts are never free of all the other meaning that surrounds them, because no text can be said to be independent of other texts. Robbins (1996a:96) argues that "intertexture concerns the relation of data in the text to various kinds of phenomena outside the text." Therefore, this implies that all writing is intertextual and through this analysis, an interpreter enquires into the way in which language in a given text interacts with outside phenomena. However, "while analysis of the intertexture of a text requires an exploration of other texts, the object of the analysis is, nevertheless, to interpret aspects internal to the text" (Robbins 1996a:96). The task of the interpreter in this analysis is to listen and observe the evidence for comparisons with other texts. He describes *intertexture* as the relation of texts to other texts be they oral, written, cultural, social, or historical (Robbins 1996a:96). Robbins (1996a:96-143, 1996b:70) breaks

down *intertexture* into four components: copying, cultural comparisons, social comparisons, and historical comparisons. An adequate analysis of a text using these intertextual components illuminates materials contained in a given text borrowed from other sources. This method enables an interpreter to “address the myriad of ways a text participates in networks of communication that reverberate throughout the world” (Robbins 1996a:97).

The first area of intertextual analysis concerns the copying of oral and written materials, what Robbins (1996a:97-108, 1996b:40-58) calls *oral-scribal intertexture*. This is a method in which a text employs language from another text implicitly or explicitly. Robbins (1996a:96-143) identifies five categories in which a text achieves this. Firstly, a text may employ language from another text through *recitation*. *Recitation* may take the form of reported speech in an exact verbatim form or reproduction of an incident which occurs in another text without necessarily reproducing the words verbatim (Robbins 1996b:41). A second aspect of copying oral and written materials takes the form of using materials from an earlier narration or speech in the process applying it to a new context without acknowledging the source (1996b:41-42). Thirdly, another dimension is the one in which an author narrates an earlier event as though it was a new one. In this way, the event is seen as possessing greater importance as compared to that of an earlier event. The fourth aspect is the procedure by which an author puts words into the mouth of a character he/she designs thereby making the new character recite them as if they were his or her own. The final aspect of copying oral and written material is what Robbins (1996b:52-58) terms as *thematic elaboration*. *Thematic elaboration*, drawn from the Greco-Roman usage of rhetoric, is the analysis in which the social nature of speech depicted in a text is examined as being made of different parts of speech comprising of the main argument with its grounds and supporting evidence (Robbins 1996b:52-58).

Second, Robbins (1996a:108-115) has suggested that apart from the analysis of intertextuality, texts must be analysed in terms of their interaction with culture. Cultural intertextuality is investigated through cultural elements that exist within the text. According to Robbins (1996a:115):

Cultural intertexture, then, concerns symbolic worlds that particular communities of discourse nurture with special nuances and emphases. The special challenge with analysis of the cultural intertexture of New Testament texts lies in the interaction among Jewish and Greco-Roman topics, codes and general conceptions in New Testament discourse.

Following this description, an interpreter would locate elements of cultural intertextuality through ideas, concepts, codes, or systems implied in the text. These elements of cultural patterns may be found in a text by way of *reference* or *allusions* in which case a word or phrase may point to a “personage or tradition known to people on the basis of tradition” (Robbins 1996b:58). *References* in a given text are simply pointers to cultural ideas and concepts, while on the other hand *allusions* may refer to a tradition already in existence without necessarily intending to recite the actual text (Robbins 1996b:58-60). An interpreter would also locate cultural intertextualities through *echo*, in which case a word or phrase evokes a concept from cultural tradition (Robbins 1996b:58).

The importance of drawing these comparisons is that they enable the interpreter to gain knowledge of the relationship between systems and communication that occur in the text. All texts are products of this kind of interaction. Language in this case becomes the metaphor for social structures and culture because it reveals the practices, systems of ideas and beliefs that constitute the social system of the text and these constitute some of the influences to which it was exposed (Robbins 1996b:59, see also Alant 1990:66-67). No culture can be said to be static. As Robbins (1996b:59) observes, “various texts rather than one text lie in the background.” This is what may be referred to as the oral text (one that is not written but circulates within a particular community by word of mouth). In order to understand the meaning of ideas and concepts being expressed in the text a comparative analysis with other materials from Biblical and non-Biblical materials is essential (Robbins 1996a:108-115). Archaeological evidence plays a very important role here as it sheds light on discoveries of inscriptions, paintings and sculptures.

The third category of intertextual analysis is social comparisons in which the interpreter analyses behaviour of people through observation of their reaction to the world, the social and cultural systems, institutions and cultural agreements and disputes presented (Fowler 1986:85-101 cited by Robbins) in a given text. Robbins (1996b:62-63) identifies four dimensions of social comparisons: social functions (which surface in such forms for instance, duty of a soldier), social establishment (which appears in forms of institutions of power such as government, synagogue etc.), social norms (such as honour-shame), and social interactions (between individuals in the community). The significance of investigating the text for social comparisons is the fact that this evidence helps in the understanding of society in relation to other societies and phenomena. It is possible to grasp the meaning of the social role a text

portrays only with the understanding that we get outside Gospel materials (Robbins 1996a: 117). Archaeological data shed more light on these phenomena. One can achieve good understanding of the Gospels by serious investigation of the Gospels in the light of Jewish texts as they (Gospels) were composed within Jewish culture (Robbins 1996b:63).

The fourth category of intertextual analysis is the historical comparisons, what Robbins (1996a:118-120, 1996b:63-68) refers to as *historical intertexture*. This is the analysis of Biblical material on the lines of historical investigations, which examine texts in relation to previous events. Robbins (1996b:63-68) argues that this analysis proceeds on a three-fold way. Firstly, it investigates the text for possible discovery of known events mentioned in other texts. Failure to find a similar occurrence in other data brings doubts as to the integrity of the text being studied. Sometimes a text may show dependency on other texts that may reveal the existence of a common source. Sometimes accounts may agree or disagree in details while preserving the core ideas. This analysis examines archaeological sources, which can shed more light on the people, places, events, customs and institutions etc., mentioned in the text. More so, this analysis also takes into account evidence from non-Biblical and Christian sources.

This sub-section has discussed the significance of intertextuality examining its operational methods. Intertextuality equips the interpreter with tools of analysis that enables him/her to compare a text with other texts, as well as with cultural, social and historical phenomena. This interaction is not only confined to first-century eastern Mediterranean culture but is open to other cultures of the world that may broaden the understanding of Biblical texts.

2.2.2.2 Strategy 2: *Inner texture*

The second strategy of socio-rhetorical criticism is unmasking the inside of a text, by which Robbins (1996b:7) means that we must examine “features in the language of the text itself.” This analysis of what Robbins (1996a:44-95, 1996b:7-39) refers to as the *inner texture* of a text is informed by literary and rhetorical studies. *Inner texture*, according to Robbins (1996b:7), is the object of a process of textual analysis in which a detailed examination of the component elements and structure of the text is done. In order to understand a text properly today, we need to analyse it on its own merit by suspending our own interpretation of the

meaning of words and those of others and allowing the text to speak for itself (Robbins 1996b:7). The interpreter is cautioned in this regard to confine himself/herself to the text before him/her prior to examining other related texts (Robbins 1996b:7) because the meaning of the text is only acquired from the language embedded in it. The principal task of this analysis is to focus on the style, thought, and argument of the author, which are reflected in the language of the text under consideration.

At the heart of this strategy is the task in which the interpreter is asked to observe and listen to the ways in which the text employs word patterns (Robbins 1996a:46, 1996b:7). The underlying principle is that nothing mentioned in the text stands alone. Each part of a text interacts with the other parts of the text since every part is constantly performing its function in relation to the other parts of the text. In this analysis language is viewed as “a symbolic act that creates history, society, culture and ideology as people know it, presuppose it...” (Robbins 1996a:46). A relationship between word patterns in the argument of the text is a major concern of *inner texture* (Robbins 1996a:46).

The importance of such an analysis is that an interpreter is informed of the way in which the author employs word patterns and structures his/her arguments, ideas and concepts in the text, and these form the basis upon which common interpretations and expressions are developed within a particular community. This is because the text and language are part and parcel of the society with which it is concerned, as it is able to communicate the entire picture of society (Malina 1981:12, 1986:1, 5, Vorster 1988:104-110). This method enables an interpreter to obtain initial understanding of the argumentation embedded in language as the medium of communication in a given text (Robbins 1996b:7, see also Vorster 1989:22, 104-110). Important though it may be that language communicates the entire societal system, I think that the written language of Luke 10:25-37, the text under consideration, and also that of any other written text cannot in any way communicate the totality of first-century society, but can only shed light on certain aspects of that society. Robbins (1996a:46, 1996b:7) has identified some of the elements that one looks for in unmasking the inside of a text as composed of frequency of items, voices, structure of a text, and argumentation.

The first stage of unmasking the inside of a text is observing and listing the frequency of word patterns, ideas and concepts. This is informed in part by redaction critical analysis that statistically determines the frequency with which a certain word or phrase occurs in a given

text. Robbins (1996a:46-50, 1996b:8-14) refers to this analysis as *repetitive-progressive texture*. *Repetitive-progressive texture*, according to Robbins, is a procedure through which an interpreter seeks to unpack the intentions and achievements of the author through his/her choice and arrangements of words in a given text (see Robbins 1996a:46-50, 1996b:8-14).

The importance of this method is that it affords the interpreter the opportunity to enter into the world of the author because the author does not just choose words without a purpose. Therefore, the frequency of items in a text illuminates themes or subjects (1996a:48-49). Such information, when gathered, can be useful for our understanding of the “nature of the discourse” (Robbins 1996a:49). The analysis portrays not only the relationship of words to each other but it also locates the individual parts and the way they are structured.

The applicability of the theory of the frequency of items in a given text has some limitations. For while it explains the dynamics of some literary works, one must always remember that there are problems with statistical arguments. For instance, many conclusions Robbins (1996a:46-50, 69-70, 1996b:8-14) draws in his analysis of the frequency of items in texts are based on counts of words or phrases of similar meaning that may occur more than once in a given text. Statistically I argue that the possibility of error in such analysis should not be under-estimated.

The second stage of unmasking the inside of a text is the analysis of the structural features of a text. Before attempting any assessment of the meaning of any given text, it is necessary to enquire into the literary structure of a text. Robbins (1996a:50-53, 1996b:19-21) calls this inquiry as *opening-middle-closing*. This inquiry has the task of defining the structure of a text. This kind of analysis is informed by methods employed by contemporary literary critics. Therefore, the employment of methods from other disciplines such as literary criticism opens up the interdisciplinary consultation with other fields, which is the sole aim of socio-rhetorical criticism (1966a:13). This is important because readers of Biblical data are also shaped and informed by other experiences of literature, and it is helpful to recognise the kinds of influence that prompt their perception of the Bible.

The analysis of the structure of a given text seeks to understand the relationship of its individual parts and the manner in which they are structured. Utilizing this method, the interpreter investigates the text for possible beginnings (as a text may have multiple

beginnings), central section and ending and inquires whether a relationship between them is visible (Robbins 1966a:50-53, 1966b:19-21). Informed by literary methods, Robbins (1966a: 50-53, 70-71, 1966b:19-21) demonstrates how an analysis of a Biblical text in the light of these methods is useful for New Testament interpretation. The task of analyzing the rhetorical structure of a text achieves the following: (1) it determines the different elements of a given unit, (2) it describes the organisation of material or the structure of the argument, and (3) it illuminates the style employed by the author.

Robbins (1966a:50-51) has argued that an analysis of the structural unit of a text helps in our understanding of the basic rhetorical functions of each individual part in the text. Questions as to whether the text is a unit or is a conflation of several individual parts are adequately dealt with by this method. Clearly, this investigation plays a major role in establishing the significance of the composition of a text. The significance of examining the structure of a text is seen when the text is analysed in the light of its literary background of the period of composition. Having stressed the importance of examining the literary structure of a work before considering its meaning, one is left with the task of defining characterisation and voices in the text, which I discuss below.

The third stage of unmasking the inside of a text is the analysis of voices in a text. Robbins (1996a:53-58, 1996b:15-19) identifies this method as *narrational texture*. This is the method of analyzing a Biblical text in its literary terms of plot, characterisation and point of view of the narration (Robbins 1996a:11). The analysis of voices in a given text enables the interpreter to distinguish between author (real and implied), narrator (and narratee), characters, reader (real and implied) [Robbins 1996a:28-32]. My notion of characterisation is the manner in which an author of a text creates a convincing picture of a person within a given discourse (Okorie 1995:274). The importance of this analysis is that it enables the interpreter to gain an adequate understanding of the individual parts of a text and what is happening behind the scenes of the discourse. Furthermore, it helps in the analysis of the structure of argumentation in a given text.

The voice of the narrator would introduce characters to the reader or hearer within a given narrative (see for example Robbins 1996b:15-19). In this way, the characters are made to speak through the voice of the narrator because a character is fashioned with "attributes" which "correspond to verbal and non-verbal actions" (Okorie 1995:274). In this analysis, the

reader begins to notice the voice of the narrator and the voices of the characters in the story. Therefore, dialogue unfolds and there is interaction between different voices in the text surface which “give life to a text” (Okorie 1995:274). This prepares the stage for reported speech. These voices may show an interesting pattern which may exhibit direct narration, reported speech, an address, or scriptural quotation (Robbins 1996a:15-19). Understanding the rhetorical and literary conventions that inform the author helps the interpreter to understand why people behave in the way in which they are portrayed in the course of the discourse. In the process this may reveal what may happen or has already taken place in history.

The fourth stage of unmasking the inside of a text is the analysis of the rhetorical argument. Robbins (1996a:77-89, 1996b:21-29) calls this method *argumentative texture*. According to Robbins (1996a:77), *argumentative texture* is a method in which the interpreter identifies and analyses the main parts of argumentation in a given text in the light of Greco-Roman rhetoric. Scholars of rhetorical criticism have on many occasions stressed the importance of identifying and analyzing rhetorical units in a given text. Kennedy (1984:19, see also Bailey & Broek 1992: 130) cites three categories of rhetoric described in the classical world:

(1) *judicial rhetoric* (is directed to the jury or judge with the underlying goal of giving defense for or accusing an individual of their action), (2) *deliberative rhetoric* (is directed to an assembly with the purpose of exhorting or dissuading the people concerning some future action), and lastly (3) *epideictic rhetoric* (is directed to spectators based on the principle of upholding communal values in which praise or blame are portioned). Although these designations were originally applied to types of public oratory, they are adaptable to any form of discourse. In other words, the text highlights a statement and supports it with evidence, or explains them through the use of opposing contrasts, and through the use of short or detailed counter-arguments (Bailey & Broek 1992:135). This happens through the employment of comparisons, illustrations, and quotations of ancient testimony in a text that works in a persuasive way.

The knowledge of the different parts of argumentation contained in a text equips the interpreter with yet another tool for locating where a particular argument starts or ends, and whether it portrays a unit of thought in itself. In this way an interpreter would gain insight into the thoughts of the author. Locating and analyzing the main parts of an argument help us to understand the intentions of the author in each stage of the argument. This analysis helps

to show evidence of the influential role of Hellenistic rhetoric in the formulation of arguments in the Gospels in general and the parables in particular. Furthermore, the role of classical rhetorical theory in the analysis of parabolic arguments would help to shed more light on the literary intention of the author and the context that the author addressed. *Judicial, deliberative or epideictic rhetoric* are types of rhetoric that address the main types of social situations in which ancient speakers found themselves.

Unmasking the inside of a text is an essential element in the analysis of New Testament material. Essentially, unmasking the inside of a text achieves the understanding of the themes, characterisation and voices, and argumentation exhibited in a text. This knowledge helps the interpreter to understand the flow of argumentation and interaction of voices shedding more light on the relationship individuals have with one another. The analysis of unmasking the inside of a text intricately sets the stage for the following strategies to be employed towards achieving adequate understanding of what is going on in a text.

2.2.2.3 Strategy 3: *Ideological texture*

The third strategy of socio-rhetorical criticism is the analysis of ideological settings in a given text. Robbins (1996a:192-235, 1996b:95-119) terms this analysis as the *ideological texture*. In his subtitle to Chapter Six, Robbins (1996a:192) provides a statement about the premise upon which the method is based as “every theology has a politics.” According to Robbins (1996b:95), “ideological texture concerns the bias, opinions, preferences, and stereotypes of a particular writer and a particular reader.” From a socio-rhetorical perspective, language plays a crucial role in the analysis of a text. I agree with Mosala (1987:204) when he perceives written language (text) as an ideological product, and tool, and the text’s influence is viewed as an ideological influence. The investigation of power and ideological settings in a text is the method in which an interpreter analyses both the text and himself/herself as a writer and reader for influences prompting his/her perception of the New Testament. Characteristic manifestations of power and ideological settings in a text include such areas as the relation of individuals to the group. These ideological ideas or concepts may be values that they uphold in common with others in their respective communities. The point of departure for this analysis is the basic assumption that an interpreter/reader/writer or the text itself is informed and shaped by political and ideological forces of their own context:

“Ideologies are shaped by specific views of reality shared by groups – specific perspectives on the world, society and man, and potentialities of human existence” (Robbins 1996b:96 citing Elliot).

According to Robbins (1996a:36), “Ideology concerns the particular ways in which our speech and action, in their social and cultural location, relate to and interconnect with resources, structures and institutions of power.” Robbins (1996b:95) recognises that the major focus of this analysis is people; in this sense the text assumes the role of being a secondary tool of analysis. The purpose of the approach is to “explore not the private and political arenas of life in and of themselves but the religious dimensions of life in a world constituted by language, subjectivity and politics” (Robbins 1996a:11). I am suggesting that Luke 10:25-37 must be studied in terms of its ideological implications by analysing how it uses language and the implications of Luke’s perception of historical people, places and events. The purpose of doing this is because I see language as a creation of society, reflecting its form and its attitudes towards class, ethnic and gender groups (see also Robbins 1996a:36-43). However, language also simultaneously creates attitudes or values within society (see also Malina 1993:2). I will discuss three of the components that Robbins’ (1996a:98) identifies as constituting power and ideological settings: (1) location, (2) power and (3) persons and communities.

Firstly, *ideological texture* calls on every interpreter/reader to investigate their own ideologies in a bid to understand what kind of thoughts and beliefs shape their perception of the New Testament (Robbins 1996a:72-73). This is an important step because, before we can interpret others, we must start with ourselves: “The beginning place for ideological analysis and interpretation is with people, and the best place to begin is with you, the reader” (Robbins 1996a:72). The analysis of ideological settings seeks to amplify the voices of the powerful, the weak and the marginalised in a given community reflected in a text (Robbins 1996b:110).

Secondly, although ideology has been described as being focused on the relationship people have to one another, it is also understood as being focused on the discourse of the people as it “represents the points where power impacts upon certain utterances and inscribes itself tacitly within them” (Robbins 1996b:110 citing Eagleton). Robbins (1996b:111) suggests three ways in which ideology in a given text can be analysed: (1) the investigation of the cultural

context of the implied author of a text, (2) investigating the power base in the text, and (3) analyzing the kinds of ideology that shape academic discourse.

In pursuing the background of the author, the interpreter has to identify from the text information that establishes historical events that have happened prior to writing for the possibility of locating the text within a right historical perspective (Robbins 1996b:111). The text may mention certain individuals, or place names that may help in this procedure. The identification of the land geographically is another added advantage in order to locate the area being referred to and types of inhabitants, which shed more light on the kind of people one meets in the text (Robbins 1996b:111). Further, traces of elements of technology will indicate the kinds of developmental phases the period of study underwent (Robbins 1996b: 111). An investigation of the culture and the kind of relationship the area of study had with its neighbours unpack added information for our understanding of the context under study. Above all, the behaviour and attitude of the people in the text to one another shed light on the kind of powerplay going on in the text (Robbins 1996b:112).

Furthermore, Robbins (1996b:113, 1996a:195 drawing on the work of Castelli 1991) introduces five principles for investigating power in a given text: (1) “system of differentiation” [system of power in a given society which allows the dominant class to act upon the actions of people in a subordinate position]; (2) “types of objectives” [the aims held by those who act upon the actions of others]; (3) “means” [dominant signs of representation in the text that bring these relationships into being]; (4) “forms of institutionalization” [established law, custom, practice or organisation for the promotion of public or religious objective]; and (5) “degree of rationalization” [the grounds on which an argument or line of thought is based]. The importance of this analysis is that it helps the interpreter to understand the center of power in the discourse and how that impacts on those who do not exercise that power in that community.

This sub-section has dealt with the ideological texture of a text. It was discovered that the central theme of ideology has to do with people because texts are merely secondary tools of ideological analysis because humans (Robbins 1996b:95) write them. It was the contention of this discussion that the beginning place for any ideological analysis, is the examination of myself, as author of this thesis and you, the reader of this thesis. This method when applied

will enable us to understand our own ideological orientation before we can interpret other people's writings.

2.2.2.4 Strategy 4: *Social and cultural texture*

The fourth dimension of socio-rhetorical criticism is the analysis of *social and cultural texture* in a given text. Robbins (1996a:144) describes this method as “living with a text in the world.” It is a method that investigates the reaction of persons in a given community to social and cultural establishments and institutions and the cultural agreements presented by the text (Robbins 1986:85-101 citing Fowler). It attempts to provide reasons why the implied reader “adopts certain social and cultural locations and orientations rather than others” (Robbins 1996a:72). Both sociological and anthropological models of analysis in the social sciences inform this strategy. *Social and cultural texture* is used to investigate concepts, ideas and truths embedded in the language of the text and the kind of individuals that the particular text under investigation would produce. These social and cultural concepts, ideas and truths play an important role in framing the context in which a text is composed. Since language is the creation of society, I agree with Malina (1981:12, see also Vorster 1988:104-110) when he observes that language communicates aspects of the entire social system. Three subtypes are prominent in Robbins' (1996a:144-176, 1996b:71-94) analysis of cultural patterns: unique social concepts, similar cultural concepts, and cultural location. The importance of this analysis is that it illuminates the interaction of discourse in a given text to ancient Christian texts.

Firstly, based on Wilson's sociological typologies, Robbins (1996a:147-159, 1996b:72-74) has developed seven models of particular responses which underlie the response of people to society: (1) “conversionist response” (perceives people as corrupt because the world in which they live is corrupt, and therefore, the world can only be transformed for good by changing the people through a divinely ordered process of salvation); (2) *revolutionist response* [seeks to mobilize the faithful to participate in the transformation of the social order so that salvation can take place]; (3) *introversionist response* [perceives the world as beyond redemption because of the presence of evil and individuals can only be saved through total withdrawal from it.]; (4) *gnostic-manipulation* [seeks to attain salvation through a secret learnt knowledge in total disregard for institutionalized ways of attaining salvation];

(5) *thaumaturgical response* [views salvation as personal and encourages individuals to seek present release from the suffering of this world through a special arrangement];
 (6) *reformist response*" [holds the view that salvation can only be attained in this world through the destruction of corruption with the help of the supernatural in a gradual process of reform]; and (7) *utopian response* [seeks to do away with the present societal arrangement by reconstructing a society based on Biblical principles in a bid to eliminate evil from the world].

Robbins (1996a:150) observes that a critical analysis of communities in Biblical materials may show some of these aspects of response to the world. The significance of these sociological models is that they help us to understand one dimension of a community one meets in a text and to notice the way the community organizes itself around the issues of religion and culture. Robbins (1996b:72) concludes that

Each kind of response creates a kind of culture that gives meanings, values, traditions, convictions, rituals, beliefs, and actions to people. Applying these taxonomy to New Testament literature reveals the kind of cultures earliest Christianity nurtured and maintained in the first century Mediterranean world. It also suggests to us what kind of Christian cultures this literature has the potential to nurture in modern society.

Robbins here is emphasizing the fact that there is interaction between the discourse embedded in a text and the social and cultural world, which has arisen since the texts are social and cultural constructs.

The second dimension of cultural patterns is the analysis for similar cultural concepts in a text with other cultures. Today more than ever before, cultural anthropology as applied to the Bible focuses on the eastern Mediterranean region for cultural parallels similar to evidence portrayed in Biblical events (Gilmore 1980, 1990). Through this method, the interpreter analyses the text in relation to the cultural anthropology of the eastern Mediterranean region (Robbins 1996a:159). Most scholars have argued that the Mediterranean region exhibits uniform cultural patterns (Gilmore 1982:178, Malina & Neyrey 1991:71). It is important to indicate here that, despite the uniformity observed, there is a sense in which to speak of a monocultural value system in the eastern Mediterranean region would be a gross generalization as there is variation from place to place. However, the importance of such analysis is that it helps in the understanding of Biblical material in its own context (Malina 1981:2). Some Biblical scholars have identified the concept of "honour and shame, patron-

client-broker, sickness and healing, purity, dyadic personality, conflict, city and countryside, temple and household, meals and table-fellowship” as some of the most important categories to be studied (Robbins 1996a:159; see also Muenchow 1989:599; Gilmore 1982:179). Since anthropology is the science of human life and culture, it follows then that cultural anthropology covers the development of different cultures and the means of life of people in contemporary society.

Eastern Mediterranean societies exhibit a communal kind of life, which is typical of most African communities as opposed to the modern-day individualistic kind of living present in Western society. These concepts determine the kind of values and ideas upheld by a particular group of communities. The study of these values determines the attitudes and approaches people have towards life in the eastern Mediterranean region. It is important to emphasize here that a text reflects and articulates the language and culture out of which meaning can be constituted for the culture, the social system and the people speaking. This is an interaction process of the individual with members of his or her own society in which meaning is unpacked.

The third and final category of cultural patterns is the analysis for cultural locations in a given text. Robbins (1996a:167-174, 1996b:86-91) terms this analysis as *final cultural categories*. According to Robbins (1996a:59-61, see also Bailey and Broek 1992:135), this analysis concerns the way in which individuals portrayed in the text present their reasoning in arguments, with the types of support they use to back their line of thought. This is what is known in rhetoric as the “art of persuasion” or “argumentation” because it shows how the author or speaker intends to achieve his intentions. It helps us to see, through the reasons provided in the text, what kinds of beliefs people hold and cherish.

Robbins (1996a:168-170, 1996b:86-89) develops five cultural categories from anthropological and sociological theories in pursuing the goal of cultural patterns in a given text. These are: (1) *dominant culture rhetoric* [backed by the social establishment, imposes its own ideas, concepts and value system on people even across their boundaries]; (2) *subculture* [employs cultural values, ideas, and concepts of the dominant culture and make it their own; further, even claim to put them to better use than the owners]; (3) *counterculture rhetoric* [it is a description of group culture that claims autonomy and having nothing to do with any other culture and it has been seen to be more of a reactionary kind of culture];

(4) *contraculture rhetoric* [this is a kind of culture that reacts to a dominant culture, but in the course of that reaction ends up implementing the same values it was opposed to]; (5) *liminal culture rhetoric* [is the culture of the time as it is liberative and in transition; more to do with a people who have never had a chance to establish their own system of culture].

This analysis plays a major role in unpacking the main distinctions in the manner dominant culture interacts with subculture. Indeed the way in which people will be portrayed as engaged in argument will reflect the kind of culture that they belong to as the evidence will be reflected in the proof that they employ to support their assertions.

This sub-section has outlined the procedures to follow in analyzing cultural patterns in a given text. The importance of this approach is that it helps in the understanding of behaviour as it is portrayed in the New Testament material in its proper context by situating the text in the eastern Mediterranean region. Robbins (1996a:186) commenting on one of the major contributions of this type of investigation says that this type of analysis will “provide data to write a new account of first-century Christianity.” Indeed it will provide new insights into the analysis of the parable of the Good Samaritan (Luke 10:25-37).

2.2.2.5 Strategy 5: *Sacred texture*

The fifth and last category that Robbins introduces is the religious dimensions of a text. This category is synonymous with commonly used terms in theological studies, and Robbins (1996b:120-131) refers to it as *sacred texture*. The term “sacred” designates the religious dimensions of existence that portray the relationship between the human and the sacred and assumes a sharp distinction between the ordinary and the holy. The ‘sacred’ is said to provide order, life sustenance and meaning to all existence. All creation is dependent on the sacred. I share Boozer’s (1983:261) definition of the sacred as “that which is infused with the holy and draws persons into a power/significance that is given and indestructible, not subject to human designations and achievements in ordinary space and time.”

This method (sacred texture) concerns the way readers and interpreters use texts to relate human life to the sacred (1996b:120). The analysis of the sacred in texts has been pursued for a long time and over the years people have been interested in understanding the way the

text portrays the sacred. I, for one, have also been consciously pursuing the sacred in texts for a number of years now. Since my Sunday school days, I have been involved with friends and colleagues in Bible studies at Church, Sections, school and home in which we have sought to discover how our relationship with each other and our sacred texts have a bearing on our social interaction in Zambia. On each occasion we have explored how the stories related by the Biblical texts might be read in the light of our own Zambian situation. In addition, we have examined methodological implications for working with Scriptural matters together in our Bible studies and seen how the reading of the same Scripture differs from one place to another the world over. As in the case of the other methods above, Robbins (1996b:120-131) identifies a number of categories, which may be used in analyzing the *sacred texture* of a text. *Sacred texture* deals with (1) manifestations of the deity, (2) holy individuals, (3) spiritual beings, (4) the manner in which people perceive history, (5) human salvation, (6) human pledge, (7) presence of religious communities, and (8) the way people think and act in different situations of life (Robbins 1996b:120-131). All these concerns can yield a language that is rich in both imagination and in accurate knowledge of the relationship between the human and the sacred.

First, *sacred texture* seeks to locate the deity in a given text (Robbins 1996b:120). The deity may be pictured in the text either in the background, or involved in an action or speech, which may be attributed to the deity. A description of the deity is the first level of interpreting the *sacred texture* of a text. This analysis (*sacred texture*) of a text helps the interpreter to understand the religious dimensions of a text, such as for instance the nature of the divine (Robbins 1996b:120).

Secondly, a text may portray certain individuals as holy persons who may be entrusted with special responsibility in the community to carry out the function of the sacred (Robbins 1996b:121-122). The New Testament portrays priests, Pharisees, Sadducees, and scribes as groups of people who possessed holiness. This method equips the interpreter to understand the interaction going on in the text between individuals, and the distinctions drawn between them provides information which enables us to understand the kind of behaviour, values and beliefs they uphold and cherish (Robbins 1996b:121).

Third, the sacred is also analysed through the discovery of the way a particular Biblical text speaks of the divine or evil beings who have the nature of a spirit rather than a human

(Robbins 1996b:123). The *sacred texture* of a text usually emerges in a conflict situation between good and evil spiritual forces (Robbins 1996b:123). The way in which the conflict is resolved provides more information on the “relation of human life to the divine in the text” (Robbins 1996b:123). Insight is also gained by reflecting on the kind of conflicts and tensions going on between the forces of evil and good (Robbins 1996b:123) portrayed by the text.

Fourth, many sacred texts presuppose implicitly or explicitly that “divine powers direct historical processes and events towards certain results” (Robbins 1996b:123-125). From the New Testament perspective, this enters the “realm of eschatology, apocalyptic or salvation history” (Robbins 1996b:123). In this approach, the interpreter looks for ways in which the text talks of the end of time or salvation. Also the interpreter endeavors to discover how salvation is understood in a given text. The importance of this analysis to parabolic interpretation is that we will begin to see in what context Jesus is portrayed by Luke to have addressed his audience.

The fifth analysis of *sacred texture* is the investigation into the text of how humans benefit from the divine following their offer of rituals, or practices (Robbins 1996b:125). This is followed by the examination of commitment to the divine by humans (Robbins 1996b:126-127). The portrayal of the faithful as opposed to the unfaithful sheds more light on how God reveals himself to humans (Robbins 1996b:126-127). The formation and nurturing of religious community is another concern of *sacred texture* (Robbins 1996b:127-129). In this regard, human commitment is not seen as an individual issue but involves other participants in the community in order to carry out the will of divine.

And finally, the analysis for ethical attitudes and responses of individuals and the community in a text, Robbins (1996b:129) argues “concerns the responsibility of humans to think and act in special ways in both ordinary and extraordinary circumstances.” This analysis provides understanding of the communities of faith and their relationship one to another, and evaluates their ethical standards (Robbins 1996b:129-130). “When addressed in the context of religious commitment,” Robbins (1996b:129) argues that “the special ways of thinking and acting are motivated by commitment to God” (ethical guidelines or principles, or rules).

This sub-section has dealt with the religious dimensions of a text which include aspects to do with the “deity, holy persons, spirit beings, divine history, human redemption, human commitment, religious community, and ethics” (Robbins 1996b:130). The analysis of the religious dimension of a text can only be adequately understood if it is examined in the context of other textures discussed above.

2.3 THE IMPLICATIONS OF SOCIO-RHETORICAL CRITICISM TO THE INTERPRETATION OF PARABLES TODAY

For many years the paradigmatic controversy on parables within New Testament scholarship has been the focus of academic debate. The diversity of approaches has brought with it a wide spectrum of conflicting ideologies that work against each other. For instance, parable interpreters are divided between those pursuing allegorical interpretations, historical-critical interpretations, historical-aesthetic interpretations, historical-existential theological interpretations, and historical existential-aesthetic and literary-critical interpretations [for a full review of approaches in parabolic interpretation see Kissinger (1979), Hunter (1960) and Tolbert (1979)]. Previous selected studies on parables reviewed in this study (1.2) highlight the need to pay greater attention to the socio-rhetorical aspects of a parabolic text. In particular, I have argued that studies on parables need an interdisciplinary approach, such as socio-rhetorical criticism, in order for them to shed more valuable insight.

In the light of these diverse approaches that characterise parabolic interpretation today, the problem is how to find an operational strategy that would accommodate interpretation of such divergent methods. To resolve this crisis, Robbins, (though he does not deal directly with parables), is proposing the socio-rhetorical approach in order to move the “boundaries” of the disputes and conflicts that characterise New Testament studies today.

A question that may arise is whether there is anything new in studying Luke 10:25-37 today. The key to finding something new in the parable is the methods, which we apply and the questions that we ask in our reading process. However, traditional analyses of Luke 10:25-37 has tended to focus on the historical aspect of the text while failing to pay sufficient attention to the social-rhetorical dimensions of the text. By studying these neglected aspects of Luke 10:25-37, in combination with the wider historical methods, it should be possible to

come up with new insights. The importance of this will be an improved understanding of the nature, purpose and interpretation of Luke 10:25-37. The study of Luke 10:25-37 from a socio-rhetorical perspective is important because it attempts to understand the text from a range of dimensions. Furthermore, it shows the advantages of combining methods of reading, thus stimulating an interaction between various approaches. It is argued in this study that the most fruitful form of reading parables is one that incorporates interdisciplinary approaches. My hope is that the application of Robbins' socio-rhetorical approach to Luke 10:25-37 will demonstrate how useful this approach can be to the understanding of parables today. Furthermore, it will serve to show that this approach could facilitate a way out of the crisis that has beset scholarship on parables.

2.4 SUMMARY

The present chapter has attempted to examine the aims, presuppositions, and implications of socio-rhetorical criticism as an approach for analysing Biblical texts in general and parables in particular. With this objective, the rest of the chapter has presented an explanation of each strategy of socio-rhetorical criticism covering: *intertexture*, *inner texture*, *ideological texture*, *social and cultural texture*, and *sacred texture*. These strategies offer an interpreter a comprehensive overview of the methods and approaches used by not only Biblical scholars but also scholars in other disciplines like social science. The integration of these methods yields valuable insights on a Biblical text under investigation. I will demonstrate in the following chapter (3) how socio-rhetorical criticism can enhance the analysis of parables by applying the approach to the parable of the Good Samaritan (Luke 10:25-37).

PART II

**APPLICATION OF SOCIO-RHETORICAL CRITICISM TO
LUKE 10:25-37**

CHAPTER THREE

A Socio-rhetorical Analysis of Luke 10:25-37

3 INTRODUCTION

The preceding chapter has presented five different aspects of a text that may be analysed. The fact that these strategies vary in scope and at the same time are interrelated means that there is room for complementary as well as symbiotic relationships among them. The main objective of Part I was to present some of the principal arguments regarding the nature and development of socio-rhetorical criticism as an interdisciplinary approach. Drawing upon the approach described in Part I, the second part of the thesis deals with the application of socio-rhetorical criticism to Luke 10:25-37. Therefore, Part II is a demonstration of this approach as applied to parabolic interpretation. The demonstration is arranged in five sections so as to group it for analysis and to enable the reader to learn the method by seeing it at work in the analysis of Luke 10:25-37. Robbins' (1996a, 1996b) five main strategies have served as guidelines to the explorations that follow.

The first section provides a discussion of intertextualities in Luke 10:25-37. Section two introduces and illustrates the main elements of sentence structure and outlines basic ways of unmasking the inside of a text. Section three discusses the special characteristics of ideological patterns exhibited in the text under consideration. Section four is devoted to the application of eastern Mediterranean cultural value systems to Luke 10:25-37, highlighting the concept of 'hospitality' which is closely related to the social value of 'honour-shame.' This chapter concludes with a discussion on the concept of the sacred in Luke 10:25-37,

covering the sacred and the profane. To commence the demonstration, the following section analyses the interactions of Luke 10:25-37 with other texts.

3.1 INTERTEXTUALITIES IN LUKE 10:25-37

Introduction

The study of intertextuality is concerned with discovering the written or oral traditions behind the Gospels, which have influenced an author producing his (or her) work (Robbins 1996a:96, 1996b:40; see also McKnight 1988:34). This analysis operates on the assumption that the author of a text brings a certain background of ideas and thought forms to the production of a text that may reflect earlier texts or culture. Culler (1981:103) says that intertextuality:

...calls our attention to the importance of prior texts, insisting that the autonomy of texts is a misleading notion and that a work has the meaning it does only because certain things have previously been written. Yet in so far as it focuses on intelligibility, on meaning, 'intertextuality' leads us to consider prior texts as contributions to a code which makes possible the various effects of significance. Intertextuality thus becomes less a name for work's relation to particular prior texts than a designation of its participation in the discursive space of a culture: the relationship between a text and the various languages or signifying practices of a culture and its relation to those texts which articulate for it the possibilities of that culture.

The dual nature of intertextuality is nicely documented in this description, which corresponds extremely well to the understanding of Robbins as it involves prior texts, culture and power. Even for Robbins (1996a:96, 143) intertextuality is essentially concerned with the relationships of a text not only to prior texts (written or oral) but also to the cultural, social, and historical writings. For the present purposes, the term intertextuality is being employed to convey how Luke 10:25-37 is created, implicitly or explicitly, by means of another text (written or oral) and culture.

Various criteria can be used in this analysis of discovering the written or oral sources that lay behind the Gospels. First, examining the Gospels word for word looking for possible

traces of these sources may result in their discovery (see also McKnight 1991:163). Second, the presence of a source may be suspected because a passage cites language that is unusual for the author of the rest of the text (Robbins, 1996a:102-103). Third, in some instances, what is cited in the text may be irrelevant to the purpose of the author, indicating the presence of materials reproduced from another source (Robbins 1996a:111).

The importance of intertextuality in the study of the parables in the Gospels is that it affords us an opportunity to see behind the author of a given text and understand the development of Christian thought at the time of writing. It also helps us to understand more accurately the manner in which the author of the text has redacted the sources cited. This analysis plays a major role in our understanding of the relationship that exists among the first three Gospels in the New Testament canon (Matthew, Mark and Luke) because of the interdependence between their sources (Baker 1987:143). The method also helps in our understanding of the theological interests and setting of the author (Stein 1987:143-5; see also McKnight 1988:85).

3.1.2 Interactions of Luke 10:25-37 with both internal and external Biblical and non-Biblical data

Luke 10:25-37 stands within a complex intertextual environment which includes other New Testament and early Christian writings, the Old Testament, Jewish intertestamental literature, and other writings from the Graeco-Roman context. By examining the structural relationship between Luke 10:25-37 and this range of writings it should be possible to develop a clearer understanding of the nature and function of the parable of the Good Samaritan (Luke 10:25-37). The discussion will commence by focusing on the relationship among the Synoptic Gospels.

3.1.2.1 Relationship of Luke 10:25-37 to other Synoptic Gospels

The first three Gospels in the New Testament canon, Matthew, Mark and Luke, show some remarkable similarities as well as differences. This is clearly exemplified when one parallels the wording of Luke 10:25-37 to Matthew 22:34-40 and Mark 12:28-34. The similarities and differences occur in their content, order and use of language (McKnight 1991:139, Blomberg 1987:12). The three have been called *Synoptic Gospels* because they share so much common material, often in the same narrative sequence with verbatim or near verbatim wording so that they can be read alongside one another in parallel columns (Funk 1990:4). This close resemblance among the first three Gospels has made scholars presume some sort of literary connection between them. The Gospel of John, on the other hand, is different from the Synoptics because John presents a different view of not only the order of events, and content, but also the style and form of Jesus' speech as well as his divine identity (Bailey & Broek 1992:172-177, Blomberg 1987:153-189). The attempt to explain the literary relationship among the first three canonical Gospels in terms of their similarities and differences is what is known as the *Synoptic Problem*, one of the most difficult literary problems of the Bible [a full review of the Synoptic problem and theories advanced as solutions need not detain us as they have been well documented in Robert Stein (1987), A. J. Bellinzoni (1985), and J. C. Hawkins (1968)].

3.1.2.2 Is Luke 10:25-37 based on Mark 12:28-34?

From the outset, one encounters a problem of this relationship among the parallel accounts to Luke 10:25-37, namely Mark 12:28-34, and Matthew 22:34-40. Did the author of Luke 10:25-37 employ Mark 12:28-34 or Matthew 22:34-40 as a source? How do we account for the similarities and differences among the three? These are very crucial issues for our understanding of Luke 10:25-37 that cannot be overlooked.

The majority of New Testament scholars believe that the Gospel of Mark was the earliest. I proceed on this premise in this study and argue for the dependence of Luke 10:25-28, 37 on

Luke places the parable of the Good Samaritan within the framework of dialogue between Jesus and an expert in the Jewish law (Luke 10:25-37). Originally, the parable (10:30-35) had no context and so Luke reworked Mark 12:28-34 in order to provide for the parable (Breech 1983:159). The changes he makes to the Markan dialogue between Jesus and the lawyer allows him to fit the parable in response to the question: "Who is my neighbour?" (10:29). Furthermore, the alterations include Jesus' asking the lawyer "Which of these three do you think proved neighbour to the man who fell among robbers?" (10:36). Although some inconsistencies have been detected in the question of the lawyer (10:29) and the response of Jesus in the form of a parable and verse 36 (see Evans 1990:462), it is my contention that the ideological interests of Luke were realised in his application of the parable. Taken typologically, the Good Samaritan (10:25-37) is an ideological construct and relevant to the relationship that existed between Jews and Samaritans at the time (see my discussion in section 3.3). Luke in re-working a famous passage from Mark, enlarges it and complicates the concept of the boundary-mark on the question of neighbour, similarly he contrasts and complicates the whole issue for Jesus' opponent, the lawyer, making it impossible for him to pursue his trap (10:30-37).

There is a possibility that Luke could have actually brought together two sets of texts, Mark 10:17ff and Mark 12:28-34, and telescoped the two traditions together. Reading Mark 12 alongside Matthew 22-23 and Luke 20 one notices that the one thing Luke leaves out is the scribal/lawyer challenge over the greatest commandment. Luke may have assimilated Mark 10 with Mark 12 in compiling his version because he found the Mark 12 version too Jewish in character to appeal to his Greek audience, whereas the question of the rich young ruler in Mark 10 was more appropriate for his audience but the answer was not. In this combination of texts he was creating a supposed setting for the parable of the Good Samaritan, which he had received independent of any narrative setting such as we find in Luke 10:25-37.

have come from Luke's own independent source or may have been entirely his own creation. Ford (1984:91) is right when he observes that the account of Luke was transposed from a different context in its source, Mark 12:28-34, and was inserted into the story of the Good Samaritan in Luke, to show the significance of Jesus' mission to the Gentiles.

On the other hand, John Drury (1976:40) is in favour of the hypothesis that holds Matthew and *Q* to be the sources for Luke. However, this hypothesis is problematic because there is no documentary evidence to establish what kind of relationship existed between Matthew and Luke. Neither can one be certain in claiming that any documents other than Mark 12:28-34 were employed by Luke (10:25-29, 37) as sources. The *Q* source cannot be determined because none of it is directly accessible to us today. The situation is further compounded by the fact that hardly anything of the sources employed by Luke remains extant (Stevenson 1960:52 citing Papias). Walls (1962:879) observes that most of these documents attributed as sources to the Gospels exist in fragmentary form and are largely of later production. To make matters worse, "three centuries separate Jesus from the earliest complete surviving copy of the gospels" (Funk 1990:2).

Drury (1985:134-135) says that Luke is dependent on Matthew and the Old Testament. This is in reference to 2 Chronicles 28. Luke 10:30-35 has striking parallels with the episode recorded in 2 Chronicles 28:15. It has been argued by some scholars that the story in 2 Chronicles could have inspired Luke by providing him with the "plot, location, characters and details of his story" (Drury 1976:78). Even if this were the case, it could be said that the ways in which Luke manipulates the traditions surrounding 2 Chronicles to fashion the figure of the Samaritan are his own, ultimately he uses them to focus our attention upon the necessity for a universal application of the mission of Jesus. Therefore, whatever the case may be, Luke has provided a narrative framework into which he can fit the parable of the Good Samaritan by redacting his Markan source. He also seems to have made use of Mark 10:17 in vs. 25). He has removed the intensity of the conflict found in Mark 12 for the obvious reason that he is only beginning to build up to the climax of Jesus' death. Furthermore, the fact that Luke shows significant differences from Matthew suggests that he is at times using a source other than Mark.

Luke places the parable of the Good Samaritan within the framework of dialogue between Jesus and an expert in the Jewish law (Luke 10:25-37). Originally, the parable (10:30-35) had no context and so Luke reworked Mark 12:28-34 in order to provide for the parable (Breech 1983:159). The changes he makes to the Markan dialogue between Jesus and the lawyer allows him to fit the parable in response to the question: "Who is my neighbour?" (10:29). Furthermore, the alterations include Jesus' asking the lawyer "Which of these three do you think proved neighbour to the man who fell among robbers?" (10:36). Although some inconsistencies have been detected in the question of the lawyer (10:29) and the response of Jesus in the form of a parable and verse 36 (see Evans 1990:462), it is my contention that the ideological interests of Luke were realised in his application of the parable. Taken typologically, the Good Samaritan (10:25-37) is an ideological construct and relevant to the relationship that existed between Jews and Samaritans at the time (see my discussion in section 3.3). Luke in re-working a famous passage from Mark, enlarges it and complicates the concept of the boundary-mark on the question of neighbour, similarly he contrasts and complicates the whole issue for Jesus' opponent, the lawyer, making it impossible for him to pursue his trap (10:30-37).

There is a possibility that Luke could have actually brought together two sets of texts, Mark 10:17ff and Mark 12:28-34, and telescoped the two traditions together. Reading Mark 12 alongside Matthew 22-23 and Luke 20 one notices that the one thing Luke leaves out is the scribal/lawyer challenge over the greatest commandment. Luke may have assimilated Mark 10 with Mark 12 in compiling his version because he found the Mark 12 version too Jewish in character to appeal to his Greek audience, whereas the question of the rich young ruler in Mark 10 was more appropriate for his audience but the answer was not. In this combination of texts he was creating a supposed setting for the parable of the Good Samaritan, which he had received independent of any narrative setting such as we find in Luke 10:25-37.

3.1.2.3 Literary borrowing

To quantify how much of the content of Luke 10:25-37 is Luke's own and how much is derived from other sources is probably impossible. While it can be shown that Luke derives details from Mark, he clearly seeks to organise what in his source was an abstract account into advice of a practical nature. The emphasis on the mission to the Gentiles is very obvious in the parable (10:30-35). Luke used Mark (for materials in Luke 10:25-29, 37) but with a judicious independence derived from his knowledge of the broader mission of Jesus to the entire world (Ford 1984:91-92). Indicative of his independence is Luke's inclusion of the story of the Good Samaritan (10:30-35) which is not recorded in the other Gospels. To determine the literary style employed by Luke and the way in which he re-worked his source(s) are issues that cannot be resolved. However, Luke provides valuable new information, and his originality in this case cannot be disputed. Luke succeeds in bringing to life very precisely the terms of the relationship that existed between the Jews and Samaritans. In other words, it is his very ability to incorporate reality into the narrative context and parable (10:25-37), that makes the Lukan story so astonishing.

Other scholars have refused to accommodate the hypothesis of the *Q* source in the composition of Luke 10:25-37, arguing that Luke could have had access to sources other than Mark and Matthew. For instance, Fitzmyer (1972:877, 883) proposes that Luke 10:25-28 and 30-37 are derived from Luke's "L" source, arguing that Luke employed verse 29 to link the two together. I disagree with Fitzmyer's view. These conflicting conclusions reached by scholars greatly confuse our whole understanding of Luke 10:25-37 and its sources. What is clear, however, is that Luke made modifications to Mark's version. The rationale for the changes he made determines what the particular modifications reveal about Luke's overall theology (Ellis 1971:3). I maintain that the Deuteronomy (6:5) and Leviticus (19:18) citations were taken from Mark 12:29-31). However, it must be acknowledged that the Lukan quotation (10:27) has two laws together unlike the Markan (and also Pauline quotation) where the two are stated separately. Funk (1985:375-376) and Miller (1992:142) identify Romans 13:8-10, James 2:8, Galatians 5:14 as paralleling the Lukan account under investigation.

In summary, therefore, comparison of Luke 10:25-37 with the other Synoptic Gospels has demonstrated that Luke has assimilated two stories because he thought that the setting of Mark 12:28-34 would not make good sense to his non-Jewish audience. The setting of Luke 10:25-37 appears far less hostile than the original challenge of Mark 12, and the question posed in Mark 10:17 was from a genuine seeker. In any case, as I have indicated in my discussion in sub-section 3.1.2.2, Luke was looking for a place to embed the parable of the Good Samaritan (10:30-35). Now the interesting question is why he was so keen to include the parable of the Good Samaritan. I respond to this question in sub-section 3.1.3 but before doing so, I want to discuss the differences between Luke 10:25-37 and the other Synoptic Gospels.

3.1.2.4 Major differences between Luke 10:25-37 and the other Synoptic Gospels

I share the views held by many scholars, such as Lambrecht (1981:75-77), Drury (1985:133), Fitzmyer (1972:883) and Marshall (1989:441), to name but a few, who argue that the account in Luke was a re-working of the episode in Mark. They maintain that the setting of the text in Mark and Matthew seems to indicate the same location for the incident, Jerusalem, since it comes after the description of Jesus' triumphant entry into Jerusalem (Mark 11:1-11, Matthew 21:1-10). However, I disagree with suggestions by some scholars such as Marshall (1989:441), and Ellis (1981:159), for a Jerusalem location in the case of Luke 10:25-37 because there is insufficient evidence to guarantee such a proposition. They base their submission on the fact that Luke 10:30-35 mentions Jerusalem but they ignore the fact that this is a story attributed to Jesus by Luke. The story referred to (10:30-35) is a narrative within a narrative which in no way describes the place of the encounter between Jesus and the lawyer. Furthermore, in Mark the setting is important because of where he locates it, in Jerusalem during the last days before Jesus' crucifixion. It is the contention of this thesis that since Luke has reconstructed the Markan source for his own purposes the Jerusalem setting is irrelevant here. It should be noted that in Luke's Gospel the triumphal entry into Jerusalem comes much later (19:28-38) than the parable of the Good Samaritan (10:25-37).

In both Luke and Matthew the opponent who Jesus encounters is a lawyer whose motive, the narrator informs us, was to subject him to a test (Luke 10:25). There may seem to be a similarity in motive in Matthew 22:35 but this is not so because Luke has reworked the lawyer's question so that instead of a question about the greatest commandment in the law, Luke has the lawyer ask about the requirements for him to inherit eternal life (10:25). Furthermore, it is the lawyer, not Jesus as in Mark, who quotes the double commandment of the law to love God and one's neighbour (Luke 10:27). The question put to Jesus is exclusively Lukan. In the Greek of Luke, it reads as, *zoen aionion* (to inherit eternal life). Internal evidence within the Lukan corpus reveals that the same expression surfaces again at 18:18: "Good Teacher, what shall I do to inherit eternal life?" However, the context in which the two questions arise is different, for in Luke 18:18 the question is posed by a ruler as in Mark 10:17 while in 10:25 it is a lawyer. There are striking similarities with the account in Luke 18:18. However, the view held by Marshall (1989:442) and Van Daalen (1976:108), that the appearance of the same question several times suggests the fact that the issue at hand was one that excited great interest at the time and may well have been discussed widely by the custodians of the Jewish law, is not convincing. This is because it overlooks the process of redaction on the part of Luke in the composition of Luke 10:25-37.

The verb in Luke 10:25b, *ekpeirazein* (trying to test), also found in 4:12, sheds more light on the independent source of the text under investigation as it is unlike the verb in Matthew (22:35) that implies "tempted him." This is a favourite term of Luke, which he puts into Markan texts to show the insincerity of the religious authorities (such as the Pharisees and Sadducees). The fact that such differences exist is further underscored by the fact that the motive of the lawyer in Luke is entirely absent in the Markan account on which Luke is thought to have depended. Even though both Luke and Matthew have the opponent as a "lawyer," it must be noted that the expression employed in Matthew, *heis ex auton nomikos*, is different from that of Luke. It is only in Luke that one comes across a single term that drives home the meaning of a single expert of the law confronting Jesus. However, in the Gospel of Luke, *nomikos* occurs seven times, while it only occurs once in Matthew and is non-existent in Mark. Apart from Luke 10:25, in the other six instances of the term

nomikos, lawyers are put together with Pharisees and are portrayed as hostile to Jesus (7:30; 11:45, 46, 52, 53; 14:3). Regarding the use of the term *nomikos*, one would be justified in arguing for exclusively Lukan material here, for its use would be more acceptable to a Gentile audience than a reference to scribes and Pharisees. It must be remembered that Luke's choice reflects the language of the Greek world. In the corresponding passage at Matthew 22:35, the term is also employed though in this particular instance the lawyer referred to is part of a group of Pharisees and Sadducees who confronted Jesus.

Therefore, I note six major differences that occur between Luke and the other two Synoptic Gospels.

(1) In Luke 10:26, Jesus responds with a counter-question to the question of the lawyer; which culminates in the lawyer himself becomes the respondent in the process.

(2) Unlike Luke, Matthew and Mark record Jesus as giving the answer.

(3) Furthermore, it is only Luke who records the peculiar question: "What is written in the law? How do you read?" (Luke 10:26).

(4) There are also a number of differences among the three Gospels in the wording of the two laws cited e.g., the handling of citations from the Pentateuch by Luke is striking (Greek, *Pentateuchos* - meaning five-volumed - refers to the first five books of the Old Testament: Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy). Luke does not maintain the two laws as separate, transforming them to such an extent that they become one law. There are, however, a number of differences in the accounts themselves. The corpus under investigation portrays the lawyer quoting Deuteronomy 6:4-5 and Leviticus 19:18. The wording in Deuteronomy 6:4-5 which is in agreement with that recorded in Joshua 22:5, is quoted in Luke apart from the Lukan addition of "and with all your mind" taking the fourth position. However, this is not to overlook the fact that the text and wording of the Lukan account, in comparison with that in the Pentateuch is problematic, justifying the claim of Marshall (1989:443) that the textual order in Luke is "confused." This has been

rationalised by a number of scholars who have argued that Luke could have been following a version based on the Hebrew. To this has been added the Hebrew translation of "mind" to mean "heart." Although it cannot be assumed that Luke was quoting Issachar 5:2; 7:6; Testament Dan 5:3 (c. 109 BC) explicitly, there is a sense in which, Luke 10:27 echoes this text.

The Markan account, like Luke, also has four phrases though the order is different to that of Luke; while Matthew has only three phases. According to my knowledge, no version of the Old Testament law is in existence that records four human aspects in the exhortation to love God, therefore it is certain that Luke derived the fourth phrase from Mark and that Matthew dropped it because of his tendency to retain the known text. It is sufficient to point out here that the original text of Deuteronomy 6:5 in Hebrew maintains only three terms heart, soul, and might. The fact that the lawyer refers to written Scripture is supported by versus 26-27, which goes to prove that there must have been in existence an epitome of law to which some Jews adhered.

(5) In both Luke and Matthew the opponent addresses Jesus as "Teacher," the Greek *didaskalos* (10:25d). While the title is absent in Mark 12:28 he does use *didaskalos* in the story of the rich young ruler (Mark 10:17). Luke incorporated the term *didaskalos* to suit his Greek-speaking audience. It is being employed here in the sense that this was the term that was acceptable among his Gentile audience. Contrary to Mark and Matthew, where the main emphasis is on the law of Moses, the Lukan use of the term "Teacher" has nothing to do with the law.

(6) In Luke, it is Jesus, who gives the approval to the answer of the lawyer, while in the corresponding passage in Mark it is the scribe who endorses the answer of Jesus (Mark 12:32-33). Not only does the character that gives the approval differ, but even the content of the affirmation. In Luke Jesus is portrayed as affirming the law while, in Mark, the scribe is seen to be proving Jesus right in his response. On the basis of texts like Luke 4:16-30 we have no need to posit a separate source for Luke since he is perfectly capable of editing his sources to say what he wants in line with his own ideological interests. What Luke does is

create a verbal challenge or challenge and riposte situation that makes greater sense than the version of Mark. In Mark we expect a negative response from the scribe but it ends positively with Jesus commending someone who started out trying to trap him (Mark 12:34). From the foregoing argument, it is clear that Luke heavily edited his Markan source just as he did in Luke 4:16-30. What can be said here therefore is that either Luke or one of his sources edited Mark.

3.1.3 Why the inclusion of the parable of the Good Samaritan (Luke 10:30-35)?

The narrative context (10:25-29, 36, 37) and the parable of the Good Samaritan (10:30-35) unveils the Lukan theology of Jesus' mission to the Gentiles (see also Acts 8). Enslin (1943:281; see also Ford 1984:91) observes that the discourse in Luke 10:25-37 was intended to demonstrate that the launching of the Gentile mission was part and parcel of the plan of God. The parable of the Good Samaritan operates as an interpretation of the commandment to love beyond the confines of our boundaries (Talbert 1986:120, see also Ford 1984:91). According to Enslin, Luke 10:25-37 falls within the corpus of Jesus' journey to Jerusalem and his activities there leading to his crucifixion. Enslin (1943:277-297; see also Ford 1984:91) further notes that apart from a partial mention of Samaritans in Matthew 10:5, both Mark and Matthew exhibit a significant omission of Jesus' mission to the Gentiles. To make matters even worse, the entire New Testament is silent on the mention of Samaria, apart from Acts and John 4. Enslin (1943:281) views the reference to Samaritans in this section of Luke's Gospel as foreseeing the dispatching of the seventy to carry on the mission of God across the world. On the other hand Sellin (1974:19-60) maintains that we could be dealing here with a real life situation in which Luke employs the figure of a Samaritan in order to demonstrate the hostile relationship that existed between Samaritans and Jews. Contrary to the views held by Sellin (1974:19-60), Montefiore (1968:467; see also Linnemann 1966:51-55) argues that the original manuscript would only have included the priest, the Levite, and an Israelite, because the inclusion of a Samaritan undermines the reality of the time under consideration. However, to accept these arguments would mean missing the significance of the parable, which was to contrast the Samaritan with the Jew

(Linnemann 1966:41). To consider the purpose of the discourse in 10:25-37) as being a mission to the Gentiles fits into the Lukan framework, as the story is followed by the mission of the seventy (seventy-two) to spread the Gospel to the entire world.

The scandalous twist of the story is that Jews could not receive any form of assistance from non-Jews (Marshall 1978:465). The focus Luke gives to the parable of the Good Samaritan is not on how Jesus acted but on what Christians of the Lukan period should "do" (Talbert 1986:122). This can be summarised as follows.

- (1) Love does not limit itself to friends but has a universal scope (2:32; 3:6; 4:25-27). I agree with the contribution of Pilch and Malina (1993:110-114) which is valuable here as they submit that in the first-century love was related to belonging to a group; thus, to show love the way in which the Good Samaritan does is to redefine group inclusiveness and therefore those to whom group obligations are owed.
- (2) Love does not look for recompense (6:32-36).
- (3) Love is not limited by clean and unclean laws (Acts 10:15). Similarly, Ford (1984:92) views the compassion of the Samaritan as transcending "national and racial barriers." According to Jones (1964:115), the parable of the Good Samaritan (10:25-37) should be understood as "a damning indictment of social, racial, and religious superiority." Indeed Ford (1984:93-94) is right here when he argues that Jesus is perceived as violating the first-century purity standard of his society in a highly provocative manner when "he commands a new attitude towards Samaritans" (10:33-37).

3.1.4 Summary

Clearly, the dependence of Luke's opening scenario (10:25-28) on Mark 12:28-34 is evident though he has changed the opening context to suit his own ideological interests. Furthermore, the most distinctive material in Luke's account (10:30-35) does not derive from Mark. To account for the presence of so much material in Luke 10:25-37 that is not

contained in Mark or Matthew, material of theological significance, one must conclude either that Luke had access to an independent source other than or in addition to Mark or that he exercised judicious independence and literary imagination in embellishing the Markan material. Therefore, Luke 10:25-37 is different from the rest of the synoptic accounts. Intertextuality concerns the analysis of a text word by word seeking potential sources. The conclusions arrived at in this section are merely historical. It remains now in the following sections to pursue these conclusions and explore them further for their significance and motive in the understanding of Luke 10:25-37. The use of data derived from this intertextual analysis along with other methods that follow in subsequent sections of this chapter underscores the value of socio-rhetorical criticism in the analysis of parables today. The next section continues the demonstration by analysing "inner features" (Robbins 1996a:49) in Luke 10:25-37 that should be in place for us to understand the structure and word patterns employed by the author.

3.2 "INNER TEXTURE:" UNMASKING THE INSIDE OF LUKE 10:25-37

3.2.1 Introduction

The relationship of Luke 10:25-37 to prior texts as described in section 3.1, specifies potential clues and sources of the text under investigation necessary to achieve the goals and objectives of intertextuality. These sources are merely historical and can only accomplish adequate meaning by unmasking the features of language, which is the concern of this section. Unmasking the inside of a text is part of a tradition of literal rhetorical analysis that goes back to the classical world, whose educational system was established on the examination of word patterns, system of speaking, and writing as part of communication (Bailey & Broek 1992:31). The power of speech acquired through mastery of the techniques of the "art of persuasion" lay at the heart of classical education and was highly respected in the Greco-Roman society (Lambrecht 1989:239). The current interest in rhetorical analysis among New Testament scholars can be traced back to Amos N. Wilder's *Early Christian Rhetoric* (1964). This work was a major turning point in the analysis of language, speech, communication and rhetoric as far as in the situation of the beginning of Christianity was concerned. Although most rhetorical studies have confined themselves to Pauline letters, quite recently some scholars, like Kennedy (1984), Mack (1989, 1990), and Robbins (1984, 1989, 1994, 1996a, 1996b, to cite a few of his many works), have applied rhetorical analysis to segments of the Gospels and Acts. Robbins, who has consciously followed in the footsteps of Wilder and other scholars, has played a key role in this development.

In Robbins' work, the systematic study of words as channels of communication has come to be known as *inner texture* (1996a:27-30, 44-95, 1996b:7-39). *Inner texture* is the analysis that examines the style, thought and argumentation the author employs in a text as it is important in the understanding of the exegesis of a text (Robbins 1996a:46). The analysis examines the interaction between words, voices and argumentation (Robbins 1996a:46).

In employing this strategy on Luke 10:25-37, this section seeks: (1) to determine statistically the frequency of items; (2) to analyse the different voices embedded in the text; (3) to describe the arrangement and structure of the text; and (4) to analyse the structure of argumentation (Robbins 1996a:44-95, 1996b:7-39). The objective of the analysis is to gain insight into the style and manner of communication contained in Luke 10:25-37. Analysing the literary style (such as the choice of words, structure) of a text highlights how the author employs words to achieve his/her purpose. This analysis fits into the whole framework of socio-rhetorical criticism because socio-rhetorical criticism proceeds on the premise that words reflect human experience.

3.2.2. Frequency of items in Luke 10:25-37

My basic concern in this sub-section is to determine statistically the frequency of items in Luke 10:25-37. Frequency of items refers to the repetition of words in the passage. The frequency with which a certain word or phrase occurs in a given text is what Robbins (1996a:46-50, 1996b:8-14) refers to as *repetitive-progressive texture*. According to Robbins (1996b:9) *repetitive-progressive-texture* occurs in "sequences (progressions) of words and phrases" which may "alternate with one another" in a given unit to convey meaning to the reader. The significance of this analysis is to demonstrate the contextual or topical reasons why the author chose certain words to go into his/her text.

The procedure to use in determining the frequency of an item in a text such as Luke 10:25-37 is to mark items that have been repeated in the text and display them in tabular form (Robbins 1996b:8). Among the various items an interpreter may look for in a discourse are themes, place names, and characterisation, to name but a few (Robbins 1996a:48-49). In

this analysis an attempt is also made to observe which sentences are matched with other words, phrases, or sentences in the given structure. The importance of this analysis is that it provides insights for understanding the nature of word patterns that produce meaning when analysed together. Most of the conclusions drawn in this sub-section will be based on counts of words, phrases, or themes that occur more than once in Luke 10:25-37. These will be shown statistically in the form of a table where possible. Table 1 highlights major characters in Luke 10:25-37 and the emphasis of their dialogue.

Table 1

Narrative employment of dialogue between Jesus and the lawyer in Luke 10: 25-37

25. lawyer I (lawyer)	test	Inherit eternal life	teacher him (Jesus)	
26. you (lawyer)			he (Jesus)	
27. he (lawyer)				love neighbour do this
28. him (lawyer)		Live	he (Jesus)	
you (lawyer)				
you (lawyer)				
29. he (lawyer)	justify		Jesus	neighbour
himself (lawyer)				
30. my (lawyer)		half dead	Jesus	
31.				
32.				
33.				
34.				compassion care care
35.				
36. you (lawyer)				neighbour
37. he (lawyer)			Jesus	mercy do likewise
him (lawyer)				

Two main characteristics stand out in Table 1: Jesus and the lawyer are the main focus of the entire story; and furthermore, four basic issues unfold from Table 1.

- (1) The Lukan Jesus and the Jewish lawyer are portrayed as the dominant speakers in this episode. Jesus is mentioned three times by name (10:29, 30, 37), thrice by personal pronouns (10:25, 26, 28) and once as "teacher" (10:25). Similarly, the lawyer is mentioned by his title only once (10:25) and thirteen times by way of personal pronouns (10:25-30, 36-37). This reveals a pattern in which a lawyer interacts with Jesus in dialogue. The analysis of the dialogue between the Lukan Jesus and the lawyer is important because the actual perceptions that people have of the world is determined by the language they speak and this also influences their interpretations of experiences.

- (2) The frequency of the attempt to trap Jesus in the discourse by the lawyer is portrayed by the two phrases "test" and "justify" (10:25, 29); and this is crucial in our understanding of the hidden motives and intentions of the opponent of Jesus in the encounter.

- (3) This is followed by the frequency that highlights the theme of "love" (occurs once, 10:27) and "neighbour" (occurs three times, 10:27, 28, 35) which covers "compassion" (occurs once, 10:33), "mercy" (occurs once, 10:37), "care" (occurs twice, 10:34), and "do" (occurs twice, 10:28, 37) attributed to the Samaritan (10:33-37). Luke here underscores the theme of neighbourly love. Love is defined in the first-century world of Luke in terms of belonging and attachment, not in terms of some sort of emotional response, as is the case in the contemporary Western world (Pilch & Malina 1993:110-114). In the context of Luke 10:25-37, the Samaritan treats the injured traveller as though he were a member of his own group, that is, as though they were attached in a way that required him to behave as he did. In a sense "neighbour" in this context implies the same thing. The significance of this finding lies in the fact that the extraordinary actions of compassion exhibited by the Samaritan towards the wounded Jew on the Jerusalem-Jericho road would have been at that time shocking. Many scholars have doubted whether such a generous Samaritan ever existed in first-century Palestine (see Young 1992:63) because he is portrayed as exceeding the confines of love: "to love one's enemy" (6:27), then is to act with social attachment

toward those from whom one is disattached. Even "neighbour" includes the enemy, not just one's fellow ethnics" (Pilch & Malina 1993:113).

(4) The last frequency involves the theme of life which is hidden in such expressions as "eternal life" (10:25), "live" (10:28); and "half dead" (10:30). These expressions give us information on how the first-century world perceived life now and in the future as it introduces the subject of eschatology (doctrine of the last things).

The people mentioned in Luke 10:25-37 constitute a very significant feature of this story because they bring to us the reality of the encounter between Jesus and those in authority in Jewish society, in this case the lawyer. This is significant because it affects the interaction of Jesus with these authorities in his ministry. However, another notable feature is the existence of a separate narrative, the parable of the Good Samaritan (10:30-35), embedded in that of Jesus' interaction with the lawyer (10:25-37). It is in this narrative within a narrative (10:30-35) that we hear of robbers, an unnamed victim on the Jerusalem-Jericho road, a priest, a Levite, and an innkeeper who exist not as historical characters in their own right, but as characters in the parable attributed to Jesus (10:30-35) by Luke (see also Kingsbury 1991:32). The frequency of these selected items highlights what is going on in the discourse.

3.2.3 Voices in Luke 10:25-37

The opening section features the narrator disclosing that a lawyer attempted to trap Jesus with a question as to what he had to do in order to inherit eternal life (10:25). Luke places his account of the Good Samaritan within a specific frame of reference by introducing the opponent of Jesus as a lawyer at 10:25. First, the narrator offers us preliminary insights into the movements and intentions of the Lukan lawyer (10:25) that he meant to "test" Jesus. Second the narrator recounts the dialogue between Jesus and the lawyer placing particular emphasis upon the Great Commandments in the first part of the dialogue (10:25-28). Third, the narrator stresses the need for love of neighbour to the lawyer by praising a Samaritan

who did good, as opposed to the religious authorities who did nothing (Schweizer 1984: 186). In this narrative, the Lukan Jesus becomes the narrator himself and puts his teaching in the form of a parable without providing any introduction (10:30-37). Throughout his account of this story, the narrator comments upon and emphasises elements of the lawyer's strategies: (1) to "test" Jesus, and (2) seeking to "justify himself" when cornered (10:25, 29). Only when we appreciate the role the narrator plays in the parable of the Good Samaritan can we understand to what purpose Luke uses the figure of a Samaritan in his narrative.

The narrator establishes Luke's point of view from the beginning, and it is his voice that gives form to the various elements of the parable. This accounts for prominence given to a Samaritan, who was on the margins of Jewish society (Talbert 1986:124). Rather than merely paraphrasing the Markan 12:28-34 story (see my discussion in section 3.1), Luke inserts the story of the Good Samaritan into the narrative from Mark using Jesus as the narrator of what Bultmann (1968:178-179) calls an "exemplary parable." Although Luke as the implied narrator takes up the bulk of the Markan material, he uses the figure of the Samaritan to illustrate that the kind of love which God expects overlooks traditional group belongings with its attachments and boundaries, in favour of one constructed along the lines of need (Pilch & Malina 1993:110-114). This is what is so radical about the parable in its first-century context and it is also why Luke could use it to make a point within his own community. Luke is redefining what love means in the Christian context: it is no longer about group belonging and attachment but is now based on the need of the other. In the early Church that was potentially a very useful innovation, since it meant that the urban elite whom Luke seems concerned to address should not simply behave along the traditional lines of social group belonging and attachment but should take responsibility for those with needs in their own Christian community, and possibly outside as well.

At the close of the account, the narrator returns to a brief and provocative question: "Which of these three (priest, Levite and Samaritan), do you think proved neighbour to the man who fell among the robbers?" (10:37). Structurally, the use of a first-person narrator for the parable unifies the parable with its wider narrative context; thematically, the presence of a narrator links the concerns of the parable to his contemporary audience, since the narrator

intrudes upon the action of the parable, providing us with a contemporary point of view (York 1991: 127). The narrator (of the Gospel of Luke) thus uses the figure of a Samaritan as a means of exploring human failure and neglect (10:30-32), while stressing a Christlike perfection that can be achieved only if we "do" like the Samaritan (10:33-37) in the story.

In the story that the Lukan Jesus recites to the lawyer, Jesus introduces six other characters within the Lukan narrative: victim, robbers, priest, Levite, Samaritan, and innkeeper. These characters do not take part in the dialogue that Luke portrays between Jesus and the lawyer directly as characters but are referred to in the narration of Jesus. The significance of their inclusion is that they are being used as foils for other characters in the story in order for Luke to employ them "negatively" to highlight a theme of Jesus' mission, such as the mission to the Gentiles (Kingsbury 1991:34). Among these characters, only one of them, the Samaritan is made to speak through the narration of the Lukan Jesus.

3.2.4 The structure of Luke 10:25-37

A detailed analysis of the structure of Luke 10:25-37 will serve to make sense of the meaning of the text by determining the individual parts and the way they are structured. Any interpretation of Luke 10:25-37 in its Lukan setting must take into account the structure not only of the parable (10:30-35) itself but also of the dialogue between Jesus and a Jewish expert of the law (10:25-29, 36, 37, see Table 2 on the following page).

Table 2
Dialogue Structure of Luke 10: 25-37

ROUND ONE

- Lawyer (Question 1): "What must I do to inherit eternal life?" (v.25)
Jesus (Question 2): "What is written in the law? How do you read?" (v.26)
Lawyer (Answer to 2): "Love God and your neighbour as yourself" (v.27)
Jesus (Answer to 1): "Do this and you will live" (v. 28)

ROUND TWO

- Lawyer (Question 3): "Who is my neighbour?" (v.29)
Jesus recites the parable of the Good Samaritan (vss.30-35)
Jesus (Question 4): "Which of these three was a neighbour?" (v.36)
Jesus (Answer to 3): "Go, and you also do likewise" (v.37)

Source: Bailey (1976: 74). Verbatim based on the Revised Standard Version of the Bible

Table 2 highlights the two main parts of the text under discussion, which have been identified by observing how Luke uses argumentation in his account by many scholars. In this way Crossan (1972:285-307), Bailey (1983:72-75), Schweizer (1984:184-185), and Tolbert (1986:121-122) have managed to identify two units in the structure of Luke 10:25-37 namely (1) 10:25-28; and (2) 10:30-37, as is shown in Table 2. The hidden depth of the double-controversy dialogue can be discerned if we analyse first of all the two questions with which the lawyer addresses Jesus (see Table 2). It is interesting to see in Table 2 that to the two-question sequence asked by the lawyer there is also a two-answer sequence provided by the lawyer himself. In the first part, as Table 2 shows, the lawyer asks Jesus a

question about eternal life (10:25). In a counter-move, Jesus turns the question back to him (10:26). It is the lawyer himself who gives the answer as shown in Table 2. To the answer of the lawyer, Jesus only gives approval. Why he asked something that he already knew is summed up in the narration, that he had set out to trap Jesus (10:25). However, the scenario gives us a glimpse into the whole situation in which some of the leading Jewish leaders, faced with the complexity of rules and regulations which had sprang up around the law of Moses, were trying to bring out its central intention, as in the case in this dialogue. They were giving prominence to one or other "great commandment" on which all others would depend.

The Jewish teacher of the law, finding himself on common ground with Jesus regarding the law cited (10:27-28), still looks for an argument by which he can put Jesus in the wrong. He probes further for a definition of "neighbour" (10:29). Jesus, in his response, appears to show that it is a completely wrong question. Many scholars have observed a rhetorical shift here following the response of Jesus. Jesus appears to be saying to the lawyer that the proper question to ask is "To whom can I be a neighbour?" By narrating the parable, Jesus takes the whole question out of the field of theoretical, academic debate and places it in a real-life situation. The road from Jerusalem to Jericho descended 1,200 metres over a distance of little more than 30 kilometres (Fitzmyer 1981:880-883). It was a narrow road with sudden turnings, ideal for ambushes, and was a hunting ground of robbers and gangsters. The parable says nothing about the motives of the priest and the Levite. We are simply to assume that they ignored the wounded man because they did not want to get involved. The dramatic point of the story is that the third man, who is the hero, is one of the hated Samaritans. Jesus chose him to bring out the exhortation to absolute unselfishness of love and service to all humankind regardless of who they are. The wounded man was neighbour to the Levite and the priest as much as he was to the Samaritan. The difference is that they might have theorised about this like the lawyer while the Samaritan simply acted, as neighbour to a man in need and thereby effectively became his neighbour.

That Luke 10:25-37 constitutes a literary unit is being assumed in this study (see also Marshall 1989:440-441). It is united both by grammatical evidence and by an elaborate

pattern of repetition leading to the theme of neighbourly love (for a fuller explanation of the theory underlying the unity of vs. 29 and 36 on grammatical grounds see Young 1992). I disagree with Marshall (1989:445) when he traces three difficulties of viewing Luke 10:25-28 and 10:29-37 as a literary unit: (1) the linkage plays down the dialogue of the lawyer as it only gives it an introductory status in relation to 10:25-28; (2) The linkage is problematic in the sense that Jesus fails to answer the question of the lawyer; (3) The text would be a redaction on the part of Luke if it relies on Mark. As though this was not enough, Funk (1966:210) also argues for discontinuity between the two questions: "Who is my neighbour?" (10:29) and "Which of these three do you think was neighbour to the man?" (10:36). Others also argue that 10:29-37 are later additions. The fact that these difficulties exist does not imply that the text is not a literary unit.

Taking these assertions seriously, I also disagree that Luke 10:29-37 is a major turning point in the structure of Luke 10:25-37, because it does not indicate a major transition in the mood of the Lukan Jesus and the direction of thought of the Gospel of Luke. The opening of the section, 10:25, begins with a question from the lawyer. The lawyer, pretending to want to know the requirements of the law for him to inherit eternal life, asks the question, "What must I do to inherit eternal life?" (10:25). Luke presents Jesus as responding by a counter-question (10:26): "What is written in the law? How do you read?" It is my argument that the two parts are held together by the key words "neighbour" (10:27, 36) and "do" (10:25, 28, 37). These terms hold the supposedly two parts of 10:25-37 together. However, the two parts do go together, as the argument flows through to the end. Without the first section (10:25-28) it would be difficult to understand the second section (10:29-37). The first sentence (10:25) sets forth authoritatively the central fact of the text. The first sentences of Luke 10:25, and 29 prefigure the story's concern with the nature of the controversial dialogue between Jesus and the lawyer. It is important to note here that the framework of the story is made clear in the opening sentence in order to build a story upon it. The first sentence can help us in determining many elements of the style, the structure and purpose of the author. Luke has Jesus assuming the role of a lawyer in the first encounter when he begins to question the lawyer in a socratic fashion. Effectively Jesus is portrayed as putting the lawyer on the defensive in a contest of challenge and riposte.

The middle section features the counter-questions of Jesus that he throws back to the lawyer, and the story that Jesus cites. To the lawyer, a Samaritan being the one given credit is contrary to his expectations and those of his fellow Jews. The supposedly Lukan transition in verse 29 merely indicates that what follows from there deals with the lawyer's self-justification as he has failed with the first plot. Therefore, I do not see a major shift in the response of Jesus (10:30-37) to the question by the lawyer (10:29) because Jesus is urging the lawyer to transcend Jewish established limits of love and neighbour (10:29) to "include the sinner, the poor, the enemy" (10:30-37; see Robert Tannehill 1986:180). This does not drastically affect the unity of the argument in the discourse. The service that Luke portrays the Samaritan to have carried out should supposedly have been done by the Jewish religious elite: priest and Levite because they were worth of great honour in Jewish eyes.

The effect of this controversial dialogue between Jesus and the lawyer as Luke portrays it reaches its final conclusion at 10:36, 37. However, in the conclusion, the parable ends with a question by the Lukan Jesus: "Which of these three do you think proved neighbour to the man who fell among the robbers?" (10:36). Therefore, the response of the lawyer (10:37): "The one who showed mercy" provides the conclusion to the discussion, which began at 10:25 and stresses the unity of the narrative.

3.2.5 Rhetorical argument

In this sub-section I will seek to (1) determine the species or genre of rhetoric represented by Luke 10:25-37, and (2) describe the arrangement of material or the structure of the argument. The aim of the analysis is to discern the significant element of speech, the kind of strategy used to strengthen the argument and to derive from it the maximum persuasive power.

3.2.5.1 The Rhetorical Genre

Now that the significant structural features of Luke 10:25-37 has been reviewed in subsection 3.2.4; the outline of the rhetorical argumentation can be completed. A knowledge of the rhetorical patterns practised in the Hellenistic world in which the Gospel of Luke was written would serve to shed light not only on instances where the Lukan Jesus gives advice but also where he defends himself or his disciples. In the classical world it was widely accepted that three genres of rhetoric existed, each having its own particular focus, setting, purpose, time and emphasis. These three genres were (1) *forensic (judicial) rhetoric*, which was, as its name implies, the rhetoric of the law court and was focused on justice, (2) *hortatory (deliberative) rhetoric*, which was the rhetoric for public assemblies in which the speaker sought to persuade people to adopt some course of action in the future or to dissuade them from some intended action; (3) *epideictic (demonstrative) rhetoric* which was directed to consolidate communal values through praise or blame (Cicero, *De Oratore*, 2.114-129; Bailey & Broek, 1992:130; Kennedy 1963:87, 1980:72).

It is, of course, beyond reasonable doubts that Lukan argumentation in Luke 10:25-37, in one degree or another, was shaped by the dominant influence of Hellenism and, in particular, Hellenistic rhetoric. Among the early Christians, Luke is one of the more likely candidates to have received a formal education in rhetoric, because the quality of his Greek indicates that he was a cultured writer. Rhetoricians in antiquity discussed the social aspect of speech because it portrays the character of the speaker (known as *ethos*) and the mind of the audience (known as *pathos*) as it affects persuasion. Through artful words the speaker sought to move the audience to praise for individuals. Although the term rhetoric has been previously used negatively as ornamental speech intended to manipulate emotions and opinion (Kennedy 1963:61-68), I am using the term here to refer to the argumentative discourse in Luke 10:25-37. The significance of the study of Luke 10:25-37 in the light of rhetorical analysis sheds more light on the unity of the entire Lukan argument in the text under consideration.

In my view, Luke 10:25-37 contains features of *deliberative rhetoric*, found particularly in the section where Jesus exhorts the lawyer to act in a certain way, in this instance to "go" and act like the Samaritan. From the Lukan perspective, the whole narrative is intended to persuade the readers to act like the Samaritan if they are to fulfil the law regarding "love of one's neighbour." I have based this conclusion on my analysis of *deliberative genre* in 10:29-37, where Jesus seeks to encourage the lawyer regarding future actions by demonstrating to him acceptable actions in contrast to unacceptable actions through the parable (10:30-35). Jesus sought to change the behaviour of his audience by getting them to decide on a more appropriate form of action than their existing behaviour. At most he says that the priest and the Levite did not behave in a neighbour-like fashion. Thus, there are elements both of persuasion and dissuasion in the discourse between the Lukan Jesus and the Jewish expert in the Law of Moses.

Luke has Jesus concerned more with persuading the lawyer to adopt a certain course of action towards those in need if he is to inherit eternal life. He begins his appeal to this new course of action through his reference to the observance of the law in Luke 10:26-28, and then follows this up in Luke 10:36-37. Some scholars have suggested that there is a significant shift in the imperative need of the Lukan Jesus following verse 29. They argue that Jesus fails to answer directly the question of the lawyer (10:29) but proceeds to present the actions of a good neighbour (10:30-37). My analysis of *deliberative conventions* suggests that this section (10:29-37) is in agreement with the logic of the argument begun earlier at verse 25.

3.2.5.2 The structure of the argument

In the classical world, rhetoricians viewed the structure of speech as composed of six parts: (1) *exordium* (introduction); (2) *narratio* (narration); (3) *propositio* (proposition); (4) *probatio* (confirmation); (5) *refutatio* (refutation); (6) *peroratio* (conclusion) [Kennedy 1963:11; Cobert 1971:299-338; Bailey & Broek 1992:130]. However, not all of these parts were present in every speech because different genres required different structures. Since

Luke 10:25-37 corresponds fairly well with the arrangement advocated in the classical world, I will now analyse each part of the argument in this narrative unit in the light of the outlines suggested by Mack and Robbins (1989:132-133).

Table 3 (see Table on the following page) shows that Luke 10:25-37 depicts the Lukan Jesus as a person with authority as 'teacher' (*ethos*) and underlines the audiences' need to accept his teaching even if this involves going against the traditionally accepted limits of "love" and "neighbourliness" (10:30-37). Jesus' powerful employment of argument in Luke 10:25-37, through counter-questions and a story emphasises his authority to interpret God's law (10:26-28) and invoke his audience to "do" like the Samaritan (10:37).

Table 3 shows that a major component of the dialogue in Luke 10:25-37 switches to interrogative form (see for example 10:25, 26, 28, 29, 36). The main objective of the Lukan lawyer's argument is to persuade Jesus to reaffirm his adherence to an exclusively Jewish interpretation of the law which had nothing to do with Gentiles (see for instance "argument by definition" as analysed in Table 3). These are the essential points that the Lukan Jesus addresses in his controversial story (10:30-35) by way of "argument by example" as elaborated in Table 3. In his "argument by example," the Lukan Jesus moves from exhortation of the lawyer to a basic definition of neighbour (10:30-37) in a slightly different way than the lawyer had expected. The point of the dispute regards the nature as to who qualified to be neighbour to the lawyer, a Jew.

In achieving his goal, the Lukan Jesus (10:30-37) presents a series of arguments in defence of the inclusion of the non-Jews into the plan of God. The two major lines of evidence are (1) the compassion of the Samaritan to a Jew (10:33-35), (2) removing hostility between Jews and Samaritans (10:33-37), and (3) that Gentiles, such as the Samaritan in the story, can inherit the Kingdom of God (implied indirectly in 10:33-37), and (4) that religious leaders cannot enter the Kingdom of God because of their legalistic tendencies (implied indirectly in 10:30-37).

Table 3 - The Rhetorical Structure of the argument in Luke 10: 25-37

Introduction

"And behold, a lawyer stood up to put him to the test, saying, ..." (vs. 25)

The introduction (exordium) in this corpus defines the character (ethos) of the questioner as a lawyer and that the issue he intends to address was merely to trap Jesus.

Statement of the case

"Teacher what shall I do to inherit eternal life" (vs.25)

The question that the Jewish expert of the law poses to Jesus defines the subject to be addressed by Jesus.

"Argument from Example in written testimony"

He said to him, "What is written in the law? How do you read?" vs.26)

Jesus asks the lawyer to recall what is written in the law of Moses and he asks him as to how he reads and interprets the law.

Analogy

And 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 neighbour as yourself." (v27)

The lawyer cites the law of Moses from Scripture that presents the commandment to love God and neighbour. The lawyer here states the central theses to be proven in the course of this dialogue.

Confirmation

And he said to him, "You have answered right, do this, and you will live" (vs28).

Jesus acknowledges the law as recited by the lawyer and gives him his approval.

Argument by definition

But he desiring to justify himself, said to Jesus, "Who is my neighbour?" (v.29)

In legal circles, argument revolves around definition of facts. And the dialogue between Jesus and the lawyer is no exception. The lawyer wants to ascertain the key term in his answer so that he can pin Jesus down. The concept of "neighbour" was a disputed fact; hence the need to justify his argument.

Argument by example

Jesus replied, "A man was going down from Jerusalem to Jericho, and he fell among robbers, who stripped him and beat him, and departed, leaving him half dead. Now by chance a priest was going down that road; and when he saw him he passed by on the other side of the road. So likewise a Levite, when he saw him, passed by on the other side. But a Samaritan, as he journeyed, came to where he was; and when he saw him, he had compassion, and went to him and bound up his wounds, pouring on oil and wine; then he set on his own beast and brought him to an inn, and took care of him. And the next day he took out two denarri and gave them to the innkeeper, saying, "Take care of him; and whatever more you spend, I will repay you when I come back" (vss. 30-35).

In this citation, the Lukan Jesus is attempting to persuade the lawyer by appealing to the more specific situation rather than the more general. Perelman (1969: 30) observed that "argumentation by example - by the very fact that one has resorted to it - implies disagreement over the particular rule the example is invoked to establish." Indeed, this is the case of the dispute in this context. The example introduces something contrary to the expectations of the lawyer in particular and Jews at large.

Comparison

Which of these three do you think proved neighbour to the man who fell among the robbers? (vs. 36).

The dialogue reaches the climax where the lawyer is now asked to compare the characters involved in the story cited so that he could find the answer to his own query as to who is the neighbour.

Rationale as conclusion

He said, "The one who showed mercy on him." And Jesus said to him., "Go and do likewise" (vs. 37.)

The conclusion begins where the argument started. The lawyer himself gives an answer and is challenged to go and do like the Samaritan.

The verbatim which is italicised in Table 3 is based on the Revised Standard Version of the Bible

In the *exhortation* (10:28, 37) Luke encourages the lawyer to re-evaluate himself and live within the requirements of the law as well as supersede the law when required to save human life (see “confirmation & rationale as conclusion” in Table 3). To go and “do” like the Samaritan meant removing obstacles that were in between the Jews and Samaritans to reach out to those in need. In this citation, the Lukan Jesus is attempting to persuade the lawyer by appealing to the more specific situation rather than the general. The lawyer made it a disputed fact for Jesus introduces something contrary to the expectations of the lawyer in particular and Jews in general (see the “comparison and conclusion” in Table 3).

The “comparison” in Table 3 employed by the Lukan Jesus in the narrative denounces the Jewish religious leaders because of their failure of objectivity and puts in the limelight a Samaritan. It is indeed startling to reconcile the situation created by Luke that a lawyer, who was a professional, would address a layman as “teacher” and a question about the law. The argument ends with “go and do likewise” (10:37) which, in fact, relates directly to the central issue of the dispute in Luke 10: 25-37 (see “statement of the case” and “argument by definition” in Table 3).

The teacher of the law, finding himself on common ground with Jesus regarding the law cited, still looks for an argument by which he can put Jesus in the wrong. He probes further for a definition of neighbour. The employment of conjunctions in Luke 10:25-37 such as: “and” (twenty-four times, “but” (twice), “so” (once), “when” (once); and “then” (once) demonstrates the fact that the corpus under discussion is clearly argumentative (see Table 3).

In the light of the evidence, which I have considered, it is clear that the entire argument between the lawyer and Jesus in Luke 10:25-37 is closely knit and unified. Thus 10:25-28 should not be considered as an introduction to the parable (10:30-35); neither should 10:29, 37 be bracketed off from the rest of the corpus, nor should 10:29 be seen as an insertion. Instead, 10:30-37 should be viewed as an extended discussion of neighbourly love, which is still related to the dialogue, began at verse 25. Any discussion of Luke 10:25-37 which treats any one segment of it as independent from the rest of the argument fails to take into

account the *inner texture* in the light of the rhetorical analysis which has demonstrated the unity of the argument.

3.2.5.3 Summary

This section has looked at the patterns and systems of speaking, writing, and argumentation as a means of communication with special regard to the nature of Robbins' socio-rhetorical criticism, applying its principal determinants of *inner texture* and some of its main consequences to Luke 10:25-37. The overall theme, implicit rather than explicit, has been the contrast between the care for the needy and oppressed shown by the outcast Samaritan, and the negligence of the leaders of Israel. I have suggested that Luke 10:25-37 is *deliberative rhetoric* and argued for the unity of the structure of the argument in the discourse. This analysis of the *inner texture* in Luke 10:25-37 has shed more light on themes, voices and arguments embedded in the text. This analysis now sets the stage for the location of themes in other sections and has yielded insights into the argumentative interaction going on in the discourse. The knowledge in this section can be used in each phase of analysis described in this thesis because when one understands the dynamics the specific features can be more appropriately designed to broaden the understanding of a parable. The section that follows examines Lukan ideology found in concepts, societal institutions, individuals and groups in Luke in a bid to discover the dominant class in the Lukan narrative world.

3.3 IDEOLOGICAL SETTINGS THAT SHAPED THE WORLD OF LUKE 10:25-37

3.3.1 Introduction

The framework of analysis in the previous section was one of using literary and rhetorical techniques to analyse the word patterns, argumentation and structure of Luke 10:25-37. The purpose of this section is to explore further the implications of these themes discovered in section 3.2 to analyse the relationship between individuals and groups. Therefore, this section is focused on the application of the *ideological texture* to Luke 10:25-37. This approach views "language" as "an instrument of ideological contention between the opposing forces that compete for domination and control of the social process" because language defines who we are (Hampton 1990:3, 13). As Roetzel (1985:1) has rightly argued "any person in the world... must view the world through political lens(es)" because "political forces beyond our control impinge on our lives, shape our common destiny, and limit our choices." My major task in this section is to identify signs of representation of Lukan ideology hidden in concepts, societal institutions, individuals and groups in Luke 10:25-37 and then to examine how these relate to the dominant class in Luke's narrative world.

Ideology is difficult to define. This is because the definition is complicated by a number of broader and narrower usages of the term, signifying that there is no standard meaning for the term ideology. However, some clarity may be achieved by defining in advance the perspective from which it is being employed in this study. Robbins (1996a:36 citing Eagleton) defines ideology as "the ways in which what we say and believe connects with the power-structure and power-relations of the society we live in..." Therefore, in this study, the term ideology is being used in the perspective suggested by Robbins in a bid to locate some of the underlying conditions and societal systems which compete for domination and control of power, ultimately having a bearing on the preservation of power in the first-century as exhibited in Luke 10:25-37. Similarly, by "signs of representation" I mean

images, symbols, or words and other expressions in the discourse, which are held to communicate concepts of ideological settings. Luke 10:25-37 needs to be read in the light of the portrayal of the Lukan Jesus dealing with powerful opposition and, furthermore, how the relationships between insiders (Jews) and outsiders (Gentiles) are portrayed in Luke's community.

3.3.2 The social classes depicted in Luke 10:25-37

Palestine was a complex colonial, social and religious formation. Clévenot (1985:50) characterises it in the following terms:

In short, first-century Palestine was a class structured society at every level. At the economic level, the masses were fiercely exploited by the privileged. In politics the priestly class supported by the great landowners, held the mechanism of the state in their hands. Ideologically the ruling class imposed its ideology (essentially the system of purity), which was passed on in diverse ways by groups, sects, and parties.

Further, Lenski (1966:210) has it that "the institutions of government are the primary source of social inequality." According to Lenski (1966:44) the distributive system in agrarian societies in the first instance was determined by two important variables: "need" and "power". For Lenski (1966:31), the concept of need relates to natural desires found in human beings and thus, "a human being has an insatiable appetite for goods and services - no matter how much he produces and consumes, he always desires more." This is in line with the nature of a human being as he/she is egocentric (self-centred). It is this egocentricity that in the history of humanity has contributed to the problem of social and economic inequalities. In this context, Saldarini (1988:23) has observed this phenomenon correctly when he says that "basic needs come first, when they are fulfilled, power determines almost entirely the distribution of surplus." Lenski (1966:44), defining the concept of power in terms of Weberian terminology, maintains that power is "the probability of persons or groups, carrying out their will even when opposed by others." It is in this context of need and power that I am going to discuss the social classes in the first-century as depicted in Luke 10:25-37. Luke 10:25-37 refers to people from three distinct classes.

These are: (1) the lawyer (Pharisees), (2) the priest and Levite, and (3) the Samaritan. I will discuss the Samaritan when I deal with Samaritans and Jews (see sub-section 3.3.4).

3.3.2.1 Lawyer (Pharisees)

Luke 10:25-37 identifies the opponent of Jesus as a lawyer whereas the Matthean (22:35) account identifies him as one of the Pharisees. The term Pharisee in Hebrew simply means "the separated ones." Pharisees emphasised the observance of the law of purity. As a result of this emphasis, they ensured that they separated themselves from unclean things, as the Levitical laws required, but this also involved separation from unclean persons such as lepers, women in general and especially after childbirth, men with bodily discharges (see Leviticus 12-14) and the dead (Numbers 19). It must be pointed out that this kind of separation was a requirement for all Jews (Josephus, *Against Apion* 1.42-43; 2.227-228, 232-235, 272-273; see also Romans 9: 30-10:4) although they could not match the oral "Torah" of the Pharisees.

Following their strict observance of the law, they also separated themselves from other Jews (Neusner 1979:22). It is not an easy task to categorise with certainty the religious movements of 2,000 years ago, because of the limitations of our sources. However, according to Josephus (*Jewish war* 2.162), the Pharisees were "the most accurate interpreters of the laws."

The lawyer belonged to the group of Pharisees whose function was three-fold: (1) they preserved and interpreted the law, and applied it to everyday life; (2) they gathered around them many students whom they instructed in the law; (3) they were entrusted with the administration of the law as judges in the Sanhedrin which was highest Jewish court of justice. The reference to written accounts (Luke 10:26) and how the lawyer read them refers to the law written by Moses (Deuteronomy 6:5 and Leviticus 19:18), which the lawyer summarises (10:27). The law recorded in the first five books of the Bible (Pentateuch), not only had the ten commandments but also covered social and religious laws which were to govern the Jewish people.

The Pharisees were "extremely influential among townsfolk; and all prayers and sacred rites of divine worship are performed according to their exposition" (Josephus *Antiquities*, 18:15). Even though the role of Pharisees is often taken for granted in the New Testament, they however, honoured the Mosaic law and all the Old Testament, but were guarded by oral tradition or the "Tradition of the Elders" (Matthew 15:2) which they regarded as having been received by Moses on Mount Sinai and later passed on by him to Joshua and then to the Jewish nation. The Pharisees had great influence in the nation and taught that it should be free from foreign rule. They had a majority in the Sanhedrin and were popular with the people as they stood for the people against the Jewish rulers. This shows the kind of influence the person (lawyer) enjoyed whom Luke presents as confronting Jesus.

The Pharisees were not a monolithic religious group. His egotistic language in his discussion betrays the ulterior motive of the lawyer in the Lukan narrative with Jesus. From the discussion itself, one can conclude that he belonged to the veteran group of Pharisees which entertained a narrow definition of "neighbour" as is reflected in his question ("Who is my neighbour?" (10:29). The parable of the Good Samaritan (10:25-37) reinforces the lawyer's stance against predestination and hatred of the enemy (10:25, 29, 37). The point that the Lukan Jesus is teaching is positive love, in contrast to Judaism which presented love in negation and hatred.

As a member of the opposite group, the lawyer attempted to coerce Jesus into circumscribing the meaning of neighbour to fellow Israelites (Leviticus 19:16), or at most to the stranger living in their land (19:33-34). Luke presents the national loyalty of Jesus as being at stake here. This must have mattered because Jesus was a Jew, but we note that on many occasions, he is said to have made statements that favoured strangers before Israel (Luke 4: 26-27; 7:36-30, & 10:30-37). In this context, I would be justified in saying that the attitude of the Lukan Jesus lacked patriotism. For Luke national identity was not important, what was important was the emphasis on human value and life, through being of help to those in need.

3.3.2.2 Priests and Levites

Luke 10:31 introduces one of the characters, who is said to have by-passed the victim on the Jerusalem-Jericho road, as a priest. The priestly class, to which he belonged, was not homogenous, but was internally stratified. The high priest and his deputy (Jeremias 1969:160) headed the hierarchy. The priestly aristocracy included all leading priests, who lived in Jerusalem and served the Temple exclusively in Jerusalem. Membership of the priestly class was through descent alone, which means that there was no recruitment into the priestly class. Schurer (1979:240) points out the primary qualification of a priest were "evidence of his genealogical descent." At the time of Jesus, the high priest came from the Zadokite family (Jeremias 1969:181). Zadok was the chief priest at the time of King David and his son Solomon (2 Samuel 8:17; 15:24; 1 King 1:8ff).

As a class, the priestly establishment accumulated wealth in numerous ways as it was demanded by the Temple authority. It is indeed important to look closely at the priestly class, especially its relationship to the distribution of power and wealth through the Temple as a religious institution. The priestly class had a far-reaching political and religious influence in the life of the Jewish society during this period. As the officials (priest and Levite) belong to the upper classes and are particularly in the public eye, it does not surprise the hearers that the story (10:30-35) presents them as unmerciful because the priesthood had a bad reputation at the time of Jesus. Jeremias (1969:179), observed that priests who had superior (Temple Captain) or comparable (Overseer) positions also held Sanhedrin seats. The Sanhedrin was the highest court of justice for the Jews and met in Jerusalem and imposed judicial decisions on the people (see Matthew 5:22; Matthew 16:59; Mark 14:55; Luke 12:66). Jeremias (1969:96, 104, 105) points to the fact that some priests belonged to the upper strata of society and lived in privileged circumstances. Social stratification of the Jewish society was partly determined by the devious behaviour of the leadership and upper classes who collaborated with the secular rulers, thereby changing the status of the Temple from being a holy sanctuary to a "den of thieves" (Luke 19:46).

As regards their livelihood, priests were entitled to many gifts and taxes.

(1) Priests were to receive the choicest portion, often including the hides, of the animals sacrificed (DeVaux 1965:403-404).

(2) Priests also received the "first-fruits" that farmers and shepherds were required to offer at the time of the harvest each year and that parents were required to present at the birth of the first son (De Vaux 1965:404). In accordance with the requirements of the law, only the best flour, the choicest fruits, and the purest first-born animals could be used to fulfil this "first-fruits" ritual; this meant that the gifts presented to the priests were of the highest quality (DeVaux 1965:404).

(3) The amounts that the priests themselves received from the tithes paid to the Levites (the Temple assistants) provided them with another source of income. According to Jewish law, one-tenth of the total harvest of the most important agricultural products was to be turned over to the Levites and the Levites were then to turn one-tenth of what they had received over to the priests (Moore 1950:70-72, see also Exodus 30:11-16; Matthew 17:24-27; Josephus, *Jewish war* 7.218). Josephus (*Antiquities*, XX.8.8, 9.2) indicates that in the New Testament period the chief priests actually sent groups of ruffians to ensure that the tithes were collected. Josephus criticises the priests for confiscating the tithes and not allowing the Levites the nine-tenths that was rightly due to them. Ideologically, this meant that the people responsible for paying the tithes did not often do so voluntarily as it was imposed on them. In this regard, the priests' power resulted from the fact that they had the exclusive right to sacrifice (Exodus 28-29; Leviticus 8-10; Numbers 16-18) and also meant that they could impose taxes on their people. The priests were part and parcel of the ruling class in Judea until the war destroyed their political and religious function.

Luke 10:32 mentions a Levite who, following the priest in the narrative, also passes by the victim on the Jerusalem-Jericho road. As mentioned earlier on, Levites were Temple assistants. They were of the tribe of Levi, but were not sons of Aaron. They had to help the priests, but were not allowed to come near to the most holy things. In the Temple, they had the duty of instructing the people, and also of killing the Passover lamb for those

who were not ceremonially clean (see Numbers 3:9, 4:19). The Levite belonged to the tribe of Levi whose members were priests of the sanctuary in ancient Israel until 586BC and later (when priesthood was restricted to descendants of the family of Aaron) assisted priests in caring for the Temple. Thus the Levite was a Temple assistant, like the priest, returning from his round of duties (see for example the views of Roetzel 1985:54-63) as he journeyed from Jerusalem to Jericho. Rabbinic tradition has it that Jericho was predominately a priestly city (see also similar discussion in Evans 1990:470).

An interesting feature of Luke 10:25-37 is the contrast Luke makes between the first two travellers: priest and Levite (10:30-32) and the third (Samaritan) which is highlighted by the emphatic positioning of “but” (10:33). That is the reason why prior understanding of the function of the priest and Levite as religious leaders is necessary to understand the story. It has been suggested by many scholars that the priest and the Levite chose not to attend to the injured man either out of fear or in obedience to ritual purification laws (Bailey 1984:44-47). The roles of the lawyer, priest and Levite, and the mention of the law show that Luke 10:25-37 had a context of a situation of prominent religious leaders who also functioned as government officials representing power vested in individuals.

3.3.3 Political and religious institutions

In order to understand first-century Palestine, one needs to grasp the nature and function of institutions referred to in the text. By institutions I mean the established law, custom, practice or organisation for the promotion of some public or religious objective. In the narrative of Luke 10:25-37, the reference to a priest, a Levite, and a lawyer point to the institutions of the Temple and the Sanhedrin to which they are connected. The understanding of the role of these institutions will assist us in viewing how they provided organisation to life, regulated the behaviour of people, how they defended and preserved the traditions of society, and how they played significant roles in the life of the people.

The forms of institutionalization implied in this text are the law, the Temple and the Sanhedrin. Behind the priest and the Levite, I see the Temple which was the most

important institution in Israel (see also Roetzel 1985:54). The Temple had considerable power to extract religious tributes from Jewish people. Furthermore, the law (“Torah”) which was the “constitution” agreed upon between God and the people, as it was a ruling institution. The Temple not only constituted the identity of Israel against other nations and preserved her history, but also affected all structures of society (Jeremias 1967:21-57, 82).

Said (1984:5) argued that:

the realities of power and authority – as well as the resistance offered by men, women, and social movements to institutions, authorities and orthodoxies – are the realities that make texts possible, that deliver them to their readers, that solicit the attention of critics.

The assertions of Said are relevant to first-century Palestine because the people in this time were beginning to question and rebel against most of the obligations imposed on them, such as taxes. In fact Freyne (1980:280) tells us how the Galilean population did not observe the Temple offerings with any great enthusiasm. Why was this the case? He suggests several reasons.

(1) There was the problem of the appropriation of Temple funds by highly ranking priests. Those highly ranking priests who were attached to the Temple grew richer while the country priests grew poorer (see also Jeremias 1969:97). This was an indication that they possessed wealth at the expense of other people who were entitled to benefit from the Temple income.

(2) In the light of Deuteronomy 14:27-29, the Levites, foreigners, fatherless, widows, poor and country priests were entitled to benefit from the tithe. These people were deprived, however, of all the support from the Temple’s income. Josephus (*Antiquities* 20:180-181) tell us that there was a social and economic gulf that existed between the high priests and the large mass of the lower priests. The high priests managed to send slaves to the threshing floors to take by force the tithes that were due to the local priests and as a result the poorest priests were in danger of starving to death (Josephus, *Antiquities* 20:181). All these were some of the serious problems, which confronted the

Galilean Jews with regard to the entire offering system, particularly the tithes. From this picture, one would say that their concern was genuine in view of the power and privilege, which determined the distributive system. It was obvious that the highly ranking priestly aristocracy benefited from all the Temple income as we have seen in the discussion. Due to Temple tax accumulation and ever-expanding valorization of capital, the Temple was very rich and Jeremias (1969: 26) reports that the Temple Treasury was able to assist the unemployed. However, when the Temple, became a vigorous trading centre, inner corrosion took place. Some high priestly families carried on flourishing trade, and some priests were also involved in commerce.

Behind the lawyer in the story, who as noted in sub-section 3.3.2.1 should be thought of as belonging to the group of Pharisees, the Sanhedrin comes into view. The members of the Sanhedrin were the High Priests and Chief Priests, the nobles of Jerusalem and the Scribes, some of whom were Sadducees and Pharisees (Jeremias [1967] provides a good discussion of the persons and groups who served on the Sanhedrin). In the Roman administration of power, the Sanhedrin was given considerable power and authority to maintain order, impose taxes and decide judicial matters except the death penalty which was exclusively the prerogative of the Roman officials (Josephus, *War*, II:8.1, see also Roetzel 1987:32-34). However, the Sanhedrin also had a party of Temple police who were Levites (see John 18:3). The Sanhedrin was distributed evenly across the land, but serious affairs had to be tried by the Sanhedrin at Jerusalem. The fact that the Pharisees and Sadducees, who were members of the Sanhedrin, could not agree on many matters made it easier for the Romans to maintain their power in the land.

In the light of this context, it is easy to see that during the first-century the city of Jerusalem, which housed the Temple and the Sanhedrin, was a powerful force which regulated the lives of many people. The Temple at Jerusalem was the centre of the Jewish religion. I may be justified in pointing out here that the Temple in Jewish eyes was seen as a symbol of the presence of God on earth. The mention of the city of Jerusalem (10:30), coupled with that of people like the priest and Levite (10:30-32), calls

to mind the fact that Jerusalem was a political and religious centre where official roles such as those of priest and Levite were recognised and functioned.

The mention of *denarius* (10:35) confirms the operational employment of money in business deals. The *denarius* was coined in silver and was the commonest Roman currency worth a day's wage for the ordinary worker (Evans [1990:467] also says that the *denarius* was worth about a shilling). Reference to the Roman coin, *denarius*, implies the presence of the emperor as a symbol of supreme political and legal power in the land. On this coin was inscribed the head of Tiberius: "Tiberius Caesar, son of the divine Augustus, Augustus with the pax seated": "high priest" (John Rousseau & Rami Arav 1995:60). The importance of the study of coins and money in this century is because they are frequently mentioned in the Gospels. Their analysis sheds light about aspects of history which we do not find in other written documents. For instance, in the case of the *denarius*, we get information about the political relationship between Tiberius Caesar and the high priest (Rousseau & Arav 1995:60-64). Oakman (1987:37) has argued that the amount of two *denarii* paid to the innkeeper could purchase food which would last three weeks for one person or was an estimated one percent of the annual budget of an ancient Palestinian. That must have been a lot of money spent on the victim on the Jerusalem-Jericho road because two *denarii* might have lasted several days' compensation for the innkeeper.

Socially, we have seen how power and privilege determined the distribution of wealth. Economically, we have seen how demands were put on peasants regarding their production level; and how in the process of distribution the 'power holders' extracted peasants' surpluses for their own benefit and enrichment. With regard to religion, we also have seen how the distribution of offerings and sacrifices to the Temple was mostly appropriated by highly ranking members of the priestly aristocracy. There was no just distribution of wealth among the clergy. The Levites and country priests, who also were the beneficiaries from the Temple income, were pushed to the periphery. Both political and religious institutions were exploitative. Much was demanded from the peasants. The

Temple, in particular, as an institution became part of the unequal distributive system and in this way it betrayed its own integrity.

3.3.4 Communities: Jews and Samaritans

Luke unveils the reality of the relationship that existed between Jews and Samaritans as one of hatred and enmity, which should not be so. Luke 10:25-37 reflects the strong hatred between Jews and Samaritans in the first-century (see Jeremias 1969:352). A historical survey of the circumstances that led to this enmity will serve to show the scandal of the story that the Lukan Jesus is portrayed as having told a Jewish lawyer. Josephus (*Antiquities*, XX.6.1) makes considerable mention of the bad relationship between Jews and Samaritans. There are numerous reasons that have been advanced to account for this bad relationship between Jews and Samaritans.

(1) Following the destruction of the Northern Kingdom with its capital at Samaria its inhabitants were deported to Assyria and foreigners were brought in to occupy the land (see 2 Kings 17:24-41 & Williamson 1980; however, the question of the origin and character of the Samaritans still remains a disputed fact). Those who escaped the deportation and remained behind intermarried with foreigners and in the process lost their racial purity (see also Ezra 4:8-16 & Young 1992:62). The loss of racial purity was unacceptable in the eyes of the Southern Jews. Although the same fate later also befell the Southern Kingdom, whose capital was Jerusalem, the Jews, even those in captivity in Babylon, kept their nationality and their religion pure until they were allowed to return under Ezra and Nehemiah and began to rebuild their shattered city and Temple at Jerusalem. Enmity ensued between the two groups of people as is reflected by a number of New Testament texts (Luke 9:51-56; John 4:9, 8:48).

(2) The decision on the part of the Samaritans to build their own Temple at Mount Gerizim soured relationships between them and Jews even further (Young 1992:62). They refused to take part in the rebuilding of the Temple at Jerusalem (Josephus

Antiquities, 11:322-324). This was in total violation of the Jewish law, which restricted the construction of the Temple to Jerusalem (see also John 4: 19-26).

(3) The other incident is when the Samaritans defiled the Jerusalem Temple and this incident is said to have happened when Coponius was procurator (6-9 C.E.) (Josephus, *Anti.*, 20:6). According to the account, Samaritans are alleged to have taken part in the Jewish Passover as pilgrims in the Temple and to have conducted a sacrifice that was profane (Josephus, *Anti.*, 20:6). They brought into the Temple human bones and placed them in the porticoes and sanctuary in total defiance of the regulations that governed the Temple (Josephus, *Anti.*, 20:6). According to the requirements for sacrifices, Jews saw corpses and bones as unclean. This is the reason why a priest could not be in attendance at a funeral (other than that of his/her closest relative). An individual who came into physical contact with a corpse was considered defiled and was required to undergo ritual cleansing. Therefore, the conduct of the Samaritans in the Temple was serious in Jewish eyes and they faced total exclusion from the assembly. In response to the conduct of the Samaritans, Josephus (*Antiquities*, 18:29-30) records that the Temple priests excluded them (Samaritans) all from the Temple. According to Josephus, this was unusual. However, this incident might be seen to have been a deliberate provocation of the Jews by the Samaritans.

(4) Further, according to Josephus (*Antiquities*, XX.6.1, describes some of the conflicts that took place when Samaritans killed a group of Jews at Gema (Ginae), as they were going to Jerusalem for the festive of the Passover. As a result, war broke out between Jews and Samaritans, with Jews massacring many Samaritans at Gema. This resulted in strong enmity between these two groups of people.

A Jew could not eat or mix with a Samaritan (see also Young 1992:63). The Jews constantly reminded the Samaritans that they were foreigners and not part of the family of God (see also Martin 1940:114). In reaction, the Samaritans refused to feed or house travelers who were going to the feasts at Jerusalem (see Luke 9:53), and even attacked and murdered them (see Josephus, *Anti.*, 20:6). Many of the Jews therefore avoided

Samaria by crossing the Jordan and going through Perea when travelling from the north to the south (Josephus, *Anti.*, 20:6). Nevertheless, in the Lukan Gospel, Jesus is shown as portraying a considerable acceptance of the despised Samaritans in spite of the long-standing tradition of hatred between Samaritans and Jews. In order to see this parable in the same light as a Jewish audience, one must take into account seriously that Jews despised Samaritans because they were of a mixed race, syncretistic in their religious faith and had no regard for the Jerusalem Temple (Evans 1990:470). Jews would understand the actions of the priest and Levite in the parable in accordance with a religious obligation to purity rules. What is provocative, however, is the making of the despised Samaritan into a hero of the story (10:36, 37).

3.3.5 Summary

The aim of this section has been to locate the power forces at play which shaped Luke 10:25-37 into the form we have it today. This application has revealed that Luke portrays Jesus as being involved in a power struggle with the lawyer who happened to be an opponent. There is a sense in which Luke views Jews and non-Jews as equal and both as going to inherit the Kingdom of God but at times he demonstrates that because of the oppressive nature of the Jewish leaders, Gentiles will inherit the Kingdom of God before them. The response of the Lukan Jesus to the hatred between Jews and Samaritans is to seek reconciliation through the definition of the term 'neighbour' to mean anyone in need. Luke attacked the neglect of the religious authorities and tried to create an alternative social order governed by compassion, love, and shared material wealth. He demonstrated this teaching through the parable he attributes to Jesus (Luke 10:30-35). The discussion in this section using data and a priori assumptions from the previous two sections will be used in the following section (3.4) to analyze the eastern Mediterranean concept of 'hospitality' as reflected in the social value of 'honour-shame' which is crucial in the encounter of Jesus with the lawyer.

3.4 “SOCIAL AND CULTURAL TEXTURE:” MEDITERRANEAN CONCEPT OF HOSPITALITY AS OBSERVED IN THE REFLECTION OF HONOUR-SHAME IN LUKE 10:25-37

3.4.1 Introduction

In the previous section, I have studied the ideological texture reflected in Luke 10:25-37. It has emerged from the study that Luke attempted to create a new social order governed by compassion, love, and shared material wealth. Having identified how language could be used to exclude other people in section 3.3, in this section also, the study of language will be a necessary tool to a consideration of the cultural patterns exhibited in Luke 10:25-37. Malina (1993:13) has established that language is part of a cultural pattern, perhaps the most important aspect, since thought and language are so interwoven. In this respect it should be seen that language is closely connected to the mode of life since when one speaks and acts one does so in one's own cultural context. This is the reason why the description of language, by Berger and Berger (1975:73), as the “fundamental social institution” is justified. My main objective in this section is to examine some eastern Mediterranean cultural concepts relating to hospitality and then to apply them to the language used in Luke 10:25-37 in a bid to provide an understanding of the first-century culture in the geographical area concerned. In realizing this goal, I will adopt the following approach: (1) I will define the term culture being used in this section; (2) I will define ‘honour-shame’ in the light of the concept of ‘hospitality’ in the eastern Mediterranean region; and (3) I will then apply the concept of ‘hospitality’ to Luke 10:25-37.

For this purpose I shall employ anthropological models as suggested by Robbins (1996a: 144, 1996b:71; see also Boissevain 1979:83; Gilmore 1982:178). The aim of using cultural anthropological models in New Testament analysis is to understand the meaning

of a given text in the cultural context in which it was originally produced (Malina 1993: xiii). Indeed Muenchow (1989:599) has correctly observed that scholars have identified 'honour and shame' as the dominant cultural value system of the Mediterranean region. I will demonstrate that honour-shame plays a crucial role in the encounter of Jesus with the lawyer as portrayed by Luke (10:25-37).

Before proceeding further I need to define one of the key terms, which is the word 'culture.' Definitions of 'culture' vary greatly as different groups use the word with different meanings. My notion of culture is a broad one, and refers to all attitudes and behavior of people in a particular group (see Malina 1993:12). Employing this definition will help me to discuss society, social relationships, social attitudes and social institutions and practices in their broadest sense.

3.4.2 Understanding honour-shame in the eastern Mediterranean region

Articles by Malina (1993), Malina and Pilch (1993), and Rabichev (1996:51-63) on the eastern Mediterranean concepts of "honour and shame" have proved to be very useful sources for my discussion in this section. Studies in cultural anthropology of the eastern Mediterranean world in the first-century AD have generated great interest among today's Biblical scholars (see also Rabichev 1996:52 citing Campbell 1964; Boissevan 1974; Davis 1977; Gilmore 1982, 1990). Concepts derived from such studies are being employed by scholars such as Malina to understand the first-century world of the Gospel materials. One of the most important values in the eastern Mediterranean region in general and the lands of the Bible in particular are the concept of "honour and shame" (see also Malina 1993:viii, 28-58; Robbins 1994:187 citing Gowler; Muenchow 1989: 599; Gilmore 1982:179). This is not to suggest that there is no regional shift of the cultures of the Mediterranean region. I use the term culture in plural because of the diversity of cultures one would come across even in this region that most scholars have assumed to be uniform (Rabichev 1996:51 citing Boissevain 1979:83; Gilmore 1982:178; Malina & Neyrey 1991b:71). However, in spite of this diversity, scholars acknowledge

the dominance of the idea of honour-shame in social interaction in the eastern Mediterranean region during the first-century.

In that region (eastern Mediterranean) “honour” is understood to be the way in which an individual perceives himself/herself and the way in which society perceives that person. It could be ascribed (inherited) or acquired through achievements (see my discussion in sub-section 3.4.4). Malina (1993:32; see also Pitt-Rivers 1977:1; Malina & Neyrey 1991a:25) says that honour is a “claim to worth and the social acknowledgements of that worth.” He further observes that honour “requires a grant of reputation by others before it becomes honour ...” (Malina 1993:33; see also Rabichev 1996:52 citing Du Boulay 1976:405). In this respect, honour should generally be regarded as a widely held acceptable norm of behaviour. Rabichev (1996:52) speaks of honour as the means through which people can consider themselves through the eyes of others and bring their behaviour in line with what they think others expect of them. The same is said to be true of the concept of shame: “A sense of shame makes the contest of living possible, dignified, and human, since it implies acceptance of and respect for the rules of human interaction” (Malina 1993:51). Shame being the opposite of honour “is a claim to worth that is publicly denied and repudiated” (Pilch & Malina 1993:96). Malina and Neyrey (1991a:41) maintain that the concept of honour-shame has largely to do with a person’s gender and consequently his or her position in society and the household.

According to Malina (1993:13), our common knowledge of the world allows us to experience the world in terms of categories which all of us employ to classify the things around us. In this regard, each individual experiences the world in terms of categories that he or she shares with the other members of that society. Therefore the aim of honour in this respect should be seen as one that enables “a person to interact in specific ways with his or her equals, superiors, and subordinates, according to the prescribed cultural cues of society” (Malina 1993:54). It enables one to know when he or she is confronted with phenomena, for instance ‘honour-shame,’ that makes it necessary to draw boundaries to distinguish oneself from other people. I hope to show that such an approach can help us understand the different dominant modes of behaviour exhibited in

Luke 10:25-37 in their proper cultural context. This perspective focuses particularly on the concept of honour-shame in the light of hospitality, which forms the basis for much of the dialogue Luke fashions between Jesus and the lawyer.

3.4.3 'Hospitality' and 'honour-shame' in the eastern Mediterranean region

The responsibility of caring and concern for the traveler and those in need is largely taken for granted in Scripture. Although we come across such examples in the Bible, the only specific instructions about providing hospitality concern the Christian's responsibility towards their fellow believers. In the eastern Mediterranean region, hospitality was the act of "receiving" strangers or visitors and turning them into guests (Pilch & Malina 1993:104). Hospitality was a demonstration of friendship extended to a stranger or visitor. This act of being hospitable to strangers was part and parcel of the cultural customs and practices which were prevalent in the eastern Mediterranean region and which every person was required to observe (Dunston 1991:393). The concept of hospitality in the eastern Mediterranean region should be understood in the light of the idea of honour-shame, because the person who extends hospitality to a stranger enhances honour. Similarly, the Old Testament speaks of the concept of hospitality included among other things concern and care for the sojourner (Exodus 22:21, Leviticus 19:10, Deuteronomy 10:19). Therefore, since hospitality was the entertainment of a stranger (sojourner) as a guest it was upheld as a sacred obligation throughout the eastern Mediterranean world (see Dunston 1991:393 and Pilch & Malina 1993:104). It is justifiable to argue here that the concept of hospitality was heartily and stringently observed in comparison to many a written law. When a person is said not to be hospitable, it means that they are in shame (Dunston 1991:393). It also implied that such a person was ignoring or disrespecting the customs of his own people (Dunston 1991:393). Failure to provide hospitality to a traveler in need was a serious offence liable to punishment by God (see Deuteronomy 23:3-4). Hospitality should not, however, be confused with the obligation of entertaining family members or friends, as the two are different.

This discussion so far goes to show that hospitality was held in very high esteem among the people of the eastern Mediterranean region and was an act that determined a person's worth. It was in a sense a sacred duty to strangers required of everyone in the community (Dunston 1991:393). To demonstrate lack of hospitality to a stranger or visitor meant dishonour. The practice of hospitality ranked very high among the virtues practiced in the eastern Mediterranean world. Malina and Pilch (1993:104-107, see also Dunston 1991:393) identify three stages that hospitality took.

(1) *A stranger must be tested.* The fact that strangers were and still are a security risk to any community required that they be subjected to a test to establish whether they were genuine or not (see Joshua 2:2-3; Genesis 19:4-5. Further in the Old Testament, a stranger would wait at the city-gate for an offer of hospitality (see Genesis 19:1, Judges 19:15). Obviously such a practice of hospitality to strangers was subject to abuse by elders and pretenders. Precautions had to be put in place in order to test the genuineness of a Christian traveler and to forestall their becoming a burden to the Christian community (cf. 1 John 4:1; 2 John 7-11). The host had to ensure how the stranger would fit into the whole framework of his community. Asking them to deliver a speech (Dunston 1991: 393, see also Acts 13:14-15) tested sometimes strangers. Even those strangers who carried with them letters of recommendation could normally not escape the test (Malina & Pilch 1993:104; see also 2 and 3 John; Romans 16:3-16; 1 Thessalonians 5:12-13).

(2) *The stranger must be treated as a guest.* Strangers or visitors came under the protection of a patron or host who should be an established member of the community (Malina & Pilch 1993:104). In order to turn a stranger into a guest, it was required of the host to conduct the ritual of foot washing which signified the process of transforming a stranger into a guest (see also Genesis 18:4; 19:2). This was followed by a kiss of welcome. Water was provided to wash the dust from the stranger's feet gathered as a result of travel (see also Genesis 18:14, 19:2, 24:32, Judges 19:21), and oil to anoint his head (see also Psalm 23:5, Amos 6:6, Luke 7:46). Apart from the use of oil at the consecration of the priest (Exodus 29:2) and the ceremonial ritual in recognition of the kingly office (1 Samuel 10:1, 1 Kings 1:39), it was also used to anoint the head of each

guest as they took their place at the feast in Egypt. In this regard we see that oil symbolised an image of comfort, spiritual nourishment or prosperity. In the case of the story under study (10:25-37), oil and wine was applied by the Samaritan on the victim as a medicine (Evans 1990:470-471). The wine was used to staunch the bleeding and perhaps as a stimulant. It had soothing protective qualities and was used for bruises and wounds, as is the case in 10:33. Furthermore, the host was required to offer two other things to the guest: protection and maintenance (Malina & Pilch 1993:105). Protection was to be extended not only to the guest but also to his animals, if any. Moreover, the guest was to be provided with food, shelter and water, and the same were to be extended to his animals (see for example in Genesis 24:14, 32, Judges 19:21 in which case animal fodder was supplied when required by the traveler). The minimum provision requirement was bread and water (Deuteronomy 23:4, 1 Kings 17:10-11), however, such meagre fare was often exceeded. The guest would take on the traditional role of *protégé* which implied that to insult or offend him one was actually insulting or offending the host (Malina & Pilch 1993:105).

3. Finally, *the stranger would leave the host either as friend or enemy*. The gesture of hospitality achieved two things. Firstly, if the stranger left as a friend, news would spread around of “praises to the host (e.g. 1 Thessalonians 1:9; Philippians 4:15).” On the other hand, if the stranger departed from the host as an enemy, “the one aggrieved will have to get satisfaction (e.g. 3 John)” [Malina & Pilch 1993:106]. This principle applies to all enemies (Dunston 1991:393). It was not a requirement that hospitality be returned according to Malina and Pilch (1993:106); but on the contrary, Stambaugh and Balch (1989:38) argue that

...a very old tradition emphasized the importance of hospitality, of the shared obligations of providing food and shelter to visitors, in the assurance that they would extend the same hospitality to you when you traveled near their home.

The Old Testament position cited here in part that sometimes hospitality might be given in return for an earlier kindness seems to agree well with Stambaugh and Balch’s views on this issue (see also Exodus 2:20, 2 Samuel 19:32-40).

3.4.4 Application of the eastern Mediterranean concept of ‘hospitality’ to Luke 10:25-37

What follows below represents an attempt to come to terms with the concept of ‘hospitality’ and its relation to honour-shame in the first-century world of Luke 10:25-37 in order to try to rationalize the behavior of characters depicted there. In doing so, as indicated in sub-section 3.4.1, much reliance will be placed upon several studies, such as the work of Malina and others, on the eastern Mediterranean world of the first-century AD.

Concepts of ‘honour-shame’ and ‘hospitality’ towards a foreigner are central in understanding Luke 10:29-37. The priest and the Levite (10:31, 32) mentioned in the story were members of a privileged Palestinian Jewish society enjoying ascribed honour. Ascribed honour is the kind of honour that one enjoys by virtue of birth or family background (Malina 1993:33-34). In the case of the priest and the Levite, it was an honour attained through Levitical orders or Aaronic heritage, which associated them closely with the Temple which was at the heart of Jewish life and was the centre of the worship of Yahweh. The lawyer who encounters Jesus in Luke 10:25-37 enjoyed acquired honour, which he attained through achievements in life and by being highly learned in the law. Acquired honour refers to the social status one attains over others in social interaction through education or achievements (Malina 1993:34-37). However, the lawyer should be thought of as occupying the same level as the others in the social hierarchy mentioned in the passage (priest and Levite). The likes of the lawyer were held in very high esteem in Jewish society as they “advised the Sanhedrin on judicial matters by interpreting the Torah” (Stambaugh & Balch, 1989:99).

Malina and Neyrey (1991a:49) classify Luke 10:25-37 as a “negative challenge” to the honour of the Lukan Jesus. Luke portrays the motive of the lawyer as one of intention to trap Jesus in a bid to dishonour him. However, the trap fails to achieve its intended objectives. Instead, the Lukan Jesus turns the tables on the lawyer by making him the

respondent to his own trap (10:25-28). The defense put forward by Jesus in Luke enables him to maintain his honour at the expense of the lawyer. The shame suffered by the lawyer in turn forces him to hit back at Jesus with another challenge (10:29) "Who is my neighbour?" This second challenge must be understood as a continuation of the honour-shame contrast between the lawyer, who seeks to reclaim his honour just lost (10:25-28), and Jesus. To counter the second challenge, the Lukan Jesus narrates the parable of the Good Samaritan (10:30-35) which is focused on hospitality to strangers. The parable (10:30-35) contrasts the actions of two esteemed and honourable Jews (priest and Levite) as compared to the hospitality of the Samaritan. The priest and the Levite could be said to have set the Temple ritual above the claims of humanity because of their failure to be hospitable to the victim. The humiliation derives from neglect and heartlessness shown by the official representatives of the official Jewish religion (priest and Levite) towards the victim on the Jerusalem-Jericho road. They failed to extend the expected hospitality to the victim.

The Samaritan's hospitality towards a foreigner is perhaps greater than often assumed. The love and mercy shown by the Samaritan towards the victim on the Jerusalem-Jericho road stands out in the Lukan construction of society as deserving great honour, because to extend hospitality to someone in need was held in very high esteem as discussed in subsection 3.4.3 above. The hospitality of the Samaritan transcends the observance of "group attachment" (Malina & Pilch 1993:110) because he does not reject an outsider and enemy in need. In spite of the fact that the Pentateuch forbids the touching of a corpse or blood, the Samaritan proceeds to supersede the law because life is endangered. His action on the Jerusalem-Jericho road is characterized by five elements: (1) he was moved with compassion (10:33), (2) he went near the victim (10:34a), (3) poured oil and wine (10:34b), (4) bandaged his wounds (10:34b), and (5) brought him to an inn for safety (10:34c). As though this were not enough, having reached the inn the Samaritan proceeded to do even more (1) by paying for the lodging of the victim at the inn (10:34), and (2) promising to return and reimburse whatever might be owing (10:35). Before the Samaritan departed, Luke records that he paid two *denarii* extra and promised to repay any extra expenses that the innkeeper might incur in looking after the victim. Oakman

(1987:37) argues that “Two *denarii*, ...represent around three weeks’ worth of food for one person or about 1% of an ancient Palestinian’s annual budget.” This was an incredible mark of hospitality on the part of the Samaritan. The story suggests that the Good Samaritan could have made regular trips to Jerusalem and could have been in good terms with the landlord of an inn as is shown by the responsibility he leaves in the hands of the owner of the inn (10:34-35).

Looking at the story in the light of the eastern Mediterranean concept of hospitality, one notices that the Samaritan more than fulfilled the requirements of the virtue of hospitality. Firstly, although this may be stretching the point too much, the Samaritan could be said to have tested the victim by going near him in order to prove that he was a genuine person in need. This, of course, involved a security risk on his part as this road was infested with criminals. Although there were very good roads, it was often dangerous for one to travel alone. As the parable (10:30) indicates, one was likely to be attacked by thieves on these main roads, especially in “politically unsettled provinces” (Stambaugh & Balch 1989:38) as is the case of the setting of this story. Banditry came into being because of the social and economic unrest which resulted in violence (Rhoads 1976:154-156). The inns could be seen as havens of safety along the dangerous roads as is demonstrated in the story (10:34-35).

Second, he turned the stranger into his guest by offering him protection and support in the form of first aid on sight, food and protection. He cared for him. Although the oil and wine in this case was used as medicine it could also be argued that the anointing of this stranger with oil signified the process of his being treated as a guest or friend. The Samaritan brought the victim to an inn to safety. Inns were places of entertainment and lodging which were found at intervals of about twenty-five to thirty-five miles along the main roads (Stambaugh & Balch 1989:38). It is generally pointed out that most of these inns were used for immoral activities and innkeepers had a bad reputation (Stambaugh & Balch 1989:38). Most of them were dirty, badly kept, and badly managed, leaky and generally uncomfortable. They usually had stables attached to them (Stambaugh & Balch 1989:38) to enable travellers with animals tend them there. Judge (1980:7; see also

Hatch 1829:44ff) argues that “security and hospitality when travelling had traditionally been the privilege of the powerful, who had relied upon a network of patronage and friendship, created by wealth.” The assertion by Judge calls to mind the fact that a private traveler along these roads, unless he was affluent, would rather endure discomfort than go into these inns. Hospitality was offered in these inns but it had to be paid for. Although the Samaritan in the parable (10:30-35) carries out the responsibility of a host, he cannot be said to be a host here in the normal sense of the word since the incident occurs outside his own community and home. In fact, the Samaritan being away from home himself becomes a foreigner in a foreign land but nevertheless takes pleasure in hosting the victim in an inn and providing maintenance, protection and first aid. That a host was responsible for the safety of his guest, and the Good Samaritan in the story vividly illustrates welfare of his guests (10:33-35).

Third, though not mentioned by the text, the victim upon recovery and going home must have spread news praising the Samaritan, which would not have been received kindly by a Jewish audience. This was because a mere mention of the word “Samaritan” left a profane taste in the mouth of a Jew because Jews refused to regard Samaritans as blood relations (Jeremias 1977:91, see also my discussion on the hatred between Jews and Samaritans in sub-section 3.3.4). In this regard the Samaritans were seen as Gentiles (Jeremias 1977:91). Although the Samaritans recognized the Pentateuch and observed the statutes of the law scrupulously, they were nevertheless not admitted into the Jewish establishment, for they steadfastly held to Gerizim, and not to Jerusalem, as “chosen place” (see also my discussion in sub-section 3.3.4). This is the framework in which the Lukan lawyer listens to the parable (10:30-37).

Furthermore, it must be emphasized that hospitality stands out as one of the virtues that was accorded the highest honour in the eastern Mediterranean region during the first-century AD. This was the reason why, through lack of hospitality, Luke portrays the Jewish religious authorities as distancing themselves from the Kingdom of God. On the contrary, the Lukan Samaritan is shown by Luke to be honorable through his gestures of hospitality, highlighted by his compassion, mercy, love to the victim on the Jerusalem-

Jericho road; in contrast the supposedly honorable Jews appears shameful (10:30-37) because of their failure to help the victim. The failure by the priest and Levite to act as neighbour fits well with the Lukan presentation of Pharisees and lawyers as people who do not accept the plans of God (7:30) and are not hospitable (7:44-46). The shameful behavior of the Jewish religious leaders in the parable is paralleled by the shameful behavior of the lawyer who sought to trap Jesus because “asking questions for the purpose of gaining an advantage over another is not a Kingdom exercise” (Craddock 1990:150).

The final blow the Lukan Jesus unleashes on the lawyer is a potent one: “Who among these three (priest, Levite and Samaritan) proved neighbour to the man who fell in the hands of robbers?” (10:36). The lawyer was forced to swallow the bitter pill because he was required to acknowledge that an accursed outsider was more honorable than his fellow Jewish leaders. The bitterness of this acceptance can be seen in his failure to mention the name of Samaritan, as it was an abominable conclusion for him to make. It is clear from the story that individuals can lose honour through failure to perform what societal norms requires of them. In the light of this parable, failure to show hospitality, love and mercy to anyone in need leads an individual to losing his or her honour in the Christian community. In the eyes of the Jewish community, however, the Samaritan depicted in the story remained despised as he was a descendant of a mixed, outcast population.

4.5

Summary

The Lukan Jesus is portrayed as ascribing honour to the Samaritan through the gesture of hospitality and turning the honour enjoyed by the lawyer, the priest and the Levite into humiliation (10:29-37) because of their lack of hospitality. Luke thus underscores the honourable position of the Samaritan as against that of the lawyer, and the Temple hierarchy in the parable (10:30-37), who were people who possessed great honour but lacked hospitality. In the context Luke’s Jesus has unsurped ascribed honour according to Luke 10:25-37. The next section discusses the concept of the sacred, which reveals the

relationship between humankind and the sacred as depicted in Luke 10:25-37, thereby merging social and cultural anthropological models to enter into dialogue with theological analysis.

3.5 "SACRED TEXTURE:" SACRED AND PROFANE IN LUKE 10:25-37

3.5.1 Introduction

The analysis of a cultural concept of 'hospitality' observed through the cultural values of 'honour-shame' in Luke 10:25-37 in the previous section (3.4) leads me to the final application of Robbins' socio-rhetorical approach in analyzing the sacred and the profane in Luke 10:25-37. Throughout human history, religious traditions have articulated what it is to be human by explaining the relationship of humankind to the sacred. A survey of literature on the parable of the Good Samaritan (Luke 10:25-37) shows that very little attention has been given to the subject of the sacred and the profane. The present section will identify and analyze theological language in Luke 10:25-37, which reveals Luke's conceptions of the sacred and the relationship of the sacred with humankind. The main purpose of this section is to discover how the first-century people conceived the sacred in relation to the human in their religious faith, practice and experience. Robbins (1996b: 120) refers to this study as *sacred texture*, which according to him implies the quest for God in a specified corpus. In this section, I will discuss the concept of the sacred and the profane in Luke 10:25-37 in terms of (1) Jesus and religious authorities, and (2) a code of conduct. Theological language seeks to interpret the way in which the sacred is related to human beings and to understand how the sacred involves men and women in the process of transforming the world into the sacred (Robbins 1996b:120)

3.5.2 Understanding sacred and profane

Durkheim (1915, 1965) was the first to formulate a clear distinction between the sacred and the profane. The term sacred refers to that "which is set apart to or for some person" (Malina 1993:151). The things that may be set apart include "persons, places, things and

times that are symbolized or filled with some sort of set-apartness which we and others recognize” (Robbins 1996b:120). The notion of the sacred is mostly reserved for God but it is also attributed to creatures. In the first-century world of Luke 10:25-37, the sacred referred to communal values upheld by the community. Micrea Eliade (1959:96) observes that religious persons seek to live their lives in harmony with the divine by emulating the conduct of the divine:

This faithful repetition of divine models has a two-fold result: (1) by imitating the gods, man remains in the sacred, hence in reality; (2) by the continuous reactualisation of paradigmatic divine gestures, the world is sanctified. Men’s religious behavior contributes to maintaining the sanctity of the world.

Malina (1993:151) defines profane as “that which is not set apart to or for some person in any exclusive way, that which might be everybody’s and nobody’s in particular to varying degrees.” In this respect, the profane should be considered to be in opposition to the sacred. The profane in this regard not only means what is regarded as secular and blasphemous, but also describes the kinds of relationships exhibited in Luke 10:25-37 which are in opposition to the sacred or could be said to be impure.

3.5.3 Jesus and religious authorities: sacred and profane

Within first-century Jewish culture religious authorities possessed considerable power because of the ideological construction of the Jewish society. This power enabled them to control the Jewish religious system, which served as a link between their fellow human beings on the one hand and God on the other. There are three types of religious authorities mentioned in Luke 10:25-37: (1) lawyer, (2) priest, and (3) Levite, who performed specific duties in society in relation to the sacred. These were the formal officials of the Jewish religion who together with the people constitute Israel (Kinsbury 1991:21). Fitzmyer (1978:883, 887) observes that Levites of the first-century enjoyed a privileged status along with the priests, and were entitled to tithes for their priestly service (see my discussion in sub-section 3.3.2.2). In Luke 10:25-37 a clear distinction between these religious authorities is made (however, apart from being separately named,

no distinction is made in terms of function, social status, etc.). Kingsbury (1991:21-22), identifies two distinctions of these religious authorities in the Lukan plot.

(1) Luke portrays these religious authorities as distinct from each other and also from Jesus and the disciples. A good example is the distinction made between the priest and the Levite in 10:31, 32.

2) Luke portrays them as the opponents of Jesus (e.g., 5:17, 21, 30). In Luke 10:25-37 and in the entire Gospel according to Luke, they confront Jesus with controversial subjects (for instance, the question of the law in Luke 10:25-37).

The Lukan Jesus stands outside the normal structures of religious authorities. Kingsbury (1991:17) maintains that Luke's Jesus is "open, sharply confrontational and forgiving towards the religious authorities...as he clashes with them" throughout his life. Luke has the lawyer address Jesus as "Teacher" (10:25) even though he (Jesus) had not been to one of the rabbinical schools. Luke was concerned to show Jesus as more important, worthier of honour than trained legal officials. Perhaps the lawyer was simply saying: "you say you are a teacher; well then, let's see how clever you are..." (my emphasis) as the motive of his question indicates (10:25). Luke presents Jesus as a person possessing much authority and the dominant speaker in this episode (see also Tannehill 1986:227)

Luke frames a controversial dialogue between Jesus and the lawyer, which is focused on the interpretation and implications of the law. Contrary to the other Synoptists, Luke portrays the lawyer as one who interprets the law; the law is 'canon', therefore, sacred (Roetzel 1985:24-25). The conclusion I would draw from here is that the lawyer was an official interpreter of the law because the Jewish community gave him the authority to interpret the law. Unlike the lawyer, Luke's Jesus takes upon himself the role of profane, because even his reaction to the interpretation of the lawyer is characterized by a profane orientation, the Samaritan (Ford 1984:83-84). It is the profane Samaritan in the parable who manifests the transcendence in human society, by 'doing' mercy to a wounded Jew (sacred) who is profaned or declared polluted by his wounds (Ford 1984:

91-92). Talbert (1986:123-124) argued that the priest and the Levite, in fear of making themselves impure by touching a wounded (or dead) person, make a detour in order to avoid pollution and leave themselves intact or clean. To approach or come into contact with a corpse would have resulted in their being contaminated, and they would be required to undergo purification rites (Leviticus 8-9). Priests were not allowed to touch blood or body, apart from their nearest of kin (mother, father, son, daughter, brother, virgin sister, see Leviticus 21:1-3). Though not implied by the text under consideration, they were at all times as priests expected not to defile themselves through any form of contamination or uncleanness (Talbert 1986:124).

It has generally been argued that the original story would have had a Jew in place of the Samaritan and the conduct of the priest and Levite would have been understood sympathetically by a Jewish audience (Caird 1963: 148 see also Montefiore 1910:467) because they understood the requirements of the law. The priest and Levite were merely fulfilling the requirements of the law. In Leviticus 8-9, a detailed ritual is prescribed which transfers priests from the realm of everyday life to that of the sacred, so that they can mediate between God and the people. Indeed Jews who were loyal to the teachings of Scriptures were very knowledgeable about cleanness and uncleanness, one such law being the one concerned with contact with a dead body (Numbers 19:11-13, 14-19). Nevertheless, the scandal of the parable of the Good Samaritan (Luke 10:25-37) is the fact that it functions as an iconoclastic text because it destroys the cherished sacred beliefs of the lawyer in a profane way. Luke does not portray Jesus as instructing the lawyer on exemplary conduct, but instead destabilizing the lawyer's world and thereby challenging him to participate in a new world, the world of the Samaritan (Talbert 1986: 124). Talbert (1986:124) is right when he maintains that in the context of the parable Luke 10:25-37 is a shocker:

The original parable in its setting in Jesus' career aimed not to instruct but rather to challenge, to provoke, to shatter stereotypes. The stereotyper is challenged in his judgements; the usual criteria for evaluating a person's worth are placed by that of unselfish attention to human need wherever one encounters it. This is provocative.

Luke challenges the neglect of those in need that was exhibited by the religious authorities of Israel, who were preoccupied with the observance of ceremonial law. The behaviour of the profane Samaritan sharply contrasts with that of the Jewish religious authorities who were considered to be sacred by their own community. In the eyes of Luke the priest and the Levite appear as villains. Luke presents Jesus, through this encounter with the lawyer, as abolishing the distinction between the sacred and the profane (Ford 1984:91-92). The portrayal of the mission of Jesus in Luke 10:25-37 would seem to be two-fold.

- (1) The extension of the Kingdom is offered to all people regardless of whether traditional Jewish society placed them down on their scale as profane. This Kingdom should be marked by love through service to the person in need across traditional boundaries.
- (2) Membership of the Jewish community is portrayed as meaningless because ritual commandments must be replaced with the law of love (implied in 10:30-37). It is a challenge to redress the entire system. In this way, Luke portrays Jesus as addressing the establishment in tones of warning and challenge so that they would change their attitude towards him and his defense of what they considered to be profane, namely, outsiders and outcasts (Scroggs 1975:13; see also Schillebeeckx 1980:32).

The mention of religious authorities in Luke 10:25-37 sets the stage for the analysis of the many roles performed by the actors in the religious life of the first-century world of Luke. This study of religious authorities provides insight into the religious and social functions they performed in that society. These were people who were solely "set apart" (Malina, 1993:151) from the people in general for religious duties. These religious authorities were considered sacred because they possess within themselves what the community as the ultimate value upheld. It needs to be stressed that the roles of the priests and the Levites were interconnected as they both served in the Temple in so far as sacrifices, music and worship were concerned. Although a clear distinction existed between their duties, they had a working relationship.

The following few paragraphs analyze a code of conduct in the text under study because it reflects the moral sense of right and good in Luke 10:25-37 as it is based on what is regarded as good in the first-century society.

5.4 **A code of conduct**

There is not a single society that may be understood without a study of its code of conduct. A code of conduct refers to a set of ethical rules, which govern acceptable standards of behavior in private, public and religious life. Implicit in Luke 10:25-37 is just such a code, at verse 28. Malina (1993:139) says that “relationships between human beings are patterned and controlled by more or less obvious rules of behavior.” The major significance of such ethical rules prevalent in the first-century society of Jesus is that they draw attention to pitfalls that can be avoided (Luke 10:31, 32), and, more positively, suggest in broad terms how people should behave in the interest of the good of society (e.g., Luke 10:33-37). In this regard, the law should be understood as a normative set of rules of conduct for human beings, which attach sanctions or penalties to the consequences of any action that transgresses one of the rules.

The society into which we as humans are born defines our existence and experience. According to Malina (1993:152): “Human beings the world over are born into systems of lines that mark off, delimit, define nearly all significant human experiences.” Luke pictures Jesus and the lawyer referring to a code of conduct known as the “law,” that is instructions delivered by God to the people of Israel which were intended to regulate individual and communal practice and behaviour: “What is written in the law? How do you read?” (10:26). The law defined society. Malina (1993:29) acknowledges this when he argues that “human beings have an overpowering drive to know where they are. Line-drawing enables us to define our various experiences so as to situate ourselves, others, and everything and everyone that we might come into contact.” Indeed sacred texts define people, existence and the world. Many sacred texts, be they oral or written, are cultural constructions as their existence is dependent on the meanings humankind

attach to them. In this instance everything in Jewish society was dependent on the understanding of the law. Israel, unlike some other nations, had carefully embedded their laws in a written code which required continuous reinterpretation, as in the case of the lawyer (10:27, 29), to keep it current with changing circumstances. Smart and Hecht (1982:xi) submit that:

The world's sacred texts are potent sources of inspiration and behavior and, more importantly, they play a crucial part in the formation of people's perception of reality. They may be thought of as somehow revealed, or as expressions of revelatory experiences, and typically they are treated as possessing authority.

In terms of this analysis, I agree that sacred texts influence the way people interpret the environment around them. These texts possess this authority because the community or 'canonized' have sanctioned them, and they are to be upheld by everybody. These laws were obviously aimed at good conduct of individuals for the well being of society and they helped prevent hatred, dishonesty, and anarchy, to name but a few of their purposes. The Jewish law was intended to be a guide to good relationships, primarily with other members of the community, in order to maintain balance. Jewish society existed on a religious ideology, according to which all those who were not true Israelites and did not strictly observe the religious and social laws were marginalised. The attitude of the Lukan Jesus towards Jews should be seen against this background. Two challenges can be singled out from the discourse on the commandments to love in Luke 10:25-37. Jesus tells the lawyer that (1) he must conduct himself in accordance with the law (10:28); and (2) he must be like the Samaritan and go beyond the requirement of his society (10:37).

Luke depicts Jesus as associating himself with important social issues drawn from the law, such as Jew-Gentile relationship. In the Lukan theology both Jews (sacred) and the Gentiles (profane) are important in the vision of Jesus. Luke intends the exchange between Jesus and the lawyer regarding the social codes to be understood as Jesus challenging the system of purity and exclusivity and the injustice that it fostered. The parable (10:30-35) violates the Jewish purity system and sharply criticizes the Jewish religious leaders. The code that the Lukan Jesus is inculcating for his own community is one that transcends Jewish limitations of "love" and "neighbour" to include those in need.

The opponent of Jesus in Luke 10:25-37 is an expert in Jewish religious law. Many scholars have wondered why the lawyer posed this question to Jesus (10:29) when he knew all the answers to his questions. However, I want to maintain that the question attributed to the lawyer, "Who is my neighbour?" is not a genuine one. The lawyer sought to justify his own practice of treating many people, including fellow Jews, in a way which implied that they were not his neighbours, i.e., he was not under social obligation to them. In any case, Luke is not primarily interested in an internal Jewish debate. He typically puts Jewish leaders in a bad light but here the Jewish leader serves as a foil for a message about a broadened attitude regarding social obligation, which makes need not group membership, important. In the case of Luke's community this looks like a potentially strong argument for insisting that the affluent are obliged to help whoever in the community is in need. This fits well with the communitarianism of Acts (whose authorship is traditionally said to be the same with the Gospel according to Luke).

Luke portrays Jesus as reading the Scriptures in a way, which is quite different from that of his contemporaries. The conduct of the priest and the Levite towards the victim on the Jerusalem-Jericho road is another case in point. Their ethical conduct derives from the existence of purity rules in the first-century world (Leviticus 21:17-24). Purity here refers to the state of complete devotion to God with an absence of any physical form of defilement (Malina 1993:29) such as coming into contact with blood. With a discussion of purity rules come the whole question of human experience of the sacred and issues of group identity. For instance, the Hebrew Bible directs that a priest was not to contaminate himself through material contacts with blood or corpses as his purity was of great importance to the community because he was considered sacred. In the event of contamination, the individual was required by law to undergo purification. One comes across these laws in the priestly documents contained in Leviticus and Deuteronomy. As the duty of the priest was to maintain the ritual purity of Israel and its Temple, this could serve as one of the reasons why the priest and the Levite passed by the victim (10:31, 32) though this was not implied by the text. However, it is a popular assumption, made by most scholars, that the priest and the Levite chose not to help the victim on the

Jerusalem-Jericho road because they were afraid of violating purity laws (Bailey 1980:44-47; Jeremias 1966:203-204; Fitzmyer 1978:887). On the other hand, the Samaritan is portrayed in his action towards the victim in a moving manner: when he saw the man in need he “was moved to pity” (10:33). Luke attributes compassion to the Samaritan, who was outside the requirements of the law (Nolan 1977:28). The action of the Samaritan (10:33-37) is consistent with the attitude of the Lukan Jesus towards outcasts. The reading of Scriptures that Luke seems to be driving home here is a call to an “inclusive” community (Cassidy 1978:33). It is clear that in Luke 10:25-37 Jesus is challenging the Jewish establishment’s definitions of neighbour and love, because his perception (10:30-37) is contrary to what Jews would have expected. The Lukan Jesus openly exposed and criticized the religious authorities for their gross negligence and pretence at the expense of the masses because they used the law to define non-Jews as profane. Evidently, religion was a factor generating division and inequality in the first-century (Desrochers 1977:50).

3.5.5 Summary

This section has described the concept of the sacred and the profane in the first-century world as exhibited in Luke 10:25-37. Because of the centrality of Scriptures to Jewish life, I find the analysis of Roetzel (1985:77) fitting in summing up this section covering Jesus and the religious authorities and a code of conduct:

The scriptures were central to the thought and life of every first century Jewish community. They defined social roles, provided moral code, offered instruction and comfort, and informed the symbol system of relevant institutions.

3.6

CONCLUSION

Part II, consisting of Chapter Three, has demonstrated Robbins' socio-rhetorical criticism by applying its methods to Luke 10:25-37 in an integrated manner. This chapter has analyzed the many ways a parable can be read and interpreted. Instead of demonstrating one limited method of reading a parable, this chapter has applied five *textures* to Luke 10:25-37. In the course of the analysis, I have shown the advantages of combining methods of reading, thus stimulating an interaction between various approaches demonstrated by individual sections in the Chapter. This analysis has enabled me to have a broader and more comprehensive understanding of Luke 10:25-37 and the methods in use. Throughout the Chapter rules of social-rhetorical criticism have operated in dialogue with other disciplines. The findings of this analysis have shown that a parable can be read from diverse methods and the other can employ the data realized from each investigation. The employment of all five *textures* suggested by Robbins to Luke 10:25-37 is not to misunderstand Robbins but is intended to evaluate how his approach can effectively serve the analysis of a parable in an interdisciplinary manner. This analysis has proved the old adage that the test of the usefulness of a method comes not in theory but in practice. It is time now to evaluate the findings of this study in totality, and draw some general conclusion from the following chapter. This is the concern of Chapter Four.

PART III

EVALUATION & CONCLUSION

CHAPTER FOUR

Evaluation

4. Introduction

My purpose in this chapter is to provide an evaluation of socio-rhetorical criticism in the light of its applicability to Luke 10:25-37 as a case study. The reason for this analysis is to demonstrate the significance of what socio-rhetorical criticism can offer to parabolic interpretation today. In order to arrive at an overall judgement with regard to the main concerns of this study, this chapter will address the following questions. What are the main strengths and weaknesses of socio-rhetorical criticism? In addition, what are its potentialities for developing a more theoretically based framework for the study of parables? These questions are best considered in relation to some of the main characteristics of this approach as identified in Chapter Two, mainly (1) interdisciplinary focus, (2) dialogue, (3) ideological interests, and (4) the relevance of socio-rhetorical criticism to parabolic interpretation today. While the theoretical advantages of socio-rhetorical criticism have been well expounded by Robbins (see 1984, 1994, 1996a, 1996b, to cite only a few) and are explained in Chapters One, Two and Three of this thesis, it is relevant to recapitulate their significance for parabolic interpretation. It is essential that I now evaluate the achievements of this study, by assessing the methods employed and the kinds of results achieved.

4.1 Achievements of the socio-rhetorical approach

Undoubtedly there are good reasons why socio-rhetorical criticism is largely concerned with

Evaluation

being an interdisciplinary approach (Robbins 1996a:16-17), although every intellectual strategy has its costs as well as its benefits. I have examined the limits of the historical-critical method (see my discussion in sub-section 1.2) and how these might be overcome using new methods and the emerging new approach in socio-rhetorical criticism. Unlike previous approaches, socio-rhetorical criticism brings to parabolic interpretation useful insights gained from "literary critics, linguistics, sociologists and anthropologists" (Robbins 1996a:17, my emphasis). Its conception of the social sciences reflects this interdisciplinary focus, and in my view it is in this aspect that the great merits of socio-rhetorical criticism reside. This approach is distinguished from the existing approaches in the field of parabolic interpretation to the extent that it takes up the historical-critical method and fuses to it a conscious application of ideas and techniques drawn from the social sciences (Robbins 1996a:239, 144-236). The significance of the method of employing the social sciences in parabolic exegesis is two-fold: (1) it has useful models that help to provide an adequate understanding of the parables, and (2) it helps to overcome the failure of the historical-critical method to engage concepts and perspectives from sociology and cultural anthropology in the analysis of parables (see Robbins 1996a:15, and also some of the exegetes who have applied the social sciences to the New Testament such as Kee 1989, 1993; Malina 1981, 1993, 1986; Tidall 1984 etc.)

Undoubtedly, the value of the applicability of socio-rhetorical criticism to the parable of the Good Samaritan (Luke 10:25-37) has been useful because it has unveiled features of first-century society and culture that could have been omitted had it not been for its interdisciplinary nature. It has indeed generated fresh insights for interpretation in the parable of the Good Samaritan (10:25-37). Since human beings do not live in a vacuum, this analysis has taken into account political, socio-economic, cultural, religious, and communal structures of the world that shaped Luke 10:25-37. This was made possible because socio-rhetorical criticism introduced great insights gained from sociology and cultural anthropology which facilitated my examination of aspects of social behaviour (such as 'hospitality' and 'honour-shame') and institutions (the law, the Temple, and the Sanhedrin, etc.) within the context of the Lukan framework.

Evaluation

I have argued that any resolution of the present crisis, which maintains the conflicts in parabolic interpretation, must involve the methods of socio-rhetorical criticism over the next decade. Socio-rhetorical criticism seeks to bring two areas of thought - socio-scientific and literary-critical methods - into dialogue with the historical-critical method - to show, how an adequate understanding of the current parabolic crisis demands some comprehension and integration of the insights of all disciplinary areas. The application of socio-rhetorical criticism to Luke 10:25-37 has revealed the social settings that characterised first-century Palestine. The methods employed were able to unveil the dynamics depicted in Luke 10:25-37, portraying the kind of interactions between the various social structures that either maintain power or bring about inequality (see also Robbins 1996a:192-236). The importance of this discovery revealed the level of power relations that made it possible in the first-century for the dominant people to oppress and act upon those in subordinate position (see my discussion in section 3.3, and also Robbins 1996a:195).

These methods of socio-rhetorical criticism were also able to define and analyze ways in which groups and individuals existed and functioned within first-century Palestine - such groups as the lawyer, priests, and Levites (10:25-37). A significant differentiation was made between Jews (represented by the lawyer, priest, and the Levite) and Gentiles (represented by the Samaritan) also between the priest and the Levite in the Lukan world-view. The significance of these findings sheds more light on the relationship between Jews (insiders, those under the law and presumably in a superior position) and Samaritans (outcasts, outside the law and presumably the weak) at the time. The discourse in 10:25-37 was able to show how in the Lukan world-view the existing social order at the time was to be reversed and the weak were to be looked upon favourable by God (see my discussion in section 3.3). Through this analysis, an adequate understanding was reached of the relationship between individuals, the relationships between groups, the structures of groups and the social stratification of first-century society (Robbins 1996a: 195; see also Meeks 1983; Malina 1981; Halliday 1978; Fowler 1981). In a nutshell, the application of these methods helped me to study Luke 10:25-37 within the confines of the New

Evaluation

Testament world and the dynamics of the Christian communities in the Roman world of the first-century. I am of the view that the discipline of socio-rhetorical criticism has great potential for enhancing our ability to enter more fully into the conditions that shaped the life and perception of the early Church, thus enriching our understanding of the parables and their significance for Christian faith today.

Another important aspect of socio-rhetorical criticism is its call for dialogue among scholars, which is the means by which they (scholars) are able to extend and improve their services to the community in their interpretative process (Robbin 1996a:16-17). Robbins laments that "while I am happily moving boundaries, others fight to keep them in place" (Robbins 1994: xii). He sees this as a frustration of his efforts towards an interdisciplinary approach that seeks to initiate dialogue. According to Robbins (1996a:11-12) dialogue is an interaction between professional persons who explore a problem to find a solution that will best serve to provide an adequate understanding of a Biblical text. As a process, dialogue should be seen as a technique for improving and expanding the interpretative process in parabolic interpretation. This method provides specialised help and technical information from a variety of disciplines by bringing together scholars and interpreters in an exchange of information, making it possible to provide greater service in resolving disputed analysis of parables (my emphasis; see also Robbins 1996a:3). The merit of this process of dialogue is the fact that it is not the property of any one discipline. The knowledge, skill, and scientific base it rests upon are those that of the professional disciplines of the scholars engaged in consultation with one another. Socio-rhetorical criticism derives its competence from the historical-critical method and the social sciences. Dialogue is predicated on three main assumptions (Robbins 1996a:9):

- (1) that the scholars engaged in dialogue over parables and bring to that dialogue greater knowledge than if they had kept it to themselves (my emphasis),
- (2) that the scholars engaged in dialogue can help to improve upon the use of their skills, or acquire new ones for the better analysis of parables today (my emphasis),
- (3) that the scholars can use the process to enhance their function by clarifying thinking, elaborating their own ideas, and defining goals and purposes of parables (my emphasis).

Gowler (1994:34) has warned: "If we fail to establish dialogue, we leave the Gospels isolated from the contexts in which they were created." Dialogue may result in the confirmation of sound knowledge and identification of gaps and weaknesses of the approaches that have been applied to parables before and those being used now. The importance of dialogue in parabolic analysis should be seen as a helpful process involving the use of technical knowledge and a professional relationship with one or more persons involved in interpretation. This is a relationship of mutual respect and confidence, which the scholar develops, enhances, and maintains by opening doors and continuing the process of dialogue (Robbins 1996a:11-12). This approach, in my view, may facilitate resolution of present controversies that surround parabolic interpretation because its value lies not only in its capacity to initiate dialogue with ancient narratives but also to initiate dialogue between interpreters through a more open discussion with those who advocate more limited agendas (Gowler 1994:35).

The role of language in social interaction has been highlighted in socio-rhetorical criticism in the understanding of individuals, groups and society (Robbins 1996a:44-95; see also Mulholland 1991:307; Alant 1990:18-166). The analysis of the role of language in Luke 10:25-37 enabled me to interact with the meanings of words and sentence patterns (Robbins 1996a:44-95). This aspect of employing techniques and tools from socio-linguistics to New Testament analysis has gained considerable prominence among scholars. Many scholars have come to realise that language not only provides the linguistic symbol system of a culture, but also is itself part and parcel of the culture in which it is used (Alant 1990:162). Obviously the function of language differs from place to place and it was discovered in this study that language could be used to exclude other people from the realm of the sacred (Luke 10:29; see also Alant 1990:163). The significance of analysing the role of language in parables could be summed up in the words of Alant (1990:71):

Language does not only indicate society's relationships with its physical-historical conditions (environment, tradition); it also expresses interpersonal relationships (class, kinship, ethnicity, generation, status etc.), as well as intrapersonal orientations which are of special relevance in re-appropriating and evaluating all the taken-for-granted meanings of society. It is this intra-relationship, which flows from man's ability to think, cry, laugh about and evaluate himself, that more than anything else gives society its symbolic fibre.

It is widely believed today that every interpretative method works to perpetuate some ideology (see Robbins 1996a:192-236). Although the nature of socio-rhetorical criticism as designed by Robbins, as well as its achievements, may be open to debate, I strongly believe that this approach is a successful part of the process which seeks to find a future way forward out of the crisis that surrounds Biblical analysis in general and parabolic interpretation in particular today.

Part of the problems surrounding parabolic interpretation have resulted from the failure of interpreters or scholars to declare their ideological interests or backgrounds that inform their tools of analysis (my emphasis, see also Robbins 1996a:36). This has resulted in numerous conflicting ideas on what the parables are and how they should be interpreted. Therefore, socio-rhetorical criticism is intended to answer some of these difficulties. It is possible now that one parabolic interpreter can recognise and talk to another if they declare their respective agendas and work together. Instead of protecting one or other fragment of discipline in parabolic interpretation, socio-rhetorical criticism is calling on all analysts to parade different alternatives so that the whole may be appreciated and organised by the reader (Robbins 1996a:20-21). The process of making ideological interests known, will facilitate analysts' suspending final judgement about the worth of particular approaches to parables until the whole conflicting array has been examined. However, this will not be easily achieved as I foresee a fierce ideological debate raging round the proposition that the socio-rhetorical approach can and should be used to overcome the limitations and inaccuracies attributed to the historical-critical method. This is because some scholars would still want to maintain their positions of power in their respective areas in order to exert their influence.

Socio-rhetorical criticism brings to light the reality that all human existence is lived within a particular context, mostly comprising diverse interactive backgrounds (Robbins 1996a:194).

What this means is that Christian life is not lived in a vacuum but within the framework of everyday experiences of political, economic, religious, educational, institutional, and cultural dynamics (Robbins 1996a:4-17). Socio-rhetorical criticism has proved useful in explaining the Lukan theology in the parable of the Good Samaritan (10:25-37) because of its capacity to dig deeper into the unique ideological purposes of the author and furthermore, by its possession of

Evaluation

some useful tools of analysis for analysing the socio-political, cultural, ideological and religious setting of first-century Palestine as depicted in Luke 10:25-37 (see also Robbins 1996a:192-236). McDonald (n.d.:599) in his critique of Robbins' (1984) book pointed out that the approach of socio-rhetorical criticism "effectively confined interpretation to the realm of social history." What McDonald fails to realise is the fact that socio-rhetorical criticism is an interdisciplinary approach which is not confined only "to the realm of social history" but relates to many disciplines which include Biblical methods (see my analysis and application of socio-rhetorical criticism in Chapters Two and Three).

4.2 Limitations of the socio-rhetorical approach

One of the costs of socio-rhetorical criticism in its application to the parable of the Good Samaritan (10:25-37) has been to inhibit generalisations about aspects of Christian community as portrayed in the New Testament having its parallels in the Roman-Hellenistic world. Parallels involve some points of similarity between two texts or cultures. This weakness came out strongly when I analyzed the eastern Mediterranean concept of 'hospitality' attributed to the Samaritan observed through the social value of 'honour-shame' (see my discussion in section 3.4 & also Luke 10:33-37). The method of analysing cultural patterns fails to take into account the regional shifts of the cultures in the eastern Mediterranean region. Robbins (1996a:144-191) utilises the works of Bruce Malina (1991, 1993), on which I also depended heavily, who equally makes this great omission. As I have indicated in section 3.4, many scholars have taken it for granted that there is uniformity of cultures in the Mediterranean region. A typical example is the way Malina employs cultural anthropology to analyze New Testament materials (see for instance Malina 1993). Malina does not take into account the diversity of social and cultural dynamics that constituted the Roman world in the first-century (see also similar criticism by Mulholland 1991:301-307). While agreeing with Robbins, I am inclined to go further and suggest that this uniformity can only be said to be true of the core ideas of these cultural concepts but variations occur from one place to another in the eastern Mediterranean region.

However, another cost of socio-rhetorical criticism is the tendency to apply modern sociological models to the New Testament in general and parables in particular. It goes without saying that models have been developed in the present world whose social, political, economic, ideological, and cultural dynamics are very different to those of the Roman world of the first-century (Mulholland 1991:304-307). Although the application of these models to Luke 10:25-37 has shed significant insight into the first-century; nonetheless, this kind of analysis does not do justice to parables, as the world of the text is not adequately accounted for. Robbins has, however, put mechanisms in place to check this but there is a probability of error.

The other problem of socio-rhetorical criticism is the process of reading and re-reading the same text from different perspectives (see Robbins 1996a:3). This could result in a text eventually being forgotten altogether if the interpreter spends so much time in investigations of diverse theories and methods that in the final analysis the text is not accorded maximum attention. My application of the approach to Luke 10:25-37 in sections 3 and 4 of Chapter Three have demonstrated this fact. Furthermore, by virtue of its interdisciplinary nature, there is a sense in which socio-rhetorical criticism inherits all the limitations embodied in other disciplines, as Robbins (1996a:3) rightly acknowledges, "while this may clarify certain issues, it will continually raise others."

4.4 Relevance of socio-rhetorical criticism to parabolic interpretation today

Among the most important practical criteria against which socio-rhetorical methods can be judged is their relevance to current issues and the ease and speed with which they can be applied to evaluate the consequences of different approaches in parabolic interpretation. The relevance of a specific approach is, of course, dependent upon its ability to quantify a particular line of thought. Thus it can be concluded that since the methods Robbins has suggested can be used to develop further methods sensitive to current issues in parabolic analysis, socio-rhetorical methods covered in this study are considerably more relevant to current issues facing parabolic interpretation today (my emphasis).

Evaluation

In view of the general conclusion that socio-rhetorical criticism strategies offer major advantages over the traditional historical-critical approach, it would seem highly desirable to implement a continuing programme of research in parabolic analysis and to open dialogue with other scholars. The programme should be directed towards the introduction of socio-rhetorical strategies as an element of an interdisciplinary approach that has developed study procedures, so that they can become common techniques available to all scholars, interpreters and students of the New Testament. Socio-rhetorical criticism has considerable potential in the field of parabolic interpretation. Not only does it answer in many respects the limitations of historical-criticism referred to earlier in the study, but it also emphasises many of the other very important technical deficiencies inherent in historical critical approach. In addition, the application of the approach to Luke 10:25-37 has shown that it is a highly relevant approach to parabolic interpretation because it offers many advantageous tools of analysis.

Foremost in importance will be the approach's own unique history and tradition, based on data from the past in which Biblical interpretation and analysis lives, moves, and has its being. However, socio-rhetorical criticism will also take shape out of encounters with other specialised approaches as it employs them in an integrated manner to Biblical texts in general and parables in particular. Indeed its very methodological procedures and nature will unfold from such encounters. The data it brings to parables will be re-expressed and re-formulated in the larger context of dialogue with other disciplines. Perhaps most important is the fact that socio-rhetorical criticism is asking us to look to the past as the source of power to transform the present and future in parabolic scholarship and interpretation. However, where does socio-rhetorical criticism fit into the realm of Biblical scholarship and interpretation today?

According to Gowler (1994:35) socio-rhetorical criticism:

...takes its place among the works of other scholars who are testing these interdisciplinary waters. These waters do not lead to that mystical promised land of the one correct interpretation, presupposed by some New Testament scholars, but they initiate a helpful and much needed dialogue.

Evaluation

Last but not least, Robbins does not in any way advocate a divorce from the past, but sees the future as one that should include:

(a) A more successful integration of the study of both Jewish and Greco-Roman literature into New Testament studies; (b) insights from secular literary criticism and modern linguistics in order for New Testament studies to become more a part of the humanities and social sciences; (c) various forms of structural analysis influenced by linguistics, sociology, and rhetorical criticism that utilises various philological, historical, social, anthropological, literary analyses (Gowler 1994:14).

Conclusion

interdisciplinary manner by bringing together social-scientific and literary-critical methods to explore the first-century world of Luke 10:25-37. Once these five methods had been identified, the analysis proceeded to employ them in the study of Luke 10:25-37.

The first method analyzed intertextualities involving the syntactical arrangement of thoughts, words and phrases in Luke 10:25-37 and how they interact with other texts and culture. The main aim was to investigate how early Christian literature, religion and society was a part of the creative process in the composition of Luke 10:25-37. It was established that a text is never free of other texts because all writing is intertextual. The findings of the analysis showed an interesting relationship between Luke 10:25-37 and the other Synoptic Gospels. It was argued that the presence of so much material in Luke 10:25-37 that is not found in Mark or Matthew, material of theological significance, is evidence enough to demonstrate that Luke exercised judicious independence and literary imagination in embellishing materials that were at his disposal. Consideration of the interactions of Luke 10:25-37 with other New Testament materials and other writings enabled me to understand Luke 10:25-37 in its wider context.

The second method was related to unmasking the inside of a text, that is, it was concerned with the examination of word patterns, systems of speaking, and writing as part of communication. Words were perceived as forming the framework of communication as they express meanings and values embedded in the inner experiences of any society. Applying this approach to Luke 10:25-37, I concluded that the patterns and systems of speaking, writing and argumentation revealed the overall theme of the contrast Luke makes between the care of the needy and the oppressed shown by the outcast Samaritan (10:33-37) and the negligence of the religious authorities of Israel (10:30-32, 37). Jesus is portrayed by Luke as redefining love from the first-century concept of "group attachment" (Pilch & Malina 1993:110) to one that moves beyond this established limit of love to include the enemy. It was suggested that Luke 10:25-37 is *deliberative* rhetoric, and I argued for unity in the structure of the argument in spite of transitions and shifts cited by most scholars at 10:29, 30-36, 37).

The third method analyzed ideological settings that shape Luke 10:25-37. It showed that ideological settings played an important role in Luke's framing the context of the encounter

Conclusion

between Jesus and the lawyer, which was dominated by Jewish ideas that had profound influence on the teaching of Jesus. The application of this method further revealed that the lawyer, the priest and the Levite were religious as well as political leaders who commanded considerable respect and influence in the first-century. Luke portrays Jesus as reversing the traditional expectations of first-century society (10:30-37). The teaching of the Lukan Jesus (10:30-37) suggests that Jesus gave priority to the powerless and those without status (10:33-37), like the Samaritan in this instance. It would seem, then, that in the Lukan framework those then in power (lawyer- priest and Levite) were not expected to retain their positions of privilege and influence in the coming Kingdom (see also Stacey 1979:358 who talks of the reversal of fortunes as a distinguishing feature of the Lukan Gospel). Accordingly, the general thesis argued that social, political and ideological factors have been highly significant in motivating Lukan theology; in other words, that Luke shaped materials at his disposal in response to social and political pressures experienced by his community.

The fourth method of socio-rhetorical criticism is the analysis of cultural patterns in a text. The aim of analysing cultural patterns was to examine some eastern Mediterranean cultural concepts and then apply them to Luke 10:25-37 in a bid to provide an understanding of the first-century culture of Palestine. This helped me in analysing more accurately the people depicted in the text regarding their behaviour, what they are saying and their environment. The conclusion reached was that eastern Mediterranean cultural concepts of 'hospitality,' shown through the cultural value of 'honour-shame,' dominate the encounter Luke portrays of Jesus and the lawyer. It was discovered that hospitality enhanced honour in the first-century. Luke pictures Jesus as triumphing in this respect, thereby gaining honour, while the lawyer fails in utter humiliation and shame.

The fifth and final method of socio-rhetorical criticism is the analysis of the concept of the sacred in Luke 10:25-37. The aim of this method was to identify and analyze theological language in Luke 10:25-37 that reveals the Lukan conceptions of the sacred and its relationship with humankind. The purpose was to show how the first-century people conceived of the sacred in relation to the human in their religious faith, practice and experience. Consideration

Conclusion

of the concept of God as manifested at the time through religious authorities and a code of conduct showed that God is implicitly implied as one who is passive but directing the course of human history through laws and through religious authorities. This was highlighted through the discussion of the theme of the sacred and the profane as depicted in Luke 10:25-37.

The evaluation of socio-rhetorical criticism and its applicability to Luke 10:25-37 highlighted both the strengths and the weaknesses of this approach. The study has shown that the approach opens new horizons for interpreting the parable of the Good Samaritan (Luke 10:25-37). This study has relevance to parabolic interpretation today because it seeks to open dialogue between the very different and sometimes conflicting traditions embraced by scholars of parables. Instead of advocates of a particular theory surrounding themselves with their own circle of followers, socio-rhetorical criticism will seek to make it possible for one intellectual faction to create, examine, and extend its ideas through dialogue with another without engaging in unnecessary conflicts and disputes. Through this interaction, exposure to a mass of conflicting ideas will facilitate standing back and understanding what has been omitted, what evidence has not been examined, and which assertions have been challenged. Although, socio-rhetorical criticism does not pretend that diverse perspectives on parables can be reduced to a fundamental harmony, this approach, however, should be seen as a useful tool to be used in attempting to resolve conflicts (my own emphasis).

Finally, it should perhaps be made clear that the approach adopted in this study (socio-rhetorical criticism) is not intended as an alternative to other Biblical approaches. Its aim is rather to complement in an interdisciplinary way, hopefully to enrich the subject matter of Biblical interpretation in general and parables in particular. Robbins' (1996a:16-17) conclusion of his discussion on the challenge of socio-rhetorical criticism seems an appropriate ending for this thesis:

Socio-rhetorical criticism has been designed to help interpreters to use these new resources. The purpose of the strategies and techniques in the approach is to move us into new forms of dialogue, exploration and co-operation that will fulfil the potential that lies in the robust field of biblical study. Socio-rhetorical criticism does this by bringing insights from literary critics, linguistics, sociologists and anthropologists into an organised frame of understanding and

Conclusion

activity.

APPENDIX: *Letter of permission from Vernon K Robbins*

EMORY UNIVERSITY

Department of Religion

Atlanta, Georgia 30322
404-727-7598
Fax: 404-727-7597Vernon K. Robbins
Professor of New Testament
and History of Religions
S214 Callaway
537 Kilgo Circle
Off. 404-727-6466
Hm. 404-982-0174
Fax 404-727-7597
relvkr@leamlink.emory.edu

December 14, 1996

Teddy Kalongo
8 Firleigh Flats
Bridge Street
Rosebank
Cape Town 7700
South Africa

Dear Teddy:

It is my pleasure to authorize you to use the method of socio-rhetorical criticism, which appears in my two books entitled *The Tapestry of Early Christian Discourse* and *Exploring the Texture of Texts* (as well as various published articles) for your M.A. thesis on Luke 10:25-37. I not only grant you permission to apply techniques that I myself have developed in my published works, but I also grant you permission to adapt the method so it appropriately applies, in your view, to the data as you interpret it from your particular context.

I am pleased that you already plan to send a copy of your thesis to me when it is completed. I request that you do this, so I can keep an accurate account of the theses, dissertations, and other studies that use and adapt the approach.

With every good wish for your work.

Sincerely,

Vernon K. Robbins
Department and Graduate Division of Religion

Bibliography

- Alant, C (Ed) (1990) *Sociology and Society* (Pretoria: Southern Book Publishers)
- Amselle, J (1992) Tensions within Culture. *Social Dynamics: A Journal of the Center for African Studies University of Cape Town*, 18/ 1
- Bailey, E K (1976) *Poet and Peasant: A Literary Cultural Approach to the Parables in Luke* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.)
- _____ (1983) *Poet & Peasant and Through Peasant Eyes: A Literary-Cultural Approach to the Parables of Luke*, Vol. I & II (Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company)
- Bailey, L J and Broek D V L (1992) *Literary forms in the New Testament* (London: SPCK)
- Baker, J (956) Luke, the Critical Evangelist. *Expository Times*, 68:123-125
- Barrett, C K (Ed) (1957) *The New Testament Background* (New York: Macmillan)
- Baum, G (1973) The Survival of the Sacred. In *The Persistence of Religion*, G Greeley & G Baum, Eds. Pp. 11-12 (New York: Herder & Herder)
- Beardslee, A W (1970) *Literary Criticism of the New Testament* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press)
- _____ (1976) Parable Interpretation and the World Disclosed by the Parable. *Perspectives in Religious Studies* 3:135
- Beare, F (1962) *The Earliest Records of Jesus* (New York: Abingdon)
- Bechtel, L M (1991) Shame as a Sanction of Social Control in Biblical Israel: Judicial, Political and Social Shaming. *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament*, 49: 47-76
- Beck, E B (1977) *Reading the New Testament Today* (Gulford & London: Lutterworth Press)

- Bellinzoni, A J (1985) *The Two-Source Hypothesis: A Critical Appraisal* (Macon: Mercer University Press)
- Berger, P and Luckmann, T (1966) *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge* (Garden City, New York: Doubleday)
- Booth, W C (1978) Metaphor as Rhetoric: The Problem of Evaluation, In *Critical Inquiry* 5:101-102
- Borsch, F H (1970) Who has Hears. *Anglican Theological Review*, 52: 131-141
- _____ (1988) *Many Things in Parables: Extravagant Stories of New Community* (Philadelphia: Fortress)
- Boozer, J S (1983) The Holy. In *A New Dictionary of Christian Theology*, A Richardson & J Bowden, (Eds.) (London: SCM Press Ltd.), 261-262
- Bouguet, A C (1974) *Everyday Life in New Testament Times* (London: Carousel Books)
- Biling, M (1991) *Ideology and Opinions: Studies in Rhetorical Psychology* (London, Newbury, New Delhi: Sage Publications)
- Black, A D and Dockery S D (Eds.) (1991) *New Testament Criticism and Interpretation* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan Publishing House)
- Black M (1960) The Parables as Allegory, *B.J.R.L.*, 42:273-287
- Blomberg, C L (1987) *The Historical Reliability of the Gospels* (Leicester & Illinois: Inter-arsity Press)
- _____ (1991) Interpreting the Parables of Jesus: Where are We and Where Do We Go from Here, *CBQ*, 53:50-78
- _____ (1984) When is a Parable Really a Parable? A Test Case: The Lukan Parables, *W.T.J.* 46:78-103
- Scot, B B (1989) *Hear Then the Parable* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press)
- Brawley, R L (1987) *Luke-Acts and the Jews: Conflict, Apology, and Conciliation* (Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press)
- Breech, J (1983) *The Silence of Jesus: The Authentic Voice of the Historical Man* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press)

- Brown, R H (1987) *Society as Text: Essays on Rhetoric, Reason, and Reality* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press)
- Brown, R E (1962) Parable and Allegory Reconsidered. *Novum Testamentum* 5:36-45
- Brownrigg, R (1993) *Who is Who in the New Testament* (London: J M Dent)
- Bruce, F F (1943) *The New Testament Documents* (Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press)
- Bultmann, R (1972) *The History of the Synoptic Tradition*. 2nd ed. Trans. J. Marsh (New York: Harper and Row)
- Burke, K (1931) *Counter-Statement* (Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: University of California)
- _____ (1966) *Language as Symbolic Action*, (Berkeley: University of Chicago)
- Cadoux, A T (1930) *The Parables of Jesus: Their Art and Use* (London: James Clarke & Company)
- Caird, G B (1963) *The Gospel of St. Luke* (London: Penguin Books)
- Campbell, J K (1964) *Honour, Family and Patronage* (Oxford: Clarendon)
- Cadbury, H J (1958) *The Making of Luke-Acts* (London: SPCK)
- _____ (1937) *The Peril of Modernizing Jesus* (London: Macmillan)
- Court, J M (1997) *Reading the New Testament* (London & New York: Routledge)
- Craddock, F B (1990) *Luke: A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching* (Louisville: John Knox Press)
- Cranfield, C E B (1954) The Good Samaritan. *Theology Today* 11:368-372
- Crespy, G (1974) The Parable of the Good Samaritan: An Essay in Structural Research. Trans. J Kirby. *Semeia* 2: 27-50
- Crossan, J D (1973) *In Parables: The Challenge of the Historical Jesus* (New York: Harper and Row)
- _____ (1974) Parables and Example in the Teaching of Jesus. *Semeia*, 63-104
- _____ (1974) The Good Samaritan Towards a Generic Definition of Parables. *Semeia*, 2:82-112

- _____ (1991) *The Historical Jesus: The Life of a Mediterranean Jewish Peasant* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark)
- Culler, J (1981) *The Pursuit of Signs: Semiotics, Literature, Deconstruction*, (Ithaca: Cornell University Press)
- Dawsey, J M (1986) *The Lukan Voice: Confusion and Irony in the Gospel of Luke* (Macron: Mercer University Press)
- Davis, J (1977) *People of the Mediterranean - an essay in Comparative Social Anthropology* (London: Routledge & Keegan Paul)
- Dodd, C H (1932) The Gospel Parables, *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, 16:396-412
- Dodd, C H (1961) *The Parables of the Kingdom*. Rev. ed. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons)
- Domeris, W R (1993) Honour and Shame in the New Testament. *Neotestamentica*, 27:1-15
- Drury, J (1976) *Tradition and Design in Luke's Gospel: A Study in early Christian Historiography* (London: Darton, Longman & Todd)
- Durheim, E (1915) 1976 *The Elementary Forms of Religious Life*, J W Swain, Trans. (London: Allen and Unwin)
- Eliade, M (1959) *The Sacred and the Profane*, Trans. W R Trask (New York, Harcourt, Brace)
- Ellis, E E (1966) *The Gospel of Luke* (London: Nelson)
- Evans, C F (1990) *Saint Luke* (London & Philadelphia: SCM Press & Trinity Press International)
- Farrer, A M (1955) On Dispensing with Q. *Studies in the Gospels: Essays in Memory of R H Lightfoot* (ed. D E Nineham; Oxford: Basil Blackwell): 55-88
- Findlay, J A (1951) *Jesus and His Parables* (London: Epworth Press)
- Fitzmyer, J A (1985) *The Gospel According to Luke (X-XXIV)* (Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, INC)
- _____ (1970) The Priority of Mark and the "Q" Source in Luke. In *Jesus and Man's Hope* Vol. 2, D Y Hadian (Ed) (Pittsburg: Pickwick)

- Freyne, S (1988) *Galilee, Jesus and the Gospel: Literary Approaches and Historical Investigations* (Dublin: Gill and Macmillan)
- Funk, W R (1966) *Language, Hermeneutic, and Word of God* (New York: Harper and Row)
- _____ (1974) The Good Samaritan as Metaphor. *Semeia*, 2: 74-81
- _____ (1964) "How do you Read?" A sermon on Luke 10:25-37. *Interpretation* 18: 25-37
- _____ (1965) The Old Testament in Parable; A Study of Luke 10:25-37. *Encounter* 26 :251-267
- _____ (1982) *Parables and Presence* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press)
- Gilmore, D D (1982) *The People of the Plain: Class and Community in Lower Andalusia* (New York: Columbia University Press)
- _____ (1972) Anthropology of the Mediterranean Area. In *Annual Review of Anthropology* 175:17-205
- Goodhue, T (1984) Shame. *Quarterly Review* 4 (2):57-65
- Goulder, M D (1968) Characteristics of Parables of Jesus. *JBL* 97:208-215
- Gowler, D B (Ed) (1994) In V K Robbins, *New Boundaries in Old Territory: Form and Social Rhetoric in Mark*, (New York: Peter Lang)
- Grant, F C (1926) *The Economic Background of the Gospels* (London: Oxford University Press)
- Guthrie, D (1970) *New Testament Introduction* (London, Tyndale, Downes Grove: IVP)
- Hunter, A M (1960) *Interpreting the Parables* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press)
- _____ (1971) *The Parable: Then and Now* (London, Philadelphia: SCM, Westminster Press)
- Jeremias, J (1963) *The Parables of Jesus*, Rev. ed. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons)
- _____ (1969) *Jerusalem in the Times of Jesus*. Trans. F H Cave and C H Cave. (Philadelphia: Fortress)

- Jones, G V (1964) *The Art and Truth of the Parables: A Study in their Literary Form and Modern Interpretation* (London: SPCK)
- Josephus (1930) *Jewish Antiquities*. Trans. H Thackeray and Others (New York: Loeb Classical Library)
- _____ (1928) *The Jewish War*. Trans. H Thackeray (New York: Loeb Classical Library)
- _____ (1926) *The Life and Against Apion*. Trans. H. Thackeray and others (New York: Loeb Classical Library)
- _____ (1926-65) *Flavius. Josephus*. 9 Vols. Trans. H. St. Thackeray, et. al. (Harvard University Press)
- Jülicher, A (1910) *Die Gleichnisreden Jesu*. 2nd ed. (Tübingen: J C B Mohr, II)
- Kautsky, K (1972) *Foundations of Christianity*. Trans. J W Hartmann. *New York Monthly Review*
- Kennedy, G A (1984) *New Testament interpretation Through Rhetorical criticism* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press)
- Kingsbury, J D (1991) *Conflict in Luke: Jesus, Authorities, Disciples* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press)
- Kissinger, W S (1979) *The Parables of Jesus: A History of Interpretation and Bibliography* (Metuchen, N.J. & London: The Scarecrow Press)
- Kitzberger, I R (1994) *Love and Footwashing: John 13:1-20 and Luke 7:36-50 Read Intertextually*. *Biblical Interpretations*, 2.2
- Krentz, E (1975) *The Historical-Critical Method* (Philadelphia: Fortress)
- Lambrecht, J (1981) *Once More Astonished: The Parables of Jesus* (New York: Crossroad)
- _____ (1989) *Rhetorical Criticism and the New Testament*. *Bijdragen, Tijdschrift voor filosofie en theologie*, 50: 239-253
- Lenski, G. E (1966) *Power and Privilege: A Theory of Social Stratification* (New York: McGraw – Hill Book Company)
- Lenski, G and Lenski J (1974) *Human Societies: An Introduction to Macrosociology*. 2nd Ed. (New York: McGraw-Hill)

- Linnemann, E (1967) *Parables of Jesus: Introduction and Exposition* (London: SPCK)
- Linnemann, E (1968) *Jesus of the Parables*, Translated by John Sturdy (New York: Harper & Row)
- Mack, B L (1990) *Rhetoric and the New Testament* (Mineapolis: Fortress Press)
- Mack B L & Robbins V K (1989) *Patterns of Persuasion in the Gospels*. Sonoma, California: Polebridge Press)
- Mack, L B (1991) *Rhetoric and the New Testament* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press)
- Malina, B J (1981) *The New Testament World, Insights from Cultural Anthropology* (Atlanta: John Knox)
- Malina, B J & Neyrey J H (1991b) First Century Personality: Dyadic, not individualistic. In Neyrey, J H (Ed). *The Social World of Luke-Acts, Models for Interpretation*. (Peabody, Mass: Hendrickson pp. 67-96)
- Malina, J B (1993) *The New Testament World: Insights from Cultural Anthropology* (Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster/John Knox Press)
- Marshall, H I (1989) *The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company)
- _____ (1970) *Luke: Historian and Theologian* (Exeter, Devon: Paternoster)
- McDonald, (n.d.)
- McKnight V E (1969) *What is Form Criticism?* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press)
- McKnight, Scott (1988) *Interpreting the Synoptic Gospels* (Grand Rapids: Baker)
- Meeks, W (1983) *The First Urban Christians* (London, New Haven: Yale University Press)
- _____ (1993) *The Origins of Christianity: The first two centuries* (New Haven & London: Yale University)
- Miller, R J (Ed) (1992) *The Complete Gospels: Annotated Version* (California: Polebridge Press)
- Moore, G F (1927) *Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era*, Vol. 2. (Cambridge: Harvard University)
- Moore, I T (1965) The Meaning of Mateship. *Meanjin*, 24:59

- Montefiore, H (1964) Jesus and the Temple Tax. *New Testament studies* 10: 60-61
- Mosala, I J (1990) *Biblical Hermeneutics and Black Theology in South Africa* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B Eerdmans Publishing Company)
- Muenchow C (1989) Dust and Dirt in Job 42:6. *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 108 (4):597-611
- Neusner, J (1973) *From Politics to Piety: The Emergence of Pharisaic Judaism*. (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall)
- Neyrey, J (Ed) (1991) *The Social World of Luke-Acts: Models for Interpretation* (Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers)
- Oakman, D (1986) *Jesus and the Economic Questions of His Day: Studies and Early Christianity* 8, (Lewistone: Edwin Mellen Press)
- Okarie, A M (1995) The Art of Characterization in the Lukan Narrative. *Religion & Theology*, 2/3: 274-282
- Perkins, P (1981) *Hearing the Parables of Jesus* (New York: Paulist Press)
- Perelman, Chaim (1982) *The Realm of Rhetoric* (Notre Dame, IN/London: University of Notre Dame Press)
- Perrin, N (1969) *What is Redaction Criticism?* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press)
- _____ (1967) The Parables of Jesus as Parables, as Metaphor, and Aesthetic Objects, *JR* 47:346
- _____ (1976) *Jesus and the Language of the Kingdom* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press)
- Pitt-Rivers, J (1977) *The Fate of Schechem or the Politics of Sex: Essays in the Anthropology of the Mediterranean* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)
- Prior, M (1995) *Jesus: The Liberator: Nazareth Liberation Theology (Luke 4:16-30)* (Scheffield: Academic Press)
- Rabichev R (1996) The Mediterranean Concepts of Honour and Shame as seen in the Depiction of the Biblical Women, *Religion & Theology* 3/1:51-63.
- Ricoeur, P (1978) Creativity in Language and Listening to the Parables of Jesus. In *The Philosophy of Paul Ricoeur*, edited by C E Reagan and D Stewart, 120-133, 239-245 (Boston: Beacon Press)

- Robbins K V (1984) *Jesus The Teacher: A Socio-Rhetorical Interpretation of Mark* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press)
- _____ (1991) The Social Location of the Implied Author of Luke-Acts. In *The Social World of Luke-Acts: Models for interpretation*, Neyrey H J (Ed) (Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson)
- _____ (1996a) *The Tapestry of Early Christian Discourse: Rhetoric, Society and Ideology* (London and New York: Routledge and Chapman Hall)
- _____ (1996b) *Exploring the Texture of Texts: A Guide to Socio-rhetorical Interpretation* (Valley Forge, Pennsylvania: Trinity Press International)
- Roetzel, J C (1985) *The World that shaped the New Testament* (London: SCM Press Ltd)
- Rousseau, J R (1995) *Jesus and His World: An Archaeological and Cultural Dictionary* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press)
- Saldarini, A J (1988) *Pharisees, Scribes and Sadducees in Palestinian Society. A Sociological Approach* (Wilmington: Michael Glazier)
- Said, E (1979) *Orientalism* (New York: Vintage Books)
- Schramm, T (1971) *Der Markusstoff bei Lukas. Eine Litterarische und readktiongeschichtliche Untersuchung* (New York: Cambridge University Press)
- Schurer E (1891) *The Jewish People in the Times of Jesus Christ*. 2 Vols. Trans. S Taylor and P Christie (New York: Scribner's)
- Schweizer, E (1984) *The Good News according to Luke*, Trans. David E. Green (Atlanta: John Knox)
- Scott, B B (1989) *Hear then the Parable* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press)
- Schneider, J (n.d.) Of Vigilance and Virgins: Honour, Shame and Access to Resources in Mediterranean Societies *Ethnology* 9:1-24
- Sider, J W (1983) Rediscovering the Parables: The Logic of the Jeremias Tradition, in *JBL* 102/1, 61-83
- _____ (1995) *Interpreting the Parables: A Hermeneutical Guide to their Meaning* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan Publishing House)

- _____ (1981) The Meaning of Parable in the usage of the Synoptic Evangelists, *Biblica* 62:453-470
- Stambaugh, J and Blach, D (1989) *The Social World of the First Christians* (London: SPCK)
- Stein R H (1975) *An Introduction to the Parables of Jesus* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press)
- Stern, D (1989) Jesus' Parables from the Perspective of Rabbinic Literature: The Example of the Wicked Husbandmen. In *Parable and Story in Judaism and Christianity*, edited by C Thoma and M Wyschogrod, 42-80
- _____ (1987). *The Synoptic Problem: An Introduction* (Grand Rapids: Baker)
- Streeter, B H (1924) *The Four Gospels: A study of Origins* (London: Macmillan)
- StuhlmueLLer, C (1968) The Gospel According to Luke. In *Jerome Biblical Commentary*. (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall)
- Talbert, C H (1982) *Reading Luke: A Literary and Theological Commentary on the Third Gospel* (New York: Crossroad)
- Tolbert, M A (1970) *Luke* (Nashville: Broadmann Press)
- Tolbert, M A (1979) *Perspectives on the Parables: An Approach to Multiple Interpretations* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press)
- Tuckett C M (1984) Synoptic Tradition in the Gospel of Truth and the Testimony of Truth, *JTS* 35:45
- Tuckett C M (1983) *The Revival of the Griebasch Hypothesis* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press)
- Tyson, J B (1978) Source Criticism of the Gospel of Luke. In *Perspectives on Luke-Acts*, edited by Charles H Talbert (Edinburgh: T & T Clark Limited)
- Daalen, V and David H (Eds.) (1976) *The Kingdom of God is Like This* (London: Epworth Press)
- Vail, A L (1924) The Good Samaritan as a Text. *Review Expositor*, 21 309-321
- Vermes. G (1973) *Jesus the Jew* (London: Collins)
- Via, D O (1967) *The Parables: Their Literary and Existential Dimension* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press)

- Via, D O (1974) Parable and Example Story: A Literary-Structuralist Approach. *Semeia* 1: 105-133
- Vorster, W S (1988) "Genre" and the Revelation of John: A Study in Text, Context and Intertext. *Neotestamentica* 22 :103-123
- Walton C R (Ed) (1970) *A Basic Introduction to the New Testament* (London: SCM Press Ltd.)
- West, C (1993) *Race Matters* (Boston: Beacon Press)
- Westermann, Claus (1990) *The Parables of Jesus in the light of the Old Testament* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press)
- Wilder, N A (1939) *Eschatology and Ethics in the Teaching of Jesus* (New York: Harper)
- _____ (1954) *Otherworldliness and the New Testament* (New York: Harper)
- _____ (1956) Scholars, Theologians, and Ancient Rhetoric, *JBL* 75: 1-11
- _____ (1964) *Early Christian Rhetoric: The Language of the Gospel* (New York: Harper & Row)
- _____ (1964) *The Language of the Gospel*, 79-96 (New York: Harper & Row)
- _____ (1982) *Jesus' Parables and the War of Myths: Essays on Imagination in the Scripture*. Edited with a Preface by James Breech (Philadelphia: Fortress Press)
- Williams, H (1926) *The Good Samaritan: Addresses on the Parable* (London: Mowbray)
- Wilson R R (1984) *Sociological approaches to the Old Testament* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press)
- Wood, H G (1929) The Parables of Jesus. In *Abingdon Bible Commentary*. New York: Abingdon Press 914-920
- Wolf, E R (1969) Society and Symbols in Latin Europe and in the Islamic Near East: Some Comparisons: *Anthropological Quarterly* 42: 287-301
- _____ (1966) *Peasant*. (New York: Prentice Hall Inc)
- _____ (1966) *Peasants, Foundations of Modern Anthropology Series* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall)

Young, H (1977) Once again, now, 'Who is My Neighbour?' A Comment. *Evangelical Quarterly* 49: 178-179

Young, N (1992). The Good Samaritan – A Paradigm of Aussie Mateship? *The Australian & New Zealand Theological Review Colloquium*, 24
2:58-66

THE RELEVANCE OF THE CULTURAL DIVISION OF THE LABOUR MARKET

The literature in the chapters on theory relating to the influence of divided labour markets in segregating ethnic interests is compelling. Because of the fact that African workers undercut the Afrikaners in employment it is certainly another issue where the principle of an "*affinity*" of interests in establishing powerful structures was relevant. The ethnic ideologues in the thirties and forties were more than aware of the fact that some form of "*job reservation*" for whites would ultimately be necessary. One must accept that the competitive interests of white semi-skilled labour strengthened the race factor in the consciousness of rank-and-file Afrikaners.

It is difficult without going into very detailed evidence, to decide on the relative significance of labour market competition in the make-up of race consciousness in the movement. Any number of quotations or examples of events in the labour market for or against the proposition will not decide the issue. Perhaps one telling point, however, is that I could find no evidence that from the thirties and forties onwards, the race consciousness in the industrial towns and cities was any more severe than in non-industrial areas like Pretoria, Pietersburg, Bloemfontein and the like.

The divided labour market was a factor, but not an overwhelming factor in the mix of factors contributing to the institutionalised racism of the Afrikaner nationalist movement. It played an important part in the general determination to protect the lower boundary of the ethnic group -- it was therefore also incorporated into the wider ethnic dynamic.

THE SURVIVAL OF RACE AS THE DOMINANT MARKER

In terms of ethnic "*markers*", then, the issue of the cultural tension between Anglo-Saxon and Afrikaans cultural worlds declined in salience after the Afrikaner nationalists achieved power. The religious marker, that of Afrikaner Calvinism, was unproblematic -- the Dutch Reformed Churches and Calvinist congregations as such had never been under serious pressure from the British. The political boundary was strengthened and extended with

confidence. These developments exposed race among the markers as the issue of greatest salience. As the tide of the other defining features ethnicity receded in salience, the issue of race was left high and almost dry, as it were.

The racially-defined ethnic boundary construction and defence fed back into the consciousness, and into the Afrikaner nationalist enterprise, and would have done so even without the relatively limited influence of the imported German race theories. This was fated to establish institutionalised racism and apartheid as the template of its ethnicity. It was, as suggested, a case of obsessional ethnic boundary maintenance usurping the content of the consciousness.

THE BUREAUCRATIZATION OF ETHNICITY

Political power after 1948 made the issue of the promotion of the Afrikaans language and culture less and less problematic; it became an issue of complacency, because the state administration took over the functions of ethnic cultural maintenance. The state, which grew more powerful in the post-war period of rapid economic growth, dealt with more and more issues on behalf of the Afrikaners. The relative, but narrowing, disadvantage of the Afrikaners in business was also an advantage in other respects because the most competent people became schoolteachers and public servants, and the Afrikaners received good service from the new dispensation. This was the institutionalisation and bureaucratization of ethnicity, and with it the growth of dependence on the National Party and its state machinery.

Race, however, maintained its salience because the emerging black liberation struggle prevented the resolution of that one aspect of the boundary system. Increasingly over time, it once again became an issue of survival, because the ethnicity had become incorporated into the state nationalism of the Republic, and the Republic was seen to be under racial and ideological attack.

The role of the state was to make the defence of boundaries too easy for the voluntary ethnic personnel in welfare and cultural organisations. Whereas in other ethnic groups, even in South Africa, boundary maintenance for whatever reason has to be maintained through the unofficial yet powerful sanctions and signals generated in the internal group dynamics, by the eighties Afrikaner professionals had the luxury of being able to distance themselves from the bureaucratic rules, which were very often crude and offensive.

In a very real sense the state had dislodged the ethnic formation. With apologies, another small example from personal experience is useful. This author, as a Probation Officer in 1960 in Pretoria, refused to implement official instructions in terms of the Child Welfare Act to remove an illegitimate baby of a Protestant unmarried mother from non-Protestant foster-care, and as a long drawn-out consequence was charged with contempt of the Children's Court. The entire Afrikaans professional establishment was sympathetic, but to no avail, and even the Magistrate fudged the issue and I left the Pretoria public service. In this and in many other ways, an ossifying state machinery was beginning to alienate its own professional and intellectual constituency. This was undermining the flexibility that any organisational system requires. Would the Afrikaner cultural leaders in the Cape have wanted to see the destruction of District Six, thereby alienating an Afrikaans-speaking coloured community substantially on the side of Afrikaners on the race issue?

STATE LEADERS AND THE LOST SCRIPT: THE COSTS OF INSTITUTIONAL DEPENDENCY IN THE TRANSITION

The most severe costs for the group were imposed by the bureaucratised state oligarchy on the leadership capacity of the ethnic group. After decades in power the government, quite aside from its ethnic representation, suffered all the defects of an unthreatened and dominant power position.

From the mid-eighties onward, it was placed under the severe, and thoroughly-deserved stress of having to deal with international pressure and sanctions, the externally and internally-organised campaigns of the liberation struggle and attempt to formulate policy

responses to complex problems arising out of the failure of Apartheid. On the policy level its responses were clumsy, and it failed to take timely initiatives to retain the high ground. The reputation of the party in academic and intellectual circles suffered disastrously. The security strategies in particular alienated many people who might otherwise have remained committed to the ethnic cause. This also meant that the government machine lost talent and capacity and became even more alienating -- a vicious cycle of bureaucratic decay.

The government was in effect experiencing, under extreme stress, all the dilemmas of state control and legitimacy in mobilised and politicised plural societies. The inevitable result was more and more Afrikaner intellectuals seeking other networks of identification.

When the costs of maintaining apartheid became too great and the government leaders began to implement a very necessary but poorly digested agenda of political change, the accelerating effect of precedents pulled them well beyond their capacity to manage the process. When the actual transition to democracy began, the role of the bureaucratic party was even more cataclysmic for the core interests of Afrikaner ethnic goals (as opposed to the goals of the Apartheid state establishment). In the end the government entered the negotiations without a clear concept of a resolution and without anticipating the disruptive effects on its agenda which negotiation crises, invented and otherwise, would have on its negotiating positions.

The shadowy "*deal*" between the political establishment and the liberation movements which was anticipated by most realistic observers, was understood as one of a broad type encountered in negotiated transitions to inclusive democracy described inter alia by O'Donnell, Schmitter and Whitehead (1986). The concept was that of a founding "*pact*". Such pacts were generally understood by the authors referred to as being based on, and guaranteeing, the vital interests of the major parties to the agreement. Although the South African transition had the appearance of such a pact, it offered very much less in terms of guarantees of the vital cultural interests of Afrikaners than Professor Schmitter himself anticipated (personal communication on a visit to South Africa).

The negotiations themselves were the basis of the long-overdue political miracle of peaceful transition from authoritarian rule. A political miracle achieved, and mercifully so, however, on the basis of an uneasy blend of the good intentions of the government leadership, unremitting local and international pressure and woeful negotiating incompetence by the establishment politicians and bureaucrats. In this respect the conclusions of Alexander Johnston (1994) that the absence of a tough, protectionist trade-union tradition in the Afrikaner nationalist establishment are particularly apposite.

- The settlement was a Godsend in its destruction of Apartheid but a disaster for the conceptually and culturally distinct interests of Afrikaner ethnicity as a collective cause, revealing the full effect of Afrikanerdom's latter-day reliance on the state, the dominant party and its advisors.

On the side of the liberation struggle, the negotiators were drawn from the ranks of highly competitive and skilled current and former trade unionists and activists, with an abundance of progressive intellectuals and lawyers available to give support. On the side of government and the National Party, the participants were state ministers and politicians who had become accustomed to the delegation of tasks and the support of bureaucratic functionaries. The legal advisors on the side of government, because of the intensity of international pressure against apartheid and on South African academia, were apologetic and often anxious to be accepted as professionals by their opponents on the side of the liberation movements.

The National Party government went into the negotiations confident that it would emerge with a form of power-sharing in which they, the National Party and the ANC, as well as certain smaller parties, would be part of some form of semi-permanent ruling coalition. The confidence with which they held this concept obscured the detail which they required to be concerned about in the negotiations. To cut a long story short, the National Party and government negotiators were clumsy and naive in the negotiations compared with their antagonists. Some ministers actually commenced the beginning of their political defection in the process.

The negotiations produced an agreement for a five-year coalition "*Government of National Unity*", but one subject to numerically-based executive decision-making, which proved to be so tension-ridden and indeed humiliating for the National Party that it withdrew into opposition after two years. No single sphere of local autonomy or categorical entrenchment of cultural rights for Afrikaners was retained; not even at local government level. The party that went into the negotiations with a massive power advantage, fortuitously for the establishment of an open democracy based on constitutionally guaranteed individual rights, managed to snatch almost total defeat from the jaws of an equitable chance of an interesting multi-cultural constitution. In one restricted historical phase it accomplished more to undermine the Afrikaans language than the entire British colonial enterprise had been able to accomplish in successive periods over centuries.

This, as said, was the ultimate price paid by the Afrikaans ethnic enterprise for the reliance on politicians and bureaucrats who had grown fat and complacent with total power over decades. As the review in chapter 5 has suggested, the Afrikaners at large would never have even remotely accepted the outcome or even the transitional negotiations had they known what they were likely to produce. They might have accepted what Dan Horowitz (1982) has described as "*dual authority politics*", but they were handed the power base of a permanent minority instead.

12.2 THE CURRENT QUALITY OF AFRIKANER ETHNICITY

Empirical studies have shown that Afrikaner ethnicity at present has a pervasive quality of ambiguity. While all ethnicities undoubtedly have a blurred quality, history has bequeathed a particular complexity to Afrikaners.

THE WIDER RACIAL OR EURO-CENTRIC IDENTITY.

The factor-analyses and the other survey-based evidence have shown a dominant preoccupation with deteriorating group status that is simultaneously a racial status. This is closely linked with material protest and a perception of governance in the country which deviates widely from the (very much idealised) memory of efficiency and orderliness under the former white government. The material protest is not based on fiction: the very large 1999 annual "AMPS" survey (All Media Products survey carried out for the advertising industry) shows that white unemployment has doubled since 1995. This consciousness is based on relativities more than on absolute deprivation because Afrikaners are still a privileged minority. The material protest is shared with English-speaking whites. Hence the threats perceived in the new situation are not specifically ethnic. Threats to Afrikaans language and culture rank very low in the priority-order of status threats. X X

In terms of group identification, the primary political identification of most Afrikaners is with other whites. This is based on an openly euro-centric conception, or misconception, that "Western" standards and orderliness are at odds with a more compliant, relaxed and less principled "African" system of governance, although many conservative whites and Afrikaners perceive some affinity with the type of African conservative traditionalism portrayed by the traditional Zulu leadership, for example. One appreciates that many readers will not expect too fine a point being put on this white orientation and would see it simply as persisting Afrikaner racism, which it is in effect. At the same time, however, because it is imbued with conceptions of European culture and styles of governance, it signals a wider zone of ethnic identification among Afrikaners -- "*dual consciousness*".

The empirical results, taken together, show that Afrikaners have a somewhat greater commitment to this conception of Western or Euro-centric identity than English-speakers. This is no doubt partly due to a greater sense of threat to their occupational interests in the new situation, but I would submit that it is also due to the fact that an aspect of Calvinist doctrine emphasises a worldly expression of faith in orderly and accountable public life.

We may recall that the results of Hanf et al (1981:91) showed Afrikaners to be about three to four times more religiously and ethnically conscious than English-speakers.

Gibson and Gouws (1998) have established empirically that the whites, mainly Afrikaners, with a stronger level of group identification, racial or ethnic, and those with more intense psychic needs for identification, are most likely to express antipathy to racial and ethnic outgroups -- a familiar finding in social science. This type of finding may be tautologous, however, saying in effect that ethnics have stronger ethnic boundaries than non-ethnics. It also glosses over the perceptual dynamics involved.

THE AFRIKANER CULTURAL AND ETHNIC "INNER-CONSCIOUSNESS"

While less than one in ten Afrikaners give priority to threats to language and cultural interests over material concerns and concerns with governance, the proportion which identifies primarily with the Afrikaans ethnic group is higher. The empirical evidence shows it at around 20 to 30 per cent. In other words, a core of the more particular ethnicity is consistently present in the consciousness of Afrikaners.

Furthermore, the level of priority given to threats to language and culture tend to be increasing over time, up to the most recent investigations. More recent, as yet uncomputerised data seem to show a further intensification of language and cultural grievances.

While not at the level of first priority, a sense of language and cultural discrimination is a matter of near-consensus among Afrikaners. In this sense, among rank-and-file Afrikaners as opposed to intellectuals, there is very little conscious defection from an association with the ethnic group. The defection which has taken place is from organised ethnic politics. Politics is dominated by wider status, identity and material concerns, whereas cultural identity is preserving itself in the private or social spheres. There is a "retreat" but it is a retreat from politically mobilised ethnicity as opposed to identity.

An extensive series of factor analyses on attitudinal data showed that within the wider crystallisation of a racial and Euro-centric group consciousness, which tends to coincide with a cultural consciousness among Afrikaners, there is a separately identifiable commitment to specifically Afrikaner ethnicity, and similar but less manifestly experienced tendencies among other minorities in South Africa.

This "*inner identity*" could conceivably be merely a superimposition on the wider racial and Euro-centric consciousness, but the factor analyses showed very consistently that it is a separate perceptual dynamic. It obviously has large areas of commonality with the wider identification but it crystallises separately and therefore has a degree of autonomous attitudinal status.

This ethnic, as opposed to racial, identity is not unique to Afrikaners, and all groups within the South African racial minorities reveal, equally consistently, a more particularistic as opposed to racial identification. It is in all groups a minority phenomenon but the minority strength of the tendency is not insignificant.

This "*ethnic*" identity among Afrikaners is not consistently associated with any greater militancy than the wider identity, and indeed there is no greater militancy among Afrikaners in general than there appears to be among other racial and language-based minorities. Associations with militancy are stronger among the coloured language minority, where the identity is overlaid, with a strong consciousness of material deprivation. Nonetheless, there is a core, albeit small, of ethnic militancy among Afrikaners.

The empirical research also confirmed much earlier findings by Schlemmer (and Turner) (1973) that the ethnic-orientation among Afrikaners includes a sub-group which we termed "*separatist verligtes*" (enlightened separatists) -- a fairly distinct tendency in which ethnicity is not associated with racial outgroup-hostility. If anything this orientation has strengthened. The evidence is strong, therefore, that Afrikaner ethnicity and racial-Euro-centric in-group identification are conceptually and ideologically separate phenomena.

They overlapped and consistently reinforced each other in the period of Afrikaner ethnic mobilisation, but they are distinguishable phenomena in their composition.

In this regard one should note as well, that research by Lever (1978:126) suggested little association between Afrikaans ethnocentrism and the authoritarian personality syndrome which has been associated with racism in a number of studies outside South Africa.

The "*inner identities*" among the coloured and English-speaking white racial minorities are not as self-consciously held as is the case among the Afrikaners. The identities have not become encoded or mythologised; they are what one may describe as nascent ethnicities in the form of group-consciousness. The finding that some form of ethnic group identification is present among English-speakers has been established before, not only by this author but also by Sennet and Vorster (1996). Among the English-speaking white "*semi-ethnics*", as it were, there is an a sense of affinity with Afrikaans ethnicity but among coloured "*semi-ethnics*" the relationship to white Afrikaners tends to be hostile, as one would expect in the light of Apartheid.

The empirical evidence also reflected a marked educational differentiation between the tendencies identified for Afrikaners. The majority of Afrikaners with university education tend to have weaker group identification at all levels of identity outlined above, but there is a core among the Afrikaans intelligentsia that remains ethnic in its commitments. The heated and hostile debate which rages currently between "*cosmopolitan*" and ethnic Afrikaners is well-reflected in the empirical data.

POLITICAL OR TERRITORIAL SELF-DETERMINATION: A LIMP CONSENSUS

Afrikaners reveal a high level of support in principle for self-determination and/or a Volkstaat, but an active commitment to the ideal is a minority phenomenon. The urge to self-determination is not only related to ethnic commitment but also to the racial-Eurocentric identification. This is also reflected in the significant support for an Afrikaner Volkstaat among English-speakers.

The level of active commitment to the ideal of a Volkstaat is mainly depressed by perceptions of its economic and political non-viability. As such it is limp and passive, but if a perception of its practical possibility took hold, the ideal is likely to burgeon.

ONION VERSUS ARTICHOKE: LAYERS OF AFRIKANER IDENTITY

What the data tends to show is well expressed by Stanley Hoffmann (1968:200-201). Ethnic identity is not like an onion with which, if one peels away layers of outer identity, the vegetable vanishes; it is rather like an artichoke, where peeling away layers of petals eventually reveals the core or heart of the flower.

The specifically Afrikaans high-priority ethnic commitment is a minority phenomenon, albeit significant. The descriptive cultural self-definition of themselves by Afrikaners, is a majority phenomenon, but does not have direct salience as regards political commitments. Religious self-identification and commitment is also a majority phenomenon, no longer with direct salience for politics.

The identification with a wider racial-Euro-centric value system, however, is a majority phenomenon with direct salience for conservative political commitments. The political salience, however, appears to be intensified where cultural and religious self-definitions are present. The effect of the apparently non-politically focused cultural self-identification, therefore, is subliminal, but powerful.

The high-priority ethnic commitment, therefore, appears to be at the core of what may be termed an ethnically-linked but not necessarily self-conscious political culture. This political formation is dominantly conservative, but it embraces an idealistic and reform-oriented minority. The political salience of both the core-ethnicity and the wider ethnically-linked elements of political culture are tending to intensify, but gradually.

The broad categorisation given above tends to be supported by empirical survey research by Bornman (1994a) and by Kotze (1997), although they did not attempt the identification of layers of identity as offered above. Another study by Bornman (1994b) has shown that ethnic identification among Afrikaners is associated with positive self-image and confidence. Although this to some extent lowers the dependence on ethnic identification, one of the problems of the Afrikaners over the decades was how to deal with extremely self-assured Anglo-Saxon competitors. The Afrikaans author Nepgen (1938) remarked on this problem long ago and argued that the ethnic identification and the sense of having a collective mission increased the sense of personal worth of Afrikaners. Here we see an illustration of one of the primary factors in ethnic identification at work.

12.3 SOME IMPLICATIONS FOR ETHNICITY THEORY

One way of relating Afrikaner ethnicity to a wider theoretical field is to ask how the major features of Afrikaner ethnicity outlined above would translate into general propositions. Some of these propositions can be fairly firm, while other issues have to be stated as possibilities, because the Afrikaner case study does not always produce a clear conclusion. The following propositions and possibilities are suggested by the conclusions for Afrikaners reached in the previous section; also by the wider evidence and the historical review of the emergence of Afrikaner ethnicity. The propositions are not assumed to be new or original, but they may have some confirmatory value. They broadly coincide with and tend to confirm the relevant propositions included in chapter 4.

THE ETHNIC CORE SUI GENERIS

Despite several overlays of group-linked interests, interactions with other groups at the boundaries and adaptations in value systems, what has been termed an ethno-cultural inner-consciousness within the particular ethnic group, can or will persist. This core-consciousness is relatively independent of extraneous instrumental motives, and denotes an intrinsic identification.

The core ethnic commitment is not necessarily a majority phenomenon. But even where it exists in a minority within the group, it is a "core" in the sense that the common self-identification of most members in terms of culture and ethnic label links them to the core commitment in a pattern of common sentiment.

THE ETHNIC CORE AND MYTHS OF ORIGIN

The ethnic core-commitments, where they are self-conscious, are likely to be linked to the myths of group origin, since these myths are the symbolic metaphors which impart the sense of belonging which is a defining feature of ethnic phenomena. The myths of origin need not be highly specific. By this is meant that they need not relate to a single ancestor or kin formation. The perception of the emergence of a group over a period of distant history, with diverse symbolic events, may be sufficient.

THE SPECIFIC IDENTITY REFERENCE IN THE MYTH OF ORIGIN MAY OR MAY NOT HAVE A BEARING ON THE RELATIVE EXCLUSIVITY OF THE GROUP AT A LATER STAGE.

The history of the Afrikaners raises the question of whether or not a broad European-Protestant self-definition at an early stage, or the ambivalence with regard to the English, may have influenced the rules of ethnic inclusion or exclusion at a later stage. The question of whether a very specific myth (eg. Moses/the Tribe of Israel) versus a more diffuse reference (Germanic-French Protestant settlers associated with a Dutch Company) makes a difference to the degree of ethnic exclusivity at a later stage, requires comparative investigation. (In the case of Afrikaners there is even today a semblance of Germanic or Huguenot pride, but its subtle effects have not been investigated.)

IT APPEARS TO BE POSSIBLE FOR ETHNIC RESPONSES, EVEN MILITANT RESPONSES, TO EMERGE EVEN WHERE THE ETHNIC IDENTITY IS LATENT.

If elements of "*contrastiveness*" are present and a competitive situation with sufficient stress to generate needs for psychic support exists, an ethnic response quite as powerful as is would occur in a self-conscious ethnic group is possible. This illustrates the "*need disposition*" aspect of ethnicity which underlies its "*availability*" as a factor in group or political mobilisation and conflict.

This proposition is drawn from the evidence of inter-group conflict among black workers on the mines which occurred with a strong ethnic coloration despite the fact that the participants were idealistically opposed to the notion of ethnic solidarity and group formation. It is also drawn from the evidence of a "*group consciousness*" with elements of activism among coloured people in the factor analyses, although the actors themselves would probably not experience anything like an ethnic consciousness and indeed would feel uneasy if they did.

ETHNIC CONSCIOUSNESS IS NOT UNIFORM ACROSS A GROUP (as implied by the distinction above between a core consciousness and marginal consciousness) *BUT THE EXTENT TO WHICH THE CORE AND THE MARGINS MOBILISE AGAINST EACH OTHER IS RELEVANT TO THE VIABILITY AND SURVIVAL OF AN ETHNIC GROUP.*

The question here is whether the outer rings in the "*artichoke*" of ethnic identity allow the "*heart*" to speak on their behalf is obviously critical to the coherence or vulnerability of a cultural group.

THE POSSIBILITY OF TENSION BETWEEN CORE VERSUS MARGIN, OR BETWEEN "EXCLUSIVES" VERSUS "INCLUSIVES" RAISES THE QUESTION OF THE EFFECTIVENESS OF LEADERSHIP, ORGANISATIONAL CO-ORDINATION AND RECONCILIATION WITHIN THE GROUP, WHICH HAS A BEARING ON THE VULNERABILITY OF THE GROUP.

The Afrikaners, for example, at different periods have spent perhaps a century or more fighting each other about the relationships with the English-speakers and more latterly with

coloured Afrikaans-speakers. This proposition has been made very effectively by Milton Esman (1990:55)

"Equally important (to an ethnic group) are the abilities, commitment, and coherence of the political entrepreneurs who organise and guide ...(and) provide ongoing links with the mass of their ethnic community."

ETHNIC BOUNDARIES (as Frederik Barth postulated) RELATE MORE TO THE INTERESTS AND INSTRUMENTAL INTERACTIONS OF AN ETHNIC GROUP THAN TO ITS CORE CONTENT AND COMMITMENTS. AND AS SUCH, SINCE THE BOUNDARIES AFFECT THE CORE CONTENT OVER TIME, THE BOUNDARY CAN USURP THE ORIGINAL COMMITMENTS.

This seems to follow convincingly from the Afrikaners instrumental concerns with race and the race boundary.

AN ORGANISED ETHNIC GROUP WILL INCORPORATE CLASS INTERESTS AND OTHER COMPETITIVE INTERESTS RELATIVE TO OTHER GROUPS. IT IS POSSIBLE FOR AN ETHNIC GROUP TO INCORPORATE OPPOSING CLASS INTERESTS SIMULTANEOUSLY, AND TO RECONCILE THEM WITHIN THE GROUP, OR TO GIVE ONE SET OF INTERESTS PRECEDENCE OVER ANOTHER. CLASS INTEREST CAN BECOME THE DOMINANT INTEREST BASE OF A GROUP OR IT MAY BE LESS SALIENT RELATIVE TO OTHER GROUP INTERESTS.

This proposition is in contrast to the proposition in Marxist literature, which would have it that the class dynamic will usurp, incorporate or even manufacture or facilitate ethnic interests to support the structural imperative of the mode of production. The fact that the Afrikaner ethnic group could simultaneously incorporate and integrate proletarian, petit bourgeois and (semi-socialist) bureaucratic interests at the time of its greatest cohesion indicates, however, that the ethnic formation can be the prior or co-ordinating factor.

WHERE CLASS INTERESTS ARE INCORPORATED, UNLESS AN ENTIRE CLASS IS INVOLVED, THE PHENOMENON OF "SPLIT LABOUR MARKETS" WILL EMERGE AND THE CLASS SEGMENT WITHIN THE ETHNIC GROUP WILL COMPETE WITH CLASS-EQUIVALENTS OUTSIDE THE GROUP. THE SAME PRINCIPLE WOULD APPLY IN RESPECT OF CAPITAL MARKETS AND BUREAUCRATIC OPPORTUNITY.

Here again the ethnic dynamic appears to have precedence over the class dynamic. In the case of Afrikaners the impoverished proletariat did not co-opt the ethnic group but returned to the ethnic group of the identification they had before their proletarianisation. The split labour market literature seems to place undue emphasis on the worker competition; the competition between ethnic adversaries will occur at all levels of opportunity, and as such reflect the instrumentality of ethnicity as such and not the incorporation of ethnicity for extraneous instrumental purposes.

IT FOLLOWS THAT THE ETHNIC FRAMEWORK CAN LEND THRUST AND COHERENCE TO CLASS INTERESTS WITHIN ITS FORMATION. AT THE SAME TIME INCORPORATION OF CLASS-BASED ORGANISATION AS A COMPONENT OF ETHNIC MOBILISATION CAN LEND STRENGTH AND TENACITY TO AN ETHNIC GROUP.

The references in the preceding text to the comparative work on South Africa and Northern Ireland by Alexander Johnston are apposite in this regard, but the development of Afrikaner capitalist organisations were particularly important to the competitive viability of Afrikaner ethnicity, AND VICE-VERSA.

It may be assumed to follow that both class and ethnic dynamics are capable of incorporating each other under the required conditions, but it is suggested that this equivalence is rare. The ethnic formation normally requires so wide a diversity of functions and roles that the occupational structure implied would cut across a typical class structure. It is suggested, therefore, that:

WHILE AN ETHNIC FORMATION CAN INCORPORATE CLASS DYNAMICS AND INTERESTS WITHIN IT, CLASS-BASED FORMATIONS, BECAUSE THEY IMPLY CONFLICT BETWEEN WORKER AND BOURGEOIS PERSONNEL, CANNOT NORMALLY INCORPORATE THE ETHNIC DYNAMIC.

THE GENERAL COMPETITIVE MOTIVATION WITHIN ETHNIC GROUPS IS THAT OF GROUP STATUS OR POSITION VIS A VIS OTHER GROUPS -- THE GENERAL REWARDS BEING SELF-ESTEEM THAT ALL MEMBERS CAN SHARE. THIS GROUP STATUS TRANSLATES INTO PSYCHIC REWARDS AND SELF-CONFIDENCE.

This factor has among Afrikaners contributed to the competitive success of individual members after periods of dislocation and defeat.

IT IS POSSIBLE, HOWEVER, FOR STRONGLY-DEVELOPED INTERESTS IN A COMPETITIVE SITUATION TO SO COLOUR AND STRUCTURE THE DEFINITIONS OF GROUP STATUS THAT SUCH INTERESTS BEGIN TO USURP THE ORGANISATION AND GOAL SETTING WITHIN THE GROUP. THIS DANGER IS GREATEST WHEN THE INTERESTS INVOLVED ARE THE POWER-INTERESTS OF INFLUENTIAL ELITES, BECAUSE THE STRATEGIC MISTAKES THEY MAKE IN PURSUIT OF THEIR POWER INTERESTS MAY DAMAGE THE COHERENCE AND VITALITY OF THE GROUP. THIS DANGER IS LESSENERED IF THE ELITES IN THE GROUP ARE DRAWN FROM A DIVERSE INTEREST-BASE IN THE ETHNIC GROUP ITSELF.

In the case of Afrikaners the political elites became too powerful and the entire project was placed at risk by its dependence on a political party, which linked the integration of group status to particularly power-oriented policies which were doomed to fail.

A RELAXED BOUNDARY BETWEEN TWO GROUPS CAN GIVE RISE TO A DUAL IDENTITY, OR AN OVERARCHING IDENTITY, WHICH CAN BECOME THE MORE SALIENT IDENTITY IN THE POLITICAL OR ECONOMIC FIELDS. THE GROUP WILL

CONTINUE TO EXIST WITH AN ETHNIC "CORE" BUT THE MARGINAL MEMBERSHIP MAY LOSE THE FEATURES OF MOBILISED ETHNICITY AND BECOME A GROUP WHICH IS MERELY LINGUISTICALLY OR CULTURALLY DISTINCTIVE.

This is the proposition arising out of the relationship between Afrikaans and English-speaking South Africans after socio-economic progress among Afrikaners and the attainment of political dominance reduced the competition between the two groups. It is necessary to note, however, that:

EVEN WHERE A BOUNDARY HAS LOST ITS INSTRUMENTALITY OR SALIENCE FOR THE PROMOTION OF GROUP STATUS, AND DUAL IDENTITY AND POLITICAL OR ECONOMIC COALITIONS EMERGE, A CORE WITHIN THE GROUP IS LIKELY TO RETAIN AN ETHNO-CULTURAL CONSCIOUSNESS, AT TIMES UNCONNECTED WITH INTER-GROUP COMPETITIVENESS (see above proposition on the inner consciousness).

UNDER THESE CONDITIONS AN ETHNIC GROUP MAY LOSE CONSIDERABLE COHERENCE AND THE SCOPE OF ETHNIC IDENTIFICATION WILL SHRINK BACK TO THE CORE.

THE RELATIVE SIZE OF THE CORE COMMITMENT, OR ALTERNATIVELY STATED, THE EXTENT TO WHICH IT BECOMES ERODED WILL DEPEND ON MODES OF EXPRESSION OF INDIVIDUALS IN THE GROUP CULTURE AND THE ALTERNATIVE IDENTITY SUPPORT AVAILABLE WITHIN THE CULTURE, LIKE RELIGIOSITY OR INDIVIDUALISM.

THE INTERACTION BETWEEN GROUPS THAT HAVE NO SALIENT COMPETITIVE RELATIONSHIPS IS AN INSTANCE OF "UNRANKED" ETHNICITY AND THE SHRINKING OF THE CORE OF ETHNIC COMMITMENT (as opposed to nominal recognition of cultural or language differences) CAN GIVE RISE TO WIDER PROCESSES OF GROUP DECOMPOSITION.

The process would accord with an observation made by Donald Horowitz (1985:29 *passim*: see theoretical section) that the ethnic "*cement*" is weaker in unranked groups than it is in ranked groups. Horowitz also makes the point that there is uncertainty in unranked groups (see ahead). His point is taken, however, that because the odds are so stark in situations of ranked ethnicity, and the possible conflicts so severe, that unranked groups may be more stable over time, albeit at a lower level of intensity. The non-mobilised and unranked "*ethnicity*" of cultural differences and residues can be very stable and persistent over time. There are other dangers, however.

IN "UNRANKED" GROUPS OR IN SITUATIONS IN WHICH POLITICAL COMPETITION BETWEEN TWO GROUPS IS OF LOW SALIENCE, THE ORGANISING AND CO-ORDINATING ELEMENTS WILL WEAKEN OR BE TAKEN OVER BY INTELLECTUALS OR ETHNIC EXTREMISTS, AND IN BOTH CASES THE ETHNIC GROUP WILL LOSE COHERENCE OUTSIDE THE ETHNIC CORE.

In the case of intellectuals in modern industrial society, their "*ethnic*" values will be vulnerable to the pervasive universally-oriented humanist or cosmopolitan spirit in upper-middle class Western culture. In the case of ethnic extremists their lack of sympathy with the more pragmatic rank-and-file members will reduce their capacity to co-ordinate and reconcile conflicting tendencies within the group. The cement in the core will have to be exceptionally strong for the group to maintain a significant coherence, as with, say, the Jewish group in South Africa where the collective memories not only of the holocaust but also of descent from ghetto communities in Eastern Europe are still fairly strong.

WHERE THE ETHNIC BOUNDARY DEMARCATES "RANKED" GROUPS, IT WILL OBVIOUSLY BE MORE FIRMLY DEFINED AND DEFENDED THAN IN CASES WHERE GROUPS ARE UNRANKED.

This observation is simple common-sense; these boundaries are more often than not accompanied by conflicts of interests, political competition or invidious status distinctions

and it follows that "*social closure*" of various kinds will result. This does not mean to say that boundaries between unranked groups become irrelevant, but as with non-exclusive Afrikaners and English-speaking whites in South Africa, there are hardly any sanctions relating to intermarriage, for example.

WHERE INTERACTION BETWEEN RANKED GROUPS THREATENS CORE FEATURES IN THE SELF-DEFINITION OF THE ADVANTAGED GROUP. AND THE INTEGRITY OF THE BOUNDARY BETWEEN THEM IS THREATENED BY SOCIAL CONDITIONS OR OTHER FACTORS INCONSISTENT WITH THE RANKING. THEN VERY INTENSIVE BOUNDARY MAINTENANCE BEHAVIOUR AND SUPPORTING RATIONALISATIONS WILL EMERGE.

In the previous section this process was put forward as an explanation of the genesis of the racism of Afrikaner nationalists. They were fighting for their conception of Afrikaners as heirs to the "*civilisation*" perceived to be associated with the European high cultures, which was under threat because of the socio-economic crisis of the Afrikaner poor. This is a case where the processes of boundary maintenance have effects which among many, if not most Afrikaners usurped the original basis of their ethnic consciousness and superimposed a systematic racism in its stead. Although one does not want to put niceties on racism, an understanding of a process such as the one outlined may help to identify means to combat the virulence of racism in some, if not all situations.

FINALLY, WHERE POLITICAL OR OTHER VICTORIES AWARD AN ETHNIC GROUP CONTROL OF A TERRITORY AND ITS STATE MACHINERY, THE ETHNICITY, IN BECOMING A NATIONALISM, IS INTRODUCED TO A NEW RANGE OF THREATS AND COMPLEXITIES.

Even ethnically-based governments in plural societies cannot ignore the competitive pressures emanating from competing civic groups and ethnic goals have to give way to strategic power goals and coalitions of interest. Such coalitions may reduce the salience of ethnic boundaries for the political elites. Furthermore, the strategic and practical

requirements of government, even in ethnically dominated states, may alienate the ethnic rulers from at least some of the ethnic followers. If the government's attempt to pursue ethnic goals at the cost of risking conflict or deeper conflict, moral contradictions will arise which will weaken collective ethnic resolve.

These and a host of other factors in governance typically appear to cause schisms and splits between tendencies within ethnic ruling groups, and in addition to the examples of political schism and splits among Afrikaners, one may think of hosts of other examples, from Israel, the Basque federal province, Northern Ireland and many others to Belgium. When ethnic groups divide between political parties, the nature of inter-party competition makes the more responsive methods of reconciling tendencies within an ethnic group more difficult to achieve.

Aside from which the bureaucratic imposition of institutionalised protection for ethnic interests by a government undermines the voluntarism and key elements of commitment which are central to the nature of ethnicity. The greatest risks to ethnic group coherence will arise when a group claims formal political power over others.

12.4 TOWARDS A FRAMEWORK

Each one of the propositions in 12.3 coincides broadly with propositions reviewed in the literature. It would be tedious to return to chapters 2 and 3 to pick up the references, but a few stand out. Mention has already been made of the fact that the conclusions of Donald Horowitz (1985) on the differences between ranked and unranked systems long preceded this text, as would his conclusions on dual and over-arching identities, and the moral contradictions which weaken ethnicities in situations of ethnic domination (Horowitz, chapter 1). Horowitz elsewhere (1975:134) observes in the context of Nigeria that

"With a multiplication of contexts, there was typically a multiplication of levels and some of the lower levels of identity often remained quite powerful":

in confirmation of the propositions made above about levels of identity and the persistence of the inner identity of Afrikaners at a core.

Similarly the propositions about the ethnic boundaries as mechanisms of competition are broadly in line with much of the analysis of Frederik Barth (1969), although this analysis gives more prominence to the fact that boundaries cannot be drawn around something that has no prior reality of ethnic consciousness. His propositions, however, accommodate the fact that the racial boundary obsession of Afrikaners usurped much of the original "*content*" of the ethnic commitment.

The persistence of core ethnic commitments on the basis of intrinsic attachments to a real or mythical origin has similarly been emphasised by authors too numerous to mention. The exposition of the utility of ethnic attachments to the individual psyche by Horowitz (1985:143-147, 182-184) and their capacity to stimulate reactions out of proportion to the threat involved (Horowitz, page 130-131) is consonant with the potential for violent responses to outgroups, even where ethnic identity has not crystallised as a self-conscious phenomenon. A pre-ethnic "*need*" for group identification under certain conditions is accommodated in the propositions above.

The propositions above take issue with some Marxists for assuming that class contradictions and interests operate with some "*hidden hand*" of structural influence, beyond human agency, to create supportive cultural and other "*superstructural*" manifestations, including ethnicity. But this analysis makes provision for class, through affinities of interest, strengthening ethnic structure. Indeed material interests and class contradictions are almost always present in inter-ethnic competition. The notion that ethnic formations can incorporate class as elements in their structure of interests is also a familiar theme in the literature reviewed in chapter 2.

The fact that there is not any new or totally contrary proposition in the range above does not unduly concern this author because social science progresses in an endless process of confirmation and refutation. But the propositions were presented in a continuous listing for a particular reason: this being to demonstrate that, in order for them to encompass the

empirical features of the particular case study, they could usefully be integrated in an explanatory framework.

The proposal of an integrated explanatory framework is not new either, but if one can be identified which covers the varied patterns of cause and effect in the South African case study it might just be useful in other contexts. What are the requirements of such a framework?

Eric Leifer, after making the point that:

"The distinctions between class and ethnic interests has allowed a sharper division between proponents of the two models than was theoretically or empirically justifiable",

argues for the need to embed the rational pursuit of advantage within a sociological model; a model which can be provided by identifying the elements of ethnic mobilisation. He emphasises the need for a focus on mobilisation of identity rather than identity as a condition which is complete in itself:

"Throw away the distinction between class and ethnic interests and the data begin speaking only one language. This is not the language of economic motives or of passionate ethnic appeals but the language of political mobilisation. The aim of a model of political mobilisation is to predict the degree of mobilization which will occur in concrete settings." (Leifer, 1981:46)

In order to be embedded in what Leifer refers to as a "*sociological*" approach, a model has to incorporate and transcend the major competing explanations of ethnic action. It has to transcend both the essentialism of reliance on anything approaching primordial sentiments as a sufficient condition for mobilisation, and those instrumentalist or radical constructivist arguments to the effect that interests and rational calculations unleash hidden processes within social structure which relegate human sentiments and needs to a secondary or accompanying role.

Something along the lines of an integrated framework is offered by Juteau (1996), a model which she terms "*ethnic communalization*". She departs from the assumption that ethnic boundaries are not created "*ex nihilo*; they are created from '*real*' social locations and

involve 'real' histories" (p61). Her model, with some colouring in of aspects which appear to be implicit in her arguments, would involve an integration of two boundary processes. The one is the "*external boundary*" which involves the changing definitions of insiders and outsiders under the impact of the transactions and competitions of interest with other groups and forces at the boundary of the ethnic group. The "*internal boundary*", on the other hand, involves the socialisation and mobilisation processes which are necessary to engender or reinforce a subjective belief in a community of origin and to establish the markers and criteria which the actors must use in social and political interaction. Yelvington (1991:165) also supports the postulate of a dual boundary process in ethnicity, as have Horowitz and others.

The "*internal boundary*" processes of Juteau can be seen in two ways. They can be seen as the consolidation and reinforcement of identities and historical memories which already exist as cultural features. They are sometimes depicted, often by authors wishing to establish the primacy of class and power interests, as the manipulations or creations of identity and meaning by powerful establishments. A South African example would be that of Hofmeyr (1987) who gives an account of "*being made into an Afrikaner*" by an "*unstable and contradictory process*" of the manufacture of an Afrikaans identity and literary culture in the early twentieth century. If such authors make the slightest acknowledgement that the manufacturing of identity is unlikely to succeed or be so common unless there is a prior "*seed*" of a sense of origin and the psychic rewards associated with a sense of difference, then the "*internal boundary*" process of Juteau can accommodate both the "*idealists*" and the Marxists. As Crawford Young explains:

"Primordialism usefully completes instrumentalism by explaining the force (I would add 'availability') of the 'affective tie' through which interest is instrumentally pursued." (Young, 1993:23)

The notion of the processes internal to the group being a form of boundary is useful because unless those processes are effective the internal identity formation will not support from below the external boundary which gives the ethnicity its cohesion in the pursuit of group status and rewards.

But the notion of the mobilisation or organisation of the internal processes and criteria is too mechanical on its own, and would in practice be too forced to be effective. There must be another or additional link between the factors associated with the external boundary and the internal responses for the model to be what Leifer above calls "*sociological*".

Carter Bentley has put forward propositions which would bridge the external and the internal dimensions of ethnicity. He calls it "*habitus*" (Bentley, 1987; Bentley, 1991). Bentley commences with the observation that ethnic boundaries and definitions do not necessarily co-vary in any regular fashion. He has to explain why ethnic identification can arise, or not arise, independently of the actual origin or cultural features of a group. He uses the concept of "*habitus*", following Pierre Bourdieu, to explain the process he postulates. Habitus is described as the experience by a group of circumstances and conditions, including economic and social factors as well as language differences, etc.-- the group's "*habitual practice*".

This habitus or habitual practice produces: "*consciousness of affinities of interest and experience that embodies subliminal awareness of objective commonalities in practice*" (Bentley, 1987:27). In a later reply to a critique, Bentley makes the description simpler when he says that shared economic, social and cultural conditions "*engender feelings of identification among people similarly endowed*" (1991:173). Furthermore, Bentley argues that habitual practice engenders "*common memories which become unconscious*" (p173) and that it represents "*deep structure ... drawing together an infinite variety of surface expressions as being of a single type*" (p170-171). Bentley rejects the assertion in a critique by Yelvington (1991) that he makes light of the sentiments and feelings of identity, but he tries to relate them more to the shared conditions of the group than to the myths and circumstances of origin.

The inputs of the authors referred to just above provide useful guidelines to a framework. The task now is to draw them together, and to relate them to both the conclusions emerging out of chapters 2 and 3 and to the propositions arising out of the South African case made under 12.3 above.

An integrated model along the following lines is suggested. The ordering of points is simply for convenience and does not necessarily imply priorities or sequences in the process:

- ETHNICITY IS MOBILISATION

First, the emphasis has to be on ethnic mobilisation, because inert ethnicity would be merely an interesting form of cultural differentiation or celebration of self by a lifestyle category.

- IDENTITY IS NOT ARBITRARY OR ENTIRELY MANUFACTURED

Second, the entire construction could be arbitrary, which it clearly is not, if the focus of identity was simply fortuitous or convenient for those who might gain advantage from it. One could have ethnic groups of Toyota or Volkswagen owners or joggers and tennis players. What makes ethnic mobilisation possible (but not inevitable) is the presence of the variable but fairly common tendency to derive psychic satisfaction from a sense of group-belonging and ego-amplification, coupled with the fact that:

- THE AFFECTIVE AFFINITY OF ETHNICITY WITH KINSHIP GIVES IT ITS PREVALENCE AND MOBILISING POWER

The sense of identification with groups of actual or putative origin has a greater capacity to provide the psychic rewards for various reasons. Bentley makes a convincing case for the fact that because ethnic identification has an emotive affinity to the perceptions which bind actual families or clans together, descent symbolism enjoys prevalence over alternative symbols of identity (Bentley, 1987, following Epstein, 1978). However, one has to allow for the fact that religious identification can and often does offer equally powerful rewards (see chapter 2) and has the capacity to dislodge descent symbolism (see also persuasive arguments by Theodor Hanf (1994)). Where descent symbolism and a specific denominational identity are intertwined, as in the case of Afrikaners until recently, the power of the identification may be compounded.

- ETHNIC IDENTITY VARIES WITH HISTORICAL PAIN AND PAST MOBILISATION

The prior propensities to identify with descent groups are not, to borrow phrases from chapter 2, definitive, inevitable, ineluctable or ineffable, but they are commonly available and their effects can be activated by mobilisation. Their availability and the ease with which they will be activated will depend on the past experience of shared social stress, pain, humiliation, privation, relative deprivation, status threat or threats to self-image in the experience of the group. Trevor-Roper's depiction, referred to earlier, of nationalism as wounded identity is apposite. The range of "*amplifiers*" given above is deliberately broad. It may be made more difficult for ethnic mobilisation to occur or to persist in a group which was for the most part satisfied, wealthy, confident and whose political position was such as to make it immune to challenges within the immediate social environment. The recent examples in South Africa and in the USA of a shared consciousness among blacks of racial victimisation, which structures their contemporary attitudes within a framework of "*victimology*", to coin a clumsy phrase, is a convenient example.

- ORIGINAL ETHNIC IDENTITY IS ELABORATED AND SHAPED BY THE COMMONALITIES OF ONGOING EXPERIENCE

Moving the identity beyond a relatively inert potential, the structuring factor of commonalities of current experience is the crystallisation -- the "*deep structure*" (Bentley) of the "*habitus*". The "*habitus*" includes the effects of interaction with others by the members of the group in question. This "*habitus*" can maintain internal coherence or it can become diffuse or fragmented by a differentiation of interpretations. This crystallisation is not yet the group "*ideology*" but it is the basis on which an ideology offered to the group by the intelligentsia becomes meaningful. The "*habitus*" as it emerges in the shared understanding, must obviously be linked plausibly but not perfectly to the historical identity and the sense of shared past group experience.

- THE ETHNIC EXPERIENCE HAS TO BE INTERPRETED WITHIN THE ETHNIC GROUP

As suggested immediately above, this habitus must be internally reinforced and consolidated through socialisation and the formulation for the group of a popular ideology in the form of a mirror of its condition. This corresponds to Juteau's internal boundary formation. If the co-ordination and interpretation functions of the ethnic leaders and intelligentsia is weak and contradictory, and the socialisation functions are equally dissipated, then the condition of internal mobilisation of the group will be vulnerable to alternative forms of engagement with the wider society. In particular, for example, more universal appeals and the logic of individualistic engagement of the economy in the liberal mode will offer persuasive alternative orientations. Horowitz (1985:24) refers to the fact of relative group worth in unranked ethnic systems always being subject to great uncertainty, and makes reference later to the alternative moralities which impact upon the ethnic value system. The internal ethnic group "*boundary*" is indeed vulnerable to the forces which have been described in sociological shorthand as the forces of "*modernisation*".

Hence, for any instance of ethnic mobilisation, the servicing role of ethnic leadership and ethnic institutions of socialisation are paramount. One should note that where the themes in the internal boundary in contemporary society include a racist consciousness or any other consciousness which offends shared international norms, the ethnic mobilisation will be under particularly sharp attack. It is in such situations that the ethnic leaders and the ethnic intelligentsia must reconcile their ethnic goals with powerful external norms.

It was precisely this failure that gave Afrikaner ethnicity its greatest single source of vulnerability, and rightfully so because the ethnic leaders either defected, or failed to confront the racist Apartheid administration and bureaucracy in time. Having rigidly institutionalised the racist system in "*separate development*" the state administration, through typical fear of precedent, was itself unable to adjust the system it had set in motion.

- THE STATE IS POWERFUL IN CREATING OPPORTUNITIES AND CONSTRAINTS FOR THE ACTIVATION OF ETHNICITY

The observation above raises the need for an additional point, this being that the state, whether colonial or otherwise, can impose conditions which shape the "*habitus*" quite formidably and can even create the opportunity for new definitions of descent (see Laitin, 1982 on the influence of colonial and post-colonial government on Yoruba ethnicity). By their very definition state laws and regulations as they intersect with ethnic aspirations will have a definitive effect. The main point about the influence of governments on the internal boundary creation is that they are less flexible than informal ethnic processes and the ethnic definitions can be artificially strengthened in the short term but become ossified in the process.

- ETHNIC BOUNDARIES ARE SHAPED IN INTERACTION WITH THE INTERNAL COMMONALITIES OF EXPERIENCE, INSTRUMENTALITIES, AND RESPONSES TO THE GROUP BY OUTSIDERS

The concepts of habitus or internal boundary formation would be meaningless if the entire group lives on an island. The potential would be there but ethnic mobilisation only becomes conceptually possible in interaction with other groups or nations. The external boundary formation, in Juteau's terms, in alignment with Barth (1969), is the vehicle or the mechanism by which competitive goals are achieved and in terms of which transactions with other groups and with the outside political and social environment occur. But most importantly, it is, to paraphrase Barth's famous expression (1969:14-15), the shape and texture and structure of the ethnic "*vessel*" which according to Barth, gives the ethnic group its content and character.

But in line with Juteau and the proposition above, the boundary is not merely some alienated construction which imposes downwards. If external forces are powerful in limiting and confining an ethnic minority in social and economic space this downward imposition would be relatively definitive, but not completely so. Similarly, if class forces or power interests exercise influences to structure a boundary, close it off or open it up for instrumental reasons, the forces would impose themselves downwards, but not

with absolute effect. In contrast to the popular conceptions of the boundary hypotheses, this author's argument and probably that of Juteau is that the vessel and the contents-- the external and internal boundary norms and criteria -- interact to produce the outcome. Two minorities in comparable situations of powerless and social exclusion will not necessary respond in the same way or develop the same types of boundaries.

The external boundaries of the group, then, are those forces of inclusion or exclusion which create opportunities or limitations for the ethnic group, as they are responded to by the ethnic membership itself, and the responses will not be uniform. But the responses can be creative to the extent that the social institutions, leaders, mobilisers and role models in the ethnic group understand the process and, once again, with respect to the reasons why an ethnic consciousness exists in the first place, attempt to reconcile the forces, constraints and opportunities.

This final suggestion is simultaneously a suggestion that "*sociology*" is not only the interplay of abstractions in the form of values and structure; it is also process and agency. Horowitz (1975:135) refers to the "*alacrity with which groups are able to adjust their identity downwards as well as upwards ...*". Sandra Wallmann (1986:245) from within the "*boundary*" tradition, observes after an empirical study of ethnic situations in London, that the resilience of ethnic organisation varies with the flexibility of its boundaries, the openness and heterogeneity of its leadership structure which allows for generative organisational forms, and with the levels of its economic and identity resources. Esman (1990), referred to earlier, also emphasises the importance of the co-ordinating and interpretive functions of ethnic elites.

These propositions, ranging from the original core of potential for ethnic mobilisation to its instrumental functions of positioning a group relative to others or dealing with the way in which the alternative groups impose boundaries on the group, would seem to be reasonably capable of answering all the questions thrown at ethnicity. As postulated in chapter 1, no basis was discovered in this analysis for declaring that essential, instrumental and constructivist explanations of ethnicity are mutually incompatible and cannot be reconciled.

They are incompatible only if either the essentiality of identity or the structures of instrumentality are claimed to be autonomous, or to have greater autonomy than the alternative dynamic. These claims, endlessly pursued in the literature, have done much to retard the development of insights potentially useful not only in the development of disciplines but in the search for the reconciliation of ethnic conflict.

12.5 FINAL COMMENTS ON THE CURRENT COLLAPSE OF AFRIKANER ETHNIC MOBILISATION

Finally, then, how and why has the formerly formidable Afrikaner ethnic mobilisation decomposed? There may be wider lessons in the answers to these questions.

Most of the attempts at answering these questions have been stated or implied in the earlier discussions. Concluding observations may be useful, however.

THE DILEMMAS OF UNRANKED ETHNIC MOBILISATION

A large part of the limpness of Afrikaner ethnicity in mobilised form derives from its unranked status. For a negatively-ranked ethnic formation -- an exploited or marginalised minority -- the mode of solidarity in opposition, protest or dissent may be dangerous, but it does provide the glue to which Horowitz referred. It also focuses the minds of the coordinating elites. There is also a great deal to be gained if opposition succeeds. Furthermore, the legitimacy of the surrounding political and social system can be discredited, which means that the elites and intellectuals are protected from distracting values and ideologies, or else they can commandeer such values to back their own claims.

Afrikaners today are not oppressed or exploited. They have serious problems which will be noted later, but they are still widespread in officialdom. the Afrikaans elite residential areas are among the richest in the country, and although unemployment is increasing, it is below

the average levels of unemployment in the European Union. Their often legitimate grievances over high levels of crime and corruption and standards of administration are fully shared with English-speakers, coloured people. Indians and increasingly with middle class blacks. In point of fact, the levels of crime are highest in English-speaking white residential areas. A report in the *Saturday Star* (13/11/1999), based on police statistics on local areas in Gauteng for 1998, shows that after central business and inner city districts, the predominantly English-speaking residential suburbs of Sandton, Randburg, and Brooklyn have higher rates of serious crime than mainly black areas like Soweto or the Afrikaans-speaking areas of northern Pretoria.

Hence there is little cause for ethnic solidarity in their socio-economic "*habitus*" conditions; rather a middle class, minority-based protest solidarity which is precisely the political framework which the English-language Democratic Party offers. In a speech to the Freedom Front in July 1997, the experienced observer of Afrikaner affairs, Isak de Villiers, the then editor of the largest Afrikaans newspaper Rapport, explained the relative lack of success of that ethnic party very simply:

"Too little has changed for Afrikaners. The constellation of trends looks bad, the major structures are shifting, things will change, but at present life has a reassuring normality."

I will come to de Villiers' prediction presently.

THE CHANGED RATIONALE FOR MOBILISATION

As discussed in chapter 5, the major impact of the change in the political dispensation for Afrikaners has been the rapid relative downgrading of the status of the Afrikaans language. From personal experience, a mere five years after transition, Afrikaner officials in Pretoria are losing their technical and professional vocabularies in Afrikaans. Poor coloured people can speak Afrikaans in public offices but white middle-class Afrikaners are simply assumed to feel obligated to speak the language of the new elite, English. As the empirical studies have shown, Afrikaners are anything but happy about this. Why then are they not mobilising?

There are initiatives such as the Afrikaans "*Oorlegplatform*" (Consultative Forum) which is just beginning the new intellectual debate, and various cultural bodies constantly make polite noises of concern. Popular grass-roots involvement is restricted to tight and localised networks, like the listeners of the "*rebel*" Radio Pretoria (which actually has very little political content).

One of the reasons for this limpness has been implied in much of the preceding discussion. Although the Afrikaans language is objectively a core concern of the ethnic group, it ceased to be an issue of mobilisation before most of today's Afrikaners were born. The language was bureaucratized into neutrality as a mobilising concern. The key sensitivities of ethnic response became centred around race, political power and economic opportunity and or privilege. The issue of Afrikaans is not aligned with these mobilising sensitivities, and more importantly, it requires an alternative framework of articulation and rationalisation.

The Afrikaans language is a non-racial marker. It is shared between a white middle class and the poorer sections of the coloured community and very small black communities. It is not the racial cleavage which is paramount, however. It is that the key priorities of the wider ethnic circle are not where Afrikaans is at. Afrikaans is what one may term a socio-cultural attribute which is "*nice to have*"; it is not a "*need to have*". As a "*nice to have*" it is passionately enjoyed and respected, but its public decline is not "*life threatening*" within Carter Bentley's conception of the ethnic "*habitus*" (see earlier).

For the Afrikaners of the "*inner*" or core consciousness, Afrikaans is a "*need to have*", but they are divided along other lines. Half or more of the core-consciousness Afrikaners are deeply conservative and have an attenuated intellectual leadership. Some are deeply conformist in religious orientation and tend to eschew activism of all kinds. Others are progressive humanists and "*greenish*" cultural conservationists for whom Afrikaans is a non-racial issue remote from any concern with its bureaucratic downgrading. There is no single Bentley-type "*habitus*" for these disparate social categories -- they live in different South Africas.

THE MYTH OF ORIGIN AND KINSHIP HAS BEEN COMPROMISED

In ethnicity myths matter, and to the extent that the Afrikaner myth of kinship was a euro-centric conception of origin in a continent of high cultures of great antiquity, that myth is no longer of any utility as an identity-anchor in strategic public debate. It is deeply politically incorrect, and as such embarrasses any Afrikaner who follows the Afrikaans press, let alone public television. Today, most of the people who visit the Voortrekker Monument are foreign tourists or curious blacks.

If Afrikaners were poor and exploited these fashionable considerations would not matter. Traditional Zulus honour the warrior-king and sub-continental tyrant, Shaka, with great enthusiasm, but Afrikaner historical rituals have been sanitised. At a 1998 *Day of the Covenant* ceremony, not long ago the premier ritual occasion for the nationalist faithful, the speaker, Professor Fika van Rensburg concluded: "*The time ... of closing off to protect and to nurture, of exclusive prescriptions and of negative, rejecting and self-congratulatory Afrikanerdom has passed*" (*Rapport*, 27/12/98). Afrikaners changed the name of Verwoerdburg to the name of a cricket-ground, and some are busy mobilising support for a name change for Pretoria, the capital of Paul Kruger's Republic, to Mandela City. Most Afrikaners and English-speaking whites, as post-industrial middle-classes, more than any of their compatriots, are captives of global New-Class ideology.

INSTRUMENTAL LIABILITIES

Afrikaners have over one-third of the total spending power in South Africa, and with coloured Afrikaans-speakers, the language-based spending power could be close to 40 per cent. But advertising in Afrikaans is declining sharply (MarkData database). Most Afrikaans companies are recasting their corporate images so as to neutralise impressions of

the ethnic connection. Employment Equity legislation, while defensible in the larger context, means that an Afrikaans or any white male identity is no advantage and is often a liability on the job-market.

There is still an active nation-wide Afrikaans Chamber of Commerce movement and Afrikaans businesses enjoy some of the advantages of networks in business linkages and market penetration, but these are typically localised in scope. There are consistent pressures on the *Afrikaanse Handelsinstituut* (The Afrikaans Commercial Institute) to merge into a wider non-racial body. There are very few instrumental reinforcements of the ethnic boundary, and more instrumental penalties associated with it.

THE WEAKNESS OF THE MANAGING AND CONCILIATING FUNCTION

Esman (1990:55) describes this function:

"Much of the energy of ethnic group leaders must often be committed to managing and conciliating these internal tensions and conflicts in order to maintain control ... and to battling opponents within the ethnic community."

This was described earlier, following Juteau, as part of the internal boundary process. In the Afrikaans ethnic formation at present this function is not even weak -- as a centrally located process it is non-existent.

The Afrikaner Broederbond, which was the co-ordinating core (see earlier assessments) maintained secrecy long after it was necessary, and hence lost accountability within the ethnic constituency. It relinquished its early independence of political parties and coalesced with the National Party, which meant that when the National Party split or lost votes, the Broederbond lost more and more of its overview capacity. It played, with other groupings, a fairly valuable undercover role in facilitating the readiness to negotiate before the transition to open government, but when the negotiations actually occurred it relinquished its responsibilities to the National Party cabinet.

The Broederbond still exists, now as the Afrikanerbond, and is no longer clandestine, but from its attenuated position it has been unable to regain any central co-ordinating role in respect of the major ethnic issue -- the status of the Afrikaans language. Its current human resource capacity is questionable.

DECOMPOSITION ALMOST COMPLETE

The collapse of the Afrikaner ethnic enterprise, therefore, has occurred neatly in terms of all the ethnic rules reviewed in previous sections; from the founding myths and anchors of identity through to co-ordinating capacities and both internal and external boundary regulations. The case study offers rather complete negative confirmation of the way ethnicity works.

All that is left are the nominal cultural markers, a sense of status loss which is salient at a secondary level of priorities and an apparently intensifying but relatively restricted core of identity -- the inner layer of consciousness uncovered by the empirical findings.

12.6 THE FUTURE: REMISSION OR REBIRTH?

Prediction is hazardous and particularly so in respect of a fluid phenomenon like ethnicity. All one can do is to employ techniques of informed speculation in an attempt to comprehend the likely variability of the phenomenon in the future. The discussion below will claim no more than to explore, tentatively at best, the contrasting but realistic possibilities which the future might hold in the form of a scenario analysis. The analysis will draw liberally but broadly on the propositions on ethnic mobilisation and conflict in chapter 3, and in the other theoretical chapters.

David Laitin remarks that "*Observers of nationalism are indeed both awed by its power and dumfounded by its weakness*" (1997: 280). Yet within nationalism the seed of identity

has impressed observers with its persistence and tenacity, language-based identity often at the forefront. In a review of modern Europe, Laitin notes that

"People want to keep their mother tongues alive even if those languages are left behind in the worlds of technology and interdependence" (p280).

The empirical review in this dissertation has demonstrated that while the political mobilisation of Afrikaners has collapsed, and their boundaries with other minority groups are porous, a core of commitment within the group, with language as its critical marker, and a sense of threat and loss of status appears to be established and, if anything, gradually intensifying. Will this trend continue and build up to a situation in which new ethnic claims challenge the state?

Research in some very broadly similar situations does not provide categorical guidance. Fenwick, after studying the historical emergence of French Quebecois regional communalism in Canada, contrary to expectations concluded that

"modernisation, industrialisation and increasing economic integration promote the likelihood that nationalist movements will develop among minority communal groups" (1981:215).

He also demonstrated that despite the structural integration of the over-arching economy, the social segmentation between French and English-speakers had not diminished, due in some measure to the cultural division of labour. On the other hand, a similar study of Flemish identity in Belgium suggests far more ambiguous processes (Kerremans, 1996). Kerremans adduces evidence to suggest that the Flemish rank-and-file are far from being overwhelmingly in favour of greater formal and constitutional Flemish autonomy or separation in Belgium, although most of the elites and political leaders certainly are.

Neither the situation of the French in Canada or of the Flemish in Belgium is strictly comparable to that of Afrikaners in South Africa today. The major difference is that neither French language in Quebec or Flemish in Belgium are any longer under any significant threat as official regional languages and as languages of formal cultural communication. One might expect that the Afrikaners, by comparison will become more activated over

language rights than the cases above as time goes by, particularly if a popular cultural leadership emerges to drive the action.

On the balance of probabilities, it would seem as if the core language-based ethnic commitment among Afrikaners is likely to at least maintain itself at the levels described in earlier sections or slowly intensify, all else being equal. A further assumption that one can make, all else being equal, is that the broader ethnic amplifier of non-ethnic grievances which was identified earlier will continue to create greater alienation among Afrikaners than among other minorities.

But all else is seldom equal and we know from the foregoing analysis that the influence of state policy and institutions, of wider conditions in the society and of the interaction with other groups will have decisive effects on the pursuit of ethnic goals. On the basis of the review of literature in chapter 3 and the conclusions in chapter 4, one might sum up the hypothetical propensity for remobilisation and activism among Afrikaners as follows:

Factors predisposing to ethnic action include:

1. the fact that they have a history of mobilisation;
2. the severe losses of status and loss of autonomy which have occurred in the recent past;
3. the clear evidence from the empirical studies that they consider the present dispensation to be unfair and less than they consider themselves to be entitled to (relative deprivation);
4. the blocks to legal redress due to the fact that that the constitution and legislation rules out any challenge to affirmative action or claims to a restoration of language rights;
5. the fact that they are "*squeezed*" in the sense that there is no escape from their perceived predicament. They cannot escape their racial identity, which means that they would not benefit by submerging their Afrikaner ethnic identity. The perception is that the only way of evading their situation is to

fall in line with government expectations and align themselves with the majority in a position of second-class status. It is perceived by many to be a situation in which they are being forced to sacrifice commitment to their own ethnic group;

6. the indication from the literature that ethnic dissent is greatest in situations of intermediate "*repression*" (neither stark authoritarian repression nor the scope of action possible in a liberal democracy) is perhaps another factor which will predispose to some form of action.

Factors which hypothetically militate against the prospects for ethnic action include the following:

1. the fact that although grievances are high, the action-orientation is lower than it is among some other groups, hence the intensity of grievances may not outweigh perceived penalties and constraints;
2. the fact that perceived discrimination is not seen to be directed against Afrikaners specifically but against whites or minorities in general;
3. the fact that the wider group, as opposed to the core group, tends to have a dual identity which would indicate that a specifically ethnic cause would be limited in scope;
4. the fact that Afrikaner elites are divided and that the coherence of organisation has become weakened;
5. as a relatively prosperous group there is the large disincentive of a lot to lose;
6. the Afrikaners would have few allies if they were to confront the state. Furthermore, state appears to be very determined to pursue a nation-building approach and most of the media, including the Afrikaans press tends to support this approach, as do the many Afrikaners who still work for the state. The moral imperatives of the central state may therefore be a very large constraint;
7. there is also the possibility that more time might have to elapse: the literature reviewed suggested that overt ethnicity can become latent or submerge for a

period while a group and its leaders remobilise and develop a strategic view. (See the discussion of the work of Gurr, de Nevers, Williams and others in chapter 3.)

It does seem then that the prospects for some form of remobilisation among Afrikaners are very much in balance, and that remobilisation, under present circumstances will not be rapid. To assess these prospects in greater detail would require extremely detailed investigation of policy and likely future developments in the wider society.. well beyond the scope of this study. All that can be attempted is to capture major possibilities in the form of broad alternative trends in Afrikaner ethnic mobilisation within the scenario analysis below.

One base of analysis in the scenarios is the internal propensity to remobilise among Afrikaners, discussed above. Another base of analysis is the current approach by government to minority interests and ethnic claims. Given the ANC government's formal and repeated commitments to non-racism, albeit qualified by relatively restrained affirmative action, transformation and redistribution policies, one can rule out any naked repressive action against Afrikaner cultural interests, or more punitive policies than the current stance (see Adam, 1995). Following Giliomee (1998) and themes debated in Giliomee and Simkins (1999), with own observations added. I would describe one of the orientations of the current ANC government as one of "*responsive hegemony*" or perhaps even "*gentle Jacobinism*".

The term hegemony, in the tradition of Gramsci, is frequently used by the ANC in its own communications, as the following recent example illustrates:

"Our first responsibility in developing an approach to deployment in the present phase is to establish what the principal tasks of the revolution are ... Winning hegemony ... Our programme of prioritising key centres of power for deployment should therefore continue ... (and) should go hand in hand with the movement having a programme of engaging with the institutions we seek to transform - hence the importance ... of the continual mass-presence of the ANC ... (in) legislatures at all levels, the economy, education science and technology, sports, recreation and culture, mass popular organisations and mass communication." (ANC, Cadre Policy and Deployment

Strategy, 20, July, 1999)

This illustration should make it clear that as one of the bases of its policy approach, the current government is clearly "*centralist*" in its philosophy and as such not exactly wedded to the principles of "*pluralist*" or liberal democracy. The composition of the ANC is multiplex, and another relevant view in the ANC is what one might describe as "*civic nationalism*". Greenfield (1992) uses this term in distinction to that of ethnic nationalism; it implies an individually-based conception of a national community based on citizenship. But the concept of civic nationalism in the case of the ANC is, not surprisingly, coloured by the notion that the character of the nation will reflect the fact that it has an African majority and an African location.

In terms of both the centralist-hegemonic and the civic-majoritarian conceptions of the national community, the notion of even a degree of autonomy for independent and particularistic interests is problematic for the party. It is to its credit, therefore, that in practice it has taken the trouble to meet with and listen to the problems of ethnic minorities, including meetings with the Afrikaner right-wing Freedom Front. This has been described earlier as a "*pacification*" strategy, and while it may not have been intended as such, that has been its effect. The Leader of the Freedom Front, General Viljoen, has in fact aroused the ire of viewpoints within his own circle because of his meetings with the ANC. A common view among many Afrikaners is that it is a "*heuningkwas*" technique (a paintbrush dipped in honey) and that it is co-optive and disempowering (Rapport, 15/2/1998).

The view of government leadership on the place and role of ethnic minorities like Afrikaners was lucidly, if diplomatically expressed by President Mbeki in an address to a recent gathering of the Afrikanerbond:

"We should say that a real Afrikaner is a good Afrikaner if he is concerned about the interests of all the people in the country ... The challenge facing South Africans is to ensure that their different cultures, languages and religions cease to make them islands unto themselves".

This is inviting rhetoric, but, not surprisingly, the Chairman of the Afrikanerbond replied that

"the ability of Afrikaners to contribute to development would be influenced by the degree to which they could continue to be themselves ... we cannot contribute if we are marginalised, if we are excluded from public life." (Citizen, 28/7/1999)

Hence the government and the ANC are firm on the principle of the unity and integration of all minorities by way of nation-building, and accept and even respect cultural variety but only as a quality of the integration. While firm in its principle that minorities have a primary obligation to commit themselves to the nation, the alacrity with which the government has at least listened to Afrikaners suggests a degree of flexibility and willingness to entertain conciliation within the model. Mbeki announced recently that he would establish a division in his office for the protection of minority rights.

As bases for the further analysis, both the consciousnesses among Afrikaners and the approach of the government to minority issues will vary with the scenarios which will be developed below. In developing the scenarios I have drawn heavily on my own regular monitor of the political environment of the economy for the South African Council of Business (SACOB/Schlemmer, 1996-1999) and a very comprehensive recent policy analysis by the Centre for Development and Enterprise (Bernstein et al, 1999). It should be noted that while the real world is always more than a little untidy, the approach of scenario construction requires that outcomes be distinctive or even polarised in order to best illustrate the underlying dynamics (see Peter Schwartz, 1991). Among many possible outcomes, the more probable scenarios which crystallise are the following:

1. **CONSOLIDATION:** present policies with regard to cultural and racial minorities continue, average levels of economic growth improve on their present mediocre levels and hence ensure reasonable per-capita income growth, and on the strength of increased fiscal resources, the coherence and effectiveness of state administration and security control also improves gradually. The demand for skills allows racial equity policies and affirmative action for blacks to be pursued without undue constraints on

opportunities for minorities. The grievances of minorities tend to subside gradually, and core Afrikaans concerns are supported less and less by wider minority grievances and disaffection. The government is under decreasing pressure to address minority issues and Afrikaans ethnic and language interests. While not discredited, are sidelined.

2. **CONCESSIONS AND CONCILATION:** economic recovery is not sustained and socio-economic grievances among minorities persists. The state experiences ongoing capacity problems and both the efficiency of state administration and the effectiveness of the security system is compromised. Because these capacity problems deepen grievances and lower investor confidence, the economy deteriorates further and all the problems are drawn into a self-reinforcing downward spiral. Recognising that there is a risk of serious disaffection among minorities, the government, within its current policy framework in respect of language, cultural and group rights, initially makes cosmetic and ameliorative gestures to minorities and to Afrikaners, but has to give greater attention to the mounting problems besetting the black majority. While it resists populist pressures, it has to increase its clientelism and patronage to the emerging black middle class to prevent divisions in the ANC support base.

3. **DEFENSIVE REACTION:** the economic, governance and security scenarios are negative as in 2 above, and as above the deterioration tends to be self-reinforcing. Instead of attempting any conciliation of minority grievances, the government, fearful of the precedents which might be created and under pressure from radical viewpoints within its alliance with the South African Communist Party and the labour movement, reacts defensively and attempts to discredit or intimidate minority protests. At the same time it has to deal with dissent of a non-ethnic kind on a wider basis as well. The overall coherence of the ANC begins to deteriorate and tendencies towards authoritarianism emerge.

If scenario 1 (CONSOLIDATION) or something like it materialises, given leadership divisions and the disparate strategic consciousness among Afrikaners, the sheer variety of

reactions to the political and economic environment will ensure broad continuity with the present. The credibility of the stance supporting a civic nationalism and an individual rights-based political culture will solidify. The scope of intense core commitment among Afrikaners will remain small and may even shrink, although the intensity of the commitment at the core might deepen very gradually over time. Afrikaners at large are likely to begin to resemble a minority linguistic category rather than an organised ethnic group. The strength and spread of the language as a private medium will shrink for a protracted period awaiting a rebirth at some much later stage if and when the political culture in the country become more accommodating of diversity and pluralism. (In other words Afrikaans may follow the route of Friesian or Welsh identity for a long while.)

No major dissent could be expected even from the core group of Afrikaners because the disincentive of improving state security capacity and the fact that so many of the members will have so much to lose will ensure compliance.

If scenario 2 (CONCESSION AND CONCILATION) were to emerge, a process of re-mobilisation of Afrikaners could commence, with far-reaching possibilities. Restricted economic opportunity and affirmative action for blacks will make more leadership talent available to the group. The protest consciousness within the core and the wider group will re-socialise people in the course of everyday interaction (see "*habitus*" in the previous sections) and the scope of core commitments will broaden. If and when a more overt ethnic protest consciousness emerges, it will be likely to enjoy moral support from the wider non-core Afrikaner group, from English-speaking whites and from black and coloured minority language groups as well.

The conciliation attempts of government will probably be to offer a more substantive "*multiculturalism*", perhaps resembling the Australian model or in the form of special cultural councils, a charter of language rights and guarantees of the language-integrity of Afrikaans schools and universities. Such gestures will perhaps pacify many Afrikaners but will also increase the confidence and sense of opportunity among the more ethnically-committed core Afrikaners, as well as that among other minorities. For this reason and

because of mounting socio-economic grievances, the concessions will not satisfy the rising expectations and the sense of being relatively deprived.

The main stimulus, however, will be the sense of emerging possibilities for self-determination, which will encourage more trenchant demands. Multi-cultural policy will tend to lurch from precedent to precedent, and it could very well become elaborated to include elements of consociation in the form of devolution, like a small self-governing Volkstaat, or areas of limited local self-determination either on a geographic basis or more probably resembling the formal spheres of autonomy for minorities in the old Austro-Hungarian Empire. -- the policies of the Austro-Marxists like Karl Renner (see Hanf, 1994; Raanan et al, 1991) While there will be a risk that the progression to more substantive forms of multiculturalism will lead to the break-up of the state, there would be an equal chance that the country could stabilise and rebuild as a territorial and non-territorial federation.

One proviso would apply, however -- the devolution could not be on racial lines, because that would alienate so many interests within the ANC that generalised instability or counter-mobilisation could well result. Hence any form of devolution would have to involve coalitions of minorities in local areas or in regions -- an interest in such coalitions has already begun to emerge in the Afrikaner right-wing movement.

The third scenario (DEFENSIVE REACTION) is the least predictable and the most disturbing. If in a deteriorating socio-economic situation, the government toughens up and rejects protests, proposals and appeals, it could lead to deterioration in the quality of the democracy to the point that special security measures are introduced. This, however, will occur at a point when the security capacity is also compromised and demoralised. The stage could be set for a widening potential for general instability.

The current mobilisation and consciousness among Afrikaners is not such that they are likely to take the initiative; it is far more likely to emerge in marginal areas of the country among black language and tribally-based ethnic categories like the former Transkei or

traditional parts of KwaZulu-Natal and the Northern Province, where militant mobilised factions already commit violence from time-to-time. Under the conditions described, events such as these, with a burgeoning of protest consciousness among right-wing core Afrikaans groupings, a mobilised form of Afrikaner dissent could follow. There are well-armed hard men who are very quiet at the moment but they could come to the fore very readily (the Mail and Guardian gives an interesting example: 25/9/1998). Current mobilisation against affirmative action by the right-wing Afrikaans-based Mineworkers Union is also suggestive, and it serves to underline the points made by Johnston (1991) about the utility of trade-union organisation within ethnic movements.

Such developments could all lead to a situation of national fragmentation which is currently typical in large parts of the rest of the Southern African sub-region, but it could lead to earlier negotiations and trade-offs, with an outcome like that suggested for scenario 2. If the government tries to enforce central control and persists in attempts to discredit minority-based movements, the initial response among Afrikaners will be typical of that described by Gurr as “*conspiracy*” (1970:341-343 *passim*).

Gurr distinguishes between three forms of instability: generalised and formless “*turmoil*”, internal war, and conspiracy. The latter occurs when dissidents are a narrowly-based formation, but with high levels of discontent among its elites and with effective resources and leadership, amidst a wider constituency which is non-mobilised and divided.

The state has capacity and loyalty problems in imposing coercive controls. As the conspirators achieve successes, elements in the wider constituency start to give strategic or moral support and an ethnic movement emerges or re-emerges.

Hence the outcome could be that of devolution along the lines of scenario 2, but the extent of eventual concessions by the state could be more far-reaching, in constitutional terms. Once again, however, the Afrikaner core movement will need cross-racial “*bodyguards*” to fend off black mass counter-reaction, and the devolution is likely to be to the benefit of multi-race coalitions or regional arrangements.

Isak de Villiers, the former editor of the Afrikaans newspaper Rapport who was quoted earlier on the reasons for the current decomposition of Afrikaner nationalism, also predicted very firmly that circumstances would arise that would eventually lead to a Volkstaat. Perhaps he had scenarios 2 or 3 in mind. Economic growth with its implication of increased state capacity and opportunities for the economic co-optation of minorities would be the most secure guarantee that scenario 1 will materialise. Even the best of macro-economic management cannot ensure a dynamic economy, however, because of chronically low savings rates in the South African economy and the ever-present danger of emerging market contagion in a globalised world.

There might be a view that one outcome has been overlooked in the assessment of the future. This outcome would be a variant on the picture of consolidation and integration which was presented under scenario 1. The view might be that an alternative to both the latency or remission of Afrikaner ethnicity under a powerfully integrating state project, and the alternative of ethnic contestation, exists in the form of democratic multiculturalism, without any devolution of power, within a benign consensus which would both preserve the coherence of the civic nationalism and the viability of ethnic cultures and languages.

The Economist (23/9/1995:21-25) is eloquent on this possibility:

"The trick in a successful (multi-ethnic) society is for minority citizens to feel that they are more than one thing at once: to be able to feel American and black, Scottish and British, an Orthodox Christian and a Bosnian, a Muslim and an Indian. This is hard and it is easier for anyone seeking a power-base to make it harder still ... But people will resist such appeals if it seems worthwhile to them. There are ideas that people value as they value blood and earth."

This possibility is the heartfelt wish of many Afrikaner intellectuals who try to balance a pride in culture with an endorsement of the civic nationalism of the ANC. It is the public stance of most foreign diplomats in the country and it is the spirit that moves the cultural desk of the ANC, provided that methods are in place to ensure that the whole project is centrally co-ordinated. It has in a sense also been the thrust of some very well-considered

recommendations for South Africa. The student of South Africa. Theo Hanf has suggested some form of "*ideological syncretism*"-- voluntary affiliation to non-racial cultural groupings coexisting with a consensus on national unity and democratic majoritarianism (Hanf, 1989:112).

No doubt this kind of resolution has been secured in many places for long periods of time – the United Kingdom would be an example in respect of the Welsh and the Scots until fairly recently, and in many ways it is the basis for the accommodation of ethnicity in the USA. The tough question, however, is whether or not it can survive in a system of ranked ethnicity, and in systems in which demographic imbalances correlate with voting trends and executive power to exclude minorities from effective political participation on a long-term basis? Is it not a system which is only likely to work or survive in pluralist democracies where the ethnic members have little sense of relative deprivation as groups and a rough equilibrium of power ensures that nobody feels politically excluded?

Multiculturalism in majority-controlled unitary states has a very poor track record in Africa, and Crawford Young argues that it has been the basis for the emergence of open or disguised second-class citizenship (Young, 1997:4-14) But this type of accusation has been levelled even in developed societies. Human rights-based individualism and liberal democracy can be an arrangement which is most advantageous for privileged majority-based elites, and one in which the lack of communal rights leaves ethnic minorities in a situation of legitimated powerlessness. Charles Taylor is well-known for his depiction of this kind of situation as a case of "*democratic exclusion*"(1998:144-156). A universal-human rights tradition promoted by the progressive upper-middle classes of an economically or politically-dominant majority can serve to obscure and protect their own implicit ethnicity, quite as successfully as implicit ethnicity can be obscured in situations of authoritarian majority dominance. The British author Geoff Dench, partly on the basis of an examination of the situation of the Maltese and other minorities in the UK, has made a compelling analysis of the ironic contradictions and protective mechanisms within a progressive nation dedicated to individual liberty and human rights (Dench, 1986). Even an

author who works in the Parliamentary office of the ANC, after a study of a Zulu ethnic festival, has concluded that:

"As South Africa attempts to consolidate its democracy ... it will have to try to reinvent pluralism, eschewing the indifference to difference which is the norm of established liberal democracies." (Mathieson and Attwell. 1998:122)

Yet, one dare not rush to discredit civic consciousness and the universal goals of liberal democracy. Ralf Dahrendorf, in outlining a general view on democracy, correctly observes that *"The constitution of liberty works, then, to the extent to which a society is dominated by public virtues."* (Dahrendorf, 1967:30) He contrasts the public or civic consciousness of Britain with the deeply romantic and ultimately lethal ethnic consciousness of pre-war Germany. This truth, and the truths of community, identity and familiarity, are all enriching, and all can be exploited. One can only hope that somewhere between South Africa's futures, a resolution may be found.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adam, Heribert, and Giliomee, Hermann, 1979. *The Rise and Crisis of Afrikaner Power*. Cape Town: David Philip.
- Adam, H., 1995. "The Politics of Ethnic Identity: Comparing South Africa", *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, Vol. 18, no. 3: 457-475.
- African National Congress, 1999. *Cadre Policy and Deployment Strategy* (ANC web page, internet).
- Althusser, Louis, 1969. *For Marx*. London: Allen Lane. the Penguin Press.
- Anderson, Benedict RO'G, 1983/1991. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso.
- Barth, Frederik, 1969. *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries: The Social Organisation of Culture Difference*. Bergen/Oslo: Universitetsforlaget / Boston: Little Brown.
- Bekker, Simon and Grobbelaar, Janis, 1987. "The White Right-Wing Movement in South Africa before and after the 1987 Election". in Van Vuuren et al (eds.). *South African Election 1987*. Pinetown: Owen Burgess.
- Bekker, Simon, 1993. *Ethnicity in Focus: the South African Case*. Durban: Indicator SA, University of Natal.
- Bell, Daniel, 1975. "Ethnicity and Social Change" in Nathan Glazer and Daniel P. Moynihan, 1975. *Ethnicity*, Cambridge Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Bell, Daniel, 1975. "Ethnicity and Social Change" in Glazer, Nathan and Moynihan, Daniel, (eds.). *Ethnicity: Theory and Experience*. Cambridge. Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Bentley, G. Carter, 1987. "Ethnicity and Practice". *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, Vol. 29. no. 1: 24-55.
- Bentley, G. Carter, 1991. "A Response to Yelvington". *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, Vol. 33, no. 1: 169-175.
- Berger, Peter and Luckmann, Thomas, 1967. *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge*. London: Allen Lane, the Penguin Press.
- Berelson, Bernard and Gary Steiner, 1964. *Human Behaviour: An Inventory of Scientific Findings*. New York: Harcourt Brace and World, Inc.
- Bernstein, Ann, et al, 1999. *Policy-making in a New Democracy: South Africa's Challenges for the 21st Century*. Johannesburg: Centre for Development and Enterprise.

- Blalock, Hubert, 1967. *Toward a Theory of Minority-Group Relations*. New York, John Wiley and Sons.
- Blauner, Robert, 1976. "Colonized and Immigrant Minorities" in Bowker, G. and Carrier, J. (eds.). *Race and Ethnic Relations: Sociological Readings*. New York: Holmes and Meier.
- Blumer, Herbert, 1964. "Race Prejudice as a Sense of Group Position" in Musuoka, J. and Valieu, P. (eds.). *Race Relations: Problems and Theory*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Bonacich, Edna, 1972. "A Theory of Ethnic Antagonism: the Split Labour Market" in *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 37, 1972: 547-559.
- Bornman, Elirea, 1994a. "A Look at Ethnicity in South Africa". *Information Update*, Vol. 4, no. 4, HSRC: 29-37.
- Bornman, Elirea, 1994b. *Self Image and Ethnic Identification*. (Synopsis of D.Phil Dissertation. University of South Africa, Mimeo.
- Central Statistical Services, 1998: *The People of South Africa. 1996 Census results*: Pretoria: Government Printer.
- Coetzee, J.M., 1991. "The Mind of Apartheid: Geoffrey Cronje (1907)." *Social Dynamics*, Vol. 17, no.1: 1-35.
- Cohen, Abner, 1974. *Two Dimensional Man: An Essay on the Anthropology of Power and Symbolism in Complex Society*, Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Cohen, Percy, 1976. "Race Relations as a Sociological Issue" in Gordon Bowker and John Carrier. *Race and Ethnic Relations: Sociological Readings*. New York: Holmes and Meier Inc.
- Cronje, Geoff, 1945. *'n Tuiste vir die Nageslag*. Stellenbosch: Pro Ecclesia/Johannesburg: Publicite Handelsreklamediens.
- Dahrendorf, Ralf, 1967. *Society and Democracy in Germany*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson.
- Davenport, Rodney, 1987. *South Africa: a Modern History*. Johannesburg: MacMillan.
- Dench, Geoff, 1986. *Minorities in the Open Society: Prisoners of Ambivalence*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Denis-Constant, Martin, 1995. "The Choices of Identity". *Social Identities*, Vol. 1, no. 1: 5-21.
- De Kock, Chris, 1996. "Movements in South African Mass Opinion and Party Support to 1993", in Johnson R.W. and Schlemmer, L. (eds.) *Launching Democracy: South Africa's First Open Election*. New Haven/London: Yale University Press.

De Nevers, Renee, 1993. "Démocratisation and Ethnic Conflict". *Survival*, Vol. 35, no.2, Summer, 1993: 31-48.

De Vos, George, and Suarez-Orozco, Marcelo, 1990. *Status Inequality: The Self in Culture*. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.

De Vos, George, 1995. "Ethnic Pluralism: Conflict and Accommodation", in Romanucci-Ross, L. and de Vos, G. *Ethnic Identity: Creation, Conflict and Accommodation*. Walnut Creek/London/New Delhi: Altamira Press.

Degenaar, J.J., 1987. "Afrikaner Nasionalisme" in Esterhuyse, W.P., du Toit, P.V.D.P., van Niekerk, A. *Moderne Politieke Ideologieë*. Johannesburg: Southern Book Publishers.

Durkheim, Emile, 1895/1964. *The Rules of the Sociological Method*. New York: The Free Press.

Du Toit, Z.B. 1999. *Die Nuwe Toekoms: Perspektief op die Afrikaner by die Eeuwisseling*. Pretoria: J.P. van der Walt Publishers.

Eller, Jack D. and Coughlan, Reed M., 1993. "The Poverty of Primordialism: The Demystification of Ethnic Attachments". *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, Vol. 16, no. 2: 183-201.

Epstein, A.L., 1978. "Ethos and Identity: Three Studies in Ethnicity". Chicago: Aldine.

Erikson, Erik, 1963. *Childhood and Society*. New York: Norton.

Erikson, Erik, 1968. *Identity, Youth and Crisis*. New York: Norton.

Erikson, Thomas Hylland, 1993. *Ethnicity and Nationalism: Anthropological Perspectives*. London/Boulder: Pluto Press.

Esman, Milton, J., 1990. "Political and Psychological Factors in Ethnic Conflict", Montville, J.V. (Ed.) *Conflict and Peacemaking in Multi-ethnic Societies*. Lexington: Lexington Books.

Fenwick, R, 1981. "Social Change and Ethnic Nationalism: An Historical Analysis of the Separatist Movement in Quebec". *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, Vol. 23, no. 2: 196-216.

Frost, Mervyn, 1996. "Preparing for Democracy in an Authoritarian State", in Johnson, R.W. and Schlemmer, L. *Launching Democracy*. New Haven/London: Yale University Press.

Furnivall, J.S., 1948. *Colonial Policy and Practice*. London: Cambridge University Press.

- Geertz Clifford, 1963. *The Integrative Revolution: Primordial Sentiments and Civil Politics in the New States*. New York, Free Press of Glencoe.
- Geertz, Clifford, 1994. "Angestammte Loyalitäten. Bestehende Einheiten: Anthropologische Reflexionen zur Identitätspolitik". *Merkur*, no. 542: 392-403.
- Geldenhuis, Deon, 1999. "Van die Verknegting moet Afrikaners hulle Bevry". *Rapport*. April 18: 13.
- Gellner, Ernest, 1994. *Encounters with Nationalism*. Oxford: Blackwells.
- Gellner, Ernest, 1997. *Nationalism*, London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson, 1998. Phoenix: Orion Books.
- Genovese, Eugene, 1971. *In Red and Black*. New York: Vintage.
- Gerth, H. and Mills, C. Wright, 1977. *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Ghai, D., Y. Ghai, and D. Westendorff, 1992. "Ethnicity, Development and Democracy" in *Peace and Conflict Issues after the Cold War*, Geneva: UNESCO: 79-103.
- Gibson, J.L. and Gouws, Amanda, 1998. "Political Intolerance and Ethnicity: Investigating Social Identity." *Indicator South Africa*. Vol. 15. no. 3: 15-20.
- Giddens, Anthony, 1984. *The Constitution of Society*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Giliomee, Hermann, 1979. "The Burgher Rebellions in the Eastern Frontier: 1795-1815", in Elphick, Richard and Giliomee, Hermann (eds.). *The Shaping of South African Society*. Cape Town: Longmans Penguin.
- Giliomee, Hermann, 1979. "The Growth of an Afrikaner Identity", in Adam, Herbert and Giliomee, Hermann (eds.). *The Rise and Crisis of Afrikaner Power*. Cape Town: David Philip: 83-127.
- Giliomee, Hermann, 1984. "Constructing Afrikaner Nationalism". *Standpunte*, Vol. 37, no 5, October.
- Giliomee, Hermann, 1992. "Broedertwis: Intra-Afrikaner Conflicts in the Transition from Apartheid". *African Affairs*, Vol. 91: 339-364.
- Giliomee, Hermann, 1998. "South Africa's Dominant Party Regime". *Journal of Democracy*, Vol. 9, no. 4: 128-142.
- Giliomee, Hermann, 1999. "The Cultural Survival of Afrikaners and Afrikaans-speakers in a Democratic South Africa". *Jewish Affairs*. Autumn, 1999.
- Giliomee, Hermann, 1999. "Eeuwendings en Bestaanskeuses vir Wit Afrikaner Inboorlinge". *Aambeeld*, Vol. 27, no. 1, 1999.

Giliomee, H. and Simkins, C. (eds.), 1999. *The Awkward Embrace: One-Party Domination and Democracy*. Cape Town: Tafelberg.

Glazer, Nathan and Daniel P. Moynihan, 1975. *Ethnicity*. Cambridge Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Gordon, Milton M., 1978. *Human Nature, Class and Ethnicity*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Greenfield, L., 1992. *Nationalism: Five Roads to Modernity*. Cambridge Mass: Harvard University Press.

Grobelaar, Janis, 1991. *Ultra Ring-Wing Afrikaners: a Sociological Analysis*. PhD Thesis. University of South Africa, July.

Guelke, Leonard, 1979. "The White Settlers: 1652-1780". in Elphick, Richard and Giliomee, Hermann (eds.). *The Shaping of South African Society*. Cape Town: Longman Penguin.

Gurr, Ted Robert, 1970. *Why Men Rebel*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Gurr, Ted Robert, 1993. "Why Minorities Rebel: a Global Analysis of Communal Mobilisation and Conflict since 1945". *International Political Science Review*, Vol. 14, no. 2.: 161-201.

Hanf, T., Weiland, H., Vierdag, Gerda, 1981. *South Africa: the Prospects for Peaceful Change*. London: Rex Collings.

Hanf, Theodor, 1989. "The Prospects of Accommodation in Communal Conflicts: a Comparative Study" in Doring, Peter, Weishaupt, Horst and Weiss, Manfred. *Bildung in Sozio-ökonomische Sicht*. Cologne/Vienna: Bolau.

Hanf, Theodor, 1989. "The Prospects of Accommodation in Communal Conflicts". Giliomee, H. and Schlemmer, L. (eds.). *Negotiating South Africa's Future*. Johannesburg: Southern Book Publishers.

Hanf, Theodor, 1994. "The Sacred Marker: Religion, Communalism and Nationalism". *Social Compass*, Vol. 41, no. 1: 9-20.

Hannan, Michael, 1979. "The Dynamics of Ethnic Boundaries in Modern States", in Meyer, J.W. (ed.). *National Development and the World System*. Chicago. University of Chicago Press.

Hartz, Louis, 1964. *The Founding of New Societies*. New York: Harcourt Brace and World.

Hechter, Michael, 1975. *Internal Colonialism: the Celtic Fringe in British National Development*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Heese, J.A., 1971. *Die Herkoms van die Afrikaner*. Cape Town: Mimeo.

- Heard, Kenneth, 1974. *General Elections in South Africa: 1943-70*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Hoffman, Stanley, 1968. "Obstinate or Obsolete: the Fate of the Nation-State and the Case of Western Europe", in Nye, J.S. (ed.) *International Regionalism*. Boston: Little Brown.
- Hofmeyr, Isabel, 1987. "Building a Nation from Words: Afrikaans Language, Literature and Ethnic Identity", in Marks, S. and Trapido, S. (eds.). *The Politics of Race, Class and Nationalism in Twentieth Century South Africa*. London: Longman.
- Homans, George, 1964. "Bringing Men Back In". *Presidential Address, American Sociological Association*.
- Horowitz, Dan, 1982. "Dual Authority Politics". *Comparative Politics*: 329-349.
- X Horowitz, Donald, 1975. "Ethnic Identity", in Glazer, Nathan and Moynihan, Daniel (eds.). *Ethnicity*. Cambridge Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- X Horowitz, Donald L., 1985. *Ethnic Groups in Conflict*. Berkeley/Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Horowitz, Donald J., 1991. *A Democratic South Africa: Constitutional Engineering in a Divided Society*. Oxford University Press.
- Human Sciences Research Council Investigation into Intergroup Relations, 1985. *The South African Society: Realities and Future Prospects*. Pretoria: HSRC.
- Isaacs, Harold, 1975/1989. *Idols of the Tribe, Group Identity and Political Change*. Cambridge Mass/London: Harvard University Press.
- Jary, David and Jary, Julia, 1991. *Dictionary of Sociology*. Glasgow: Harper Collins.
- Johnson, R.W. and Schlemmer, L., 1996. "National Issues and National Opinion", in: Johnson, R.W. and Schlemmer, L. (eds.). *Launching Democracy in South Africa: the First Open Election, April 1994*. New Haven/London: Yale University Press.
- Johnstone, F., 1970. "White supremacy and White prosperity in South Africa". *African Affairs*, Vol. 69. 1970:124-40.
- Johnston, Alexander, 1993. *Covenanted Peoples: the Ulster Unionist and Afrikaner National Coalitions in Growth, Maturity and Decay*. PhD Dissertation. Durban: University of Natal.
- Juteau, Danielle, 1996. "Theorising Ethnicity and Ethnic Communalisations at the Margins: from Quebec to the world system". *Nations and Nationalism*, Vol. 2, no.1: 45-66.

Kapp, P.H., 1987. "The Historical Background to and Significance of the May 1987 Election", in Van Vuuren, D.J., Latakgomo, J., Marais, H.C. and Schlemmer, L. (eds.). *South African Election 1987*. Pinetown: Owen Burgess.

Kerremans, B., 1996. "The Flemish Identity: Nascent or Existent". *Res Publica*: 303-313.

Kotze, D.J., 1968. *Positiewe Nasionalisme*. Cape Town: Tafelberg.

Kotze, Hennie. 1997. *Culture, Ethnicity and Religion: South African Perspectives on Social Ideology*. Monograph. Johannesburg: Konrad Adenauer Foundations.

Kuper, Leo and Smith M.G. (eds.), 1971. *Pluralism in Africa*. Berkeley/Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Laitin, David, 1982. *Hegemony and Religious Conflict: British Imperial Control and Political Cleavages in Yorubaland*. Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Denver: Colorado, September.

Laitin, David, 1997. "The Cultural Identities of a European State". *Politics and Society*, Vol. 25, no. 3: 277-302.

Le Cordeur, Basil A., 1986. "The Occupation of the Cape: 1795-1854", in Cameron, Trehwella. *An Illustrated History of South Africa*. Cape Town/Johannesburg: Jonathan Ball/Human & Rousseau.

Lefebvre, Henri, 1968. *The Sociology of Marx*. New York: Vintage Books.

Leftwich, A. (ed.), 1975. *South Africa: Economic growth and political change*. London: The Anchor Press.

Legassick, Martin, 1974. "South Africa: capital accumulation and violence", *Economy and Society*. Vol. 3, no. 3, 1974: 253-91.

Leifer, Eric M., 1981. "Competing Models of Political Mobilisation: The Role of Ethnic Ties". *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 87, no. 1: 23-46.

Lever, Henry, 1978. *South African Society*. Johannesburg: Jonathan Ball.

Lijphart, Arend, 1979. "Religious vs Language vs Class Voting: The 'Crucial Experiment' of Comparing Belgium, Canada, South Africa and Switzerland". *The American Political Science Review*, Vol. 73, no. 2, 1979: 442-458.

Lijphart, Arend, 1980. "Language, Religion, Class and Party Choice: Belgium, Canada, Switzerland and South Africa Compared", in Richard Rose (ed.). *Electoral Participation: a Comparative Analysis*. Beverley Hills: Sage.

Lockwood, D., 1970. "Race, Conflict and Plural Society", in Zubaida, S., *Race and Racism*. London: Tavistock.

- Luxemburg, Rosa, edited by Davis, H.B., 1976. *The National Question: Selected Writings*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Market and Opinion Surveys (Pty) Ltd. Various survey reports. 1980-1989. Belleville: Mimeo.
- Marx, Karl, 1889/1970. *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*. New York: International Publishers.
- Marx, Karl and Engels, Frederick, 1971. *Economy and Society*. reprinted in Horowitz, David (ed.). *Radical Sociology*. San Francisco: Canfield press: 25.
- Mason, David. 1988. "Controversies and Continuities in Race and Ethnic Relations", in Rex, John and Mason, David (eds.). *Theories of Race and Ethnic Relations*. Cambridge: University of Cambridge Press (paperback).
- Mason, T. David, 1992. "Ethnicity and Politics". in Hawkesworth, Mary and Kogan, Maurice (eds.). *Encyclopaedia of Government and Politics*. London/New York: Routledge.
- Mathieson, Susan and Attwell, D., 1998. "Between Ethnicity and Nationhood". Bennett, D. (Ed.). *Multicultural States*. London: Routledge.
- McNamara, Kent and Schlemmer, L., 1988. *Black Employees' Attitudes to Inter-Group Violence in the Gold Mines of the Evander Area*. Unpublished Commissioned Report.
- Mead, George Herbert, 1934/1962. "The I and the Me" in Charles Morris. *Mind, Self and Society*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press: 276-292.
- Mimni, Ephraim, 1985. "Marxism and Nationalism". in Martin Shaw (ed.). *Marxist Sociology Revisited*. Houndmills, Basingstoke/London: MacMillan Press.
- Moerman, Michael, 1965. "Who are the Lue? Ethnic Identification in a Complex Civilisation". *American Anthropologist*, Vol 67, no. 5: 1215-1229.
- Moodie, T. Dunbar, 1975. *The Rise of Afrikanerdom: Power, Apartheid and The Afrikaner Civil Religion*, Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Nagel, Joanne and Olzak, Susan, 1982. "Ethnic Mobilisation in Old and New States: an Extension of the Competition Model", *Social Problems*, Vol 30: 127-143.
- Nairn, Tom, 1977. *The Break-up of Britain*, London: New Left Books.
- Nash, Manning, 1988. *The Cauldron of Ethnicity in the Modern World*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Nepgen, 1938. *Die Sosiale Gewete van die Afrikaner*. Stellenbosch: Pro Ecclesia.
- Neuhaus, Richard J., 1986. *Dispensations: The Future of South Africa as South Africans see it*. Grand Rapids, Mich. William B. Erdmans.

- Norusis, M.J., 1994. "Factor Analysis". *Statistical Package for the Social Sciences*. Chicago: SPSS Inc, Chapter 2.
- No Sizwe (pseudonym), 1979. *One Azania, One Nation: The National Question in South Africa*. London: Zed Books.
- Olzak, Susan, 1992. *The Dynamics of Ethnic Competition and Conflict*. Stanford, Stanford University Press, 1992.
- O'Donnell, G., Schmitter, P., 1986. "Tentative Conclusions about Uncertain Democracies", in O'Donnell, G., Schmitter, P. and Whitehead, L. *Transitions from Authoritarian Rule: Prospects for Democracy*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- O'Donnell, G., Schmitter, P. and Whitehead, L., 1986. *Transitions from Authoritarian Rule: Prospects for Democracy*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- O'Meara, Dan, 1983. *Volkskapitalisme: Class, Capital and Ideology in the Development of Afrikaner Nationalism, 1934-1948*. Braamfontein: Ravan Press.
- Orum, Anthony M., 1983. *Introduction to Political Sociology: The Social Anatomy of the Body Politic*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall Inc.: 288-289.
- Parkin, Frank, 1979. *Marxism and Class Theory: a Bourgeois Critique*. London: Tavistock.
- Parsons, Talcott and Shils, Edward, 1951. *Towards a General Theory of Action*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Parsons, Talcott and Shils, Edward, 1962. *Toward a General Theory of Action*. New York: Harper.
- Parsons, Talcott, 1970. *Social Structure and Personality*. Glencoe: The Free Press.
- Pfabigan, Alfred, 1991. "The political feasibility of Austro-Marxist proposals for the solution of the nationality problem of the Danubian Monarchy" in Uri Ra'anan et al. (eds.). *State and Nation in Multi-Ethnic Societies*. Manchester/New York: Manchester University Press.
- Ra'anan, Uri, et al (eds.), 1991. *State and Nation in Multi-Ethnic Societies*, Manchester/New York: Manchester University Press.
- Ra'anan, Uri, 1991. "Nation and State: Order out of Chaos", in Ra'anan et al (eds.). *State and Nation in Multi-Ethnic Societies*, Manchester University Press.
- Rex, John. 1970-71. "The Plural Society: the South African case". *Race*, Vol. 12: 401-13.
- Romanucci-Ross, Lola, and de Vos, George, 1995. *Ethnic Identity: Creation, Conflict and Accommodation*. Walnut Creek/London/New Delhi: Altamira Press.

- Roosens, Eugene, 1989. *Creating Ethnicity: The Process of Ethnogenesis*. Newbury Park/London: Sage Publications.
- Rosenberg, Morris, 1979. *Conceiving the Self*. New York: Basic Books.
- Rothschild, Joseph, 1981. *Ethnopolitics: a Conceptual Framework*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Rummel, R.J., 1967. Understanding Factor Analysis. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*. Vol. 11: 444-480.
- Runciman, W.G., 1999. *The Social Animal*. London: Harper Collins/ Fontana Press.
- Russel, B. and Starr, H., 1989. *World Politics: The Menu for Choice*. New York: Freeman.
- SACOB/Schlemmer, L., 1996-1999. *Quarterly Political Notes*. Johannesburg: South African Council of Business.
- Schermerhorn, R.A. 1970. *Comparative Ethnic Relations: a Framework for Theory and Research*. New York: Random House.
- Schlemmer, Lawrence, 1973. "Social Status, Perceptions of Personal Adequacy and Morale: a neglected field of Enquiry". *Sociology in Southern Africa*. Durban: Association for Sociology in Southern Africa: 50-63.
- Schlemmer, Lawrence (with then politically banned and hence unacknowledged author Turner, Rick), 1973. *Privilege, Prejudice and Parties: A Study of Patterns of Political Motivation among White Voters in Durban*. Johannesburg: South African Institute of Race Relations.
- Schlemmer, Lawrence, 1987. "The National Party: Ideology, Aims, Role and Strategy", in Van Vuuren, D.J., et al (eds.). *South African Election 1987*. Pinetown: Owen Burgess.
- Schlemmer, Lawrence, 1992. "Codesa and the People", *Information Update*. March 1992, Vol. 2. No. 1, Human Sciences Research Council, Pretoria: 3-20.
- Scholtz, G.D., 1967. *Die Ontwikkeling van die Politieke denke van die Afrikaner*, Vol. 1. Cape Town: Voortrekker Press.
- Schwartz, P., 1991. *The Art of the Long View*. Garden City, New York: Doubleday.
- Sennett, J. and Vorster, D., 1996. "Social Identity: Comparing White English-speaking Students in South Africa in 1975 and 1994". *South African Journal of Psychology*, Vol. 26, no. 4: 203-220.
- Serfontein, J.H.P., 1979. *Brotherhood of Power*. London: Rex Collings.

Shils, Edward, 1957. "Primordial, Personal, Sacred and Civil Ties: Some Particular Observations on the Relationships of Sociological Research and Theory". *British Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 8: 130-145.

Simmel, Georg, 1917/1950/ Wolff, Kurt, H. (Editor and translator). *The Sociology of George Simmel*. Glencoe Illinois: Free Press.

Slovo, Joseph, 1988. "The South African working class and the National Democratic revolution," *Umsebenzi*, discussion pamphlet, South African Communist Party, 4, 36.

Smith, M.G., 1965. *The Plural Society in the British West Indies*. Berkeley/Los Angeles: University of California Press.

South African Advertising Research Foundation, 1999. *AMPS 1999*. Johannesburg: SAARF.

South African Institute of Race Relations (various years). *Annual Survey of Race Relations*. Johannesburg: SAIRR.

Stone, John, 1985. *Racial Conflict in Contemporary Society*. London: Fontana Press.

Tamarkin, Moshe, 1995. *Culture, State and Politics in Africa: Tribalism or Moral Ethnicity*. Draft, Mimeo.

Taylor, Charles, 1984. "Hegel: History and Politics". in Sandel, Michael. *Liberalism and its Critics*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell: 177-199.

Taylor, C., 1998. "The Dynamics of Democratic Exclusion". *Journal of Democracy*, Vol. 9, no. 4: 144-156.

The Citizen (daily newspaper) Johannesburg: various issues.

The Economist, 1996. London: November: 16-22 .

Trevor-Roper, Hugh, 1962. *Jewish and other Nationalisms*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson.

Van den Berghe, 1967. *South Africa: A Study in Conflict*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Van den Berghe, Pierre, 1986. "Ethnicity and the Sociobiology Debate". Rex, John and Mason, David. *Theories of Race and Ethnic Relations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Van den Berghe, Pierre, 1978. "Race and Ethnicity: a Sociobiological Perspective" in *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, Vol.1. no. 4: 401-411.

Van den Berghe, Pierre, 1979. "The Present State of Comparative Race and Ethnic Studies", Jan Berting, Felix Geyer and Ray Jurkovich (eds). *Problems in International Comparative Research in the Social Sciences*. Oxford: Pergamon: 23-36.

- Van den Berghe, Pierre, 1981. *The Ethnic Phenomenon*. New York/Oxford: Elsevier.
- Van Jaarsveld, F.A., 1959. *Die Ontwikkeling van die Afrikaner Nasionale Bewussyn*. Johannesburg: Voortrekker Pers.
- Van Niekerk, P.J., 1985. *Tradisie en Vernuwning - Kontinuiteit en Diskontinuiteit in Afrikanerdenke*. Report to the Human Sciences Research Council. Pretoria: HSRC.
- Wallman, Sandra, 1988. "Ethnicity and the Boundary Process in Context". in Rex, John and Mason, David (eds.). *Theories of Race and Ethnic Relations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (paperback).
- Weber, Max. 1968. G. Roth and C. Wittich (eds.). *Economy and Society*. New York: Bedminster Press.
- Weber, Max. 1922/1968/1980. *Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft/Economy and Society: an Outline of Interpretive Sociology*. New York, Bedminster Press (Transl. G. Roth and G. Wittich)/ Tubingen: J.C.B. Mohr.
- Welsh, David, 1978. "The Nature of Racial Conflict in South Africa". *Social Dynamics*, Vol. 4, no. 2: 29-39.
- Westergaard, J. and Resler, H., 1975. *Class in a Capitalist Society*. London: Heinemann.
- Williams, Robin Jr., 1994. "The Sociology of Ethnic Conflicts: Comparative International Perspectives" in *Annual Review of Sociology*. Vol. 20: 49-79.
- Wilson, E.O., 1975. *Sociobiology: The new Synthesis*. Cambridge Mass: Harvard University Press.
- Wolpe, Harold, 1972. "Capitalism and cheap labour power in South Africa", *Economy and Society*, Vol. 1, no. 4 1972: 425-58.
- Wolpe, Harold, 1976. "The White Working Class in South Africa". *Economy and Society*. Vol. 5, no. 2 1976.
- Yelvington, Kevin, 1991. "Ethnicity as Practice, a Comment on Bentley". *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, Vol. 33, no. 1: 158-168.
- Young, Crawford, (ed.) 1993. *The Rising Tide of Cultural Pluralism*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Young, Crawford, 1997. "Democracy and the Ethnic Question in Africa". *Africa Insight*, Vol. 27, no. 1: 4-14.