PART II

PERSPECTIVES ON LEADERSHIP

Leadership in the world of the Bible: (De)institutionalisation as an ongoing process

Y Dreyer

(University of Pretoria)

ABSTRACT

Leadership in the world of the Bible: (De)institutionalisation as an ongoing process

This article discusses the development of leadership in the biblical world in light of structuration theory. The use of the structuration theory is embedded in the theoretical work of Max Weber. Max Weber distinguishes three types of authority: legal, traditional and charismatic authority. In order to differentiate between the more nurturing and the more institutionalised aspects of authority (with the innate possibility of the abuse of power), Latin, rather than Western languages, provides the most useful terminology. The article traces the development from auctoritas (nurturing authority) to potestas (coercive power). It focuses on how authority manifested in the Near- and Middle-East, the Hellenistic Emperor Cult and early Christianity. The aim is to explain the ways in which power and authority function in society by reflecting on the development from charismatic to institutionalised leadership. The potential danger that the message of Jesus can be adapted to the power structures of the world, is highlighted. Deinstitutionalisation is a postmodern demystifying process, by means of which church and society can be restructured today.

1   INTRODUCING STRUCTURATION THEORY

This article reflects on leadership against the background of the *structuration theory* of Anthony Giddens (1984; cf 1979, 1982) as used by David Horrell ([1997] 1999) to develop a church leadership model. The structuation theory demonstrates that the process of structuring society is ongoing. Resources which are of a symbolic and linguistic nature function in an *ideological* way to legitimate a pattern of domination (see

Horrell 1995; 1996:45-59). By means of the structuration theory, Horrell illustrates the development from charismatic to institutionalised leadership (see Horrell [1997] 1999). This resulted in the need for the ideological legitimation of leaders which in turn led to the marginalisation of people such as women and slaves (Horrell 1999:309-310; cf also 1995; 1996:45-59). Horrell (1999:329-331) is interested in the development from itinerant to resident leadership within the household structures in the early church. He makes use of the theory of Max Weber ([1947] 1968a; 1968b) and builds on the work of the biblical scholars Theissen (1973; 1975; [1979]; 1988), Holmberg (1978), MacDonald (1979), Maier (1991) and Campbell (1994).

Some of the fundamental dualisms in social theory are theory/ *praxis*, action/structure and macro structure/micro structure. The structuration theory of Giddens is an attempt to resolve these dualisms (see Swingewood [1984] 2000:208-211). An essential issue in sociological analysis is the role of actors (groups, not individuals) in the formation of an organised society. It is about how everyday dialogic relationships contribute to the constitution of society as a whole. There are mainly two possibilities for describing the dualisms of theory/praxis and action/structure. Parsons (1978) is known for the viewpoint that "theory develops autonomously" and that "analytic concepts [are] derived from theoretical and not empirical and historical analysis" (Swingewood 2000:208). The "theory of communicative action" of Jürgen Habermas (1984 and 1989) is an example of this approach also followed by Giddens. The reflexive sociology of Pierre Bourdieu is an example of the other possibility. Bourdieu argues that "sociology is simultaneously theoretical and empirical" and, following Karl Marx, refuses to "separate theoretical from the empirical and historical" (Swingewood 2000:208).

According to Giddens, insight into social structure comes through theoretically interpreting the actions embodied by the structure. Social life is "the production of active subjects" (Giddens 1976:120-121). His structuration theory focuses on the process of *making* social life. The concept of "active agent" takes the place of all objectivist theories, which see the social world as "an independent, pre-given realm of external, constraining social facts" (Swingewood 2000:209; see Giddens 1984:165). In his theory, social systems are open-ended: "Human society … would plainly not exist without human agency. But it is not the case that actors create social systems. They reproduce or transform them, remaking what is already made in the continuity of *praxis*" (Giddens 1984:170-171). To gain insight into praxis, it is necessary to understand the relationship between rules and resources (the properties of structure – institutions). According to this theory, in an open-ended society rules

are "utilised by agents in everyday social interaction, in conversation, providing the basis of an ordered and stable social life. Rules are both formal and public – rules governing elections and teaching practices, for example – and informal rules governing relations between individuals and structuring the varied encounters that make up everyday interaction" (Swingewood 2000:210). Power is a resource. Utilising rules and being empowered by resources, agents restructure society.

The use of the structuration theory as background for this article is also embedded in the theoretical work of Max Weber, especially as applied by Bengt Holmberg. The focus of this study differs from that of Horrell. The "structuration" of authority is seen as a consequence of how God and Jesus were perceived in the biblical world. The article discusses how authority manifested in the Near- and Middle-East, the Hellenistic Emperor Cult, and early Christianity. It aims to explain the ways in which power and authority function in society. Lack of awareness of the open-ended (ongoing) process of institutionalisation may lead to a closed system, in which the gospel is used as a rule and the transforming gospel message dissolves into power structures in the guise of church leadership. "[T]he church seems too much in appearance like the world – too busy, too tired, too involved, too demanding, too unstable, too spiritually impoverished, too leadership deprived" (Stairs 2000:1). Deinstitution-alisation is a postmodern demystifying process by means of which church and society can be restructured in an ongoing way.

2   CHARISMATIC OR COERCIVE LEADERSHIP

Max Weber (1968a:15-16; cf also Eisenstadt 1968:46-47; Horrell 1999: 312-313) poses the question as to when authority is legitimate. He distinguishes three types of authority:

- *Legal* authority is an impersonal order maintained by officials and obeyed by the people. It is exerted by means of the codification and enforcement of laws by power structures.
- *Traditional* authority pertains to the authority of the paterfamilias, the person (a patron or royal figure) whose position of leadership and status is generally accepted.
- *Charismatic* authority depends not on office, position or status, but on the individual qualities of an extraordinary person. Charismatic authority appears when the given order is changed by revolution. A charismatic leader opposes the traditional order and finds a following among people, who become convinced that his vision and ideas promise a better life for them. The revolutionary quality does not, however, remain indefinitely. The acts and deeds of the charismatic leader in time become traditionalised and normative.

In order to distinguish between the more nurturing and the more official aspects of authority (with the innate possibility of the abuse of power), Latin, rather than Western languages, provides the most useful terminology (see Dreyer 2002:46-47). In Roman thought a distinction was made between the terms *potestas* and *auctoritas* (Gunneweg & Schmithals 1982:16-17). *Potestas* indicated the power of officials who were legally invested in their office. Their authority and limits were determined by law. *Auctoritas*, on the other hand, was not based on an office or a given position. It was acquired on account of a person's attributes and capabilities, as well as the recognition of others. *Auctoritas* could be a quality of a person with insight, wisdom and charisma, with the power to influence and convince, and it could also be a quality of tradition, holy scriptures and accepted rules of wisdom. *Auctoritas* can, therefore, be a great asset to someone with *potestas* (an official position of authority such as a priest or a scribe), but it does not automatically come with the position. A person with *potestas* can be someone without *auctoritas*. "(I)t also follows that in principle *potestas* has to do with compulsion, while *auctoritas* always has to do with freedom. Authority exists only where there is free acceptance" (Gunneweg & Schmithals 1982:17).

Auctoritas provides the safe space in which a person can grow, whereas legal authority provides the order and safety for people to live together. In this sense authority is necessary for human life, while anarchy (a total rejection of all forms of authority) would be detrimental to life. On the other hand, to turn away from authority in order not to remain dependent, is also a natural phenomenon. An irrational and harmful protest against authority is often brought on by a situation where *auctoritas* has been supplanted by *potestas* (Gunneweg & Schmithals 1982:20). This means that force has taken the place of persuasion and coercion has destroyed freedom.

Max Weber (1968b:53) distinguishes between the terms "power" and "domination". "Power" is the ability to execute one's will regardless of whether the other party or parties agree or resist. The relationship is coercive. "Domination", on the other hand, is when the other party or parties have at least some interest in obeying the person or institution with power. They therefore do so voluntarily (see Weber 1968b:53, 212). One of the reasons for compliance is when the leader's authority is accepted as legitimate. In such a relationship power plays a role and authority is legitimate and becomes institutionalised (Holmberg 1978: 125). It is therefore necessary to distinguish between "power, "domination" and "authority". "Domination" and "authority" are on the same level, whereas "power" functions in a different sphere. The term "domin-

ation" is used for the authority of a social system, whereas "authority" pertains to people. In a relationship where there is authority, the ruler's behaviour is such that the ruled obey willingly because the authority is accepted as right and good (Holmberg 1978:131). On the level of authority and domination, obedience is, therefore, given voluntarily because the authority is regarded as legitimate. When people obey for reasons other than the legitimacy of the authority, for instance under threat of physical harm, it can be seen as "power" rather than authority. Coercion is termed "violence" and this use of "power" is a perversion of authority and domination. As far as the legitimacy of authority is concerned, a distinction should be made between "legality" which means "being in accordance with the law" and "legitimacy" which is the quality of the "rightness" of something (see Holmberg 1978:128; cf also Friedrich 1963:234; Schelsky 1970:23).

There are other typologies than that of Weber (cf Blau 1963:313-314; Eschenburg 1976). In this article Weber's will still be used as a basic point of departure, though critically modified. Criticism against Weber's typology is that it does not include some modern forms of legitimate authority (see Hartmann 1964:4; Sternberger 1968:247), that the three types overlap, since all three types build on tradition to some extent (see Winch 1958:238; Friedrich 1963:235; Sternberger 1968:247), that all authority has charismatic elements (see Horrell 1999:313), in other words that it has something to do with the value system and the social order of society (see Eisenstadt 1968). Holmberg (1978:141-142) further criticises Weber for not distinguishing sufficiently between *charismatic leadership* and *charismatic authority*. Charismatic leadership focuses on the relationship between the leader and the followers. It is an intensely personal and emotional relationship: "The leader can do nothing wrong, everything he says, wishes or prescribes is absolutely true and right, as he is considered to be a source of goodness, truth and strength in himself" (Holmberg 1978:142).

Weber himself (1968a:262-264) admits that it is not likely that "pure" types could ever exist, but that his typology is a classification meant to assist the process of analysis. Holmberg (1978:137-150; cf also Blau 1963:309-311) considers Weber's classification to be of analytical value "especially in non-modern historical situations". This analysis is therefore especially relevant for studying the development from charismatic authority (*auctoritas*) to institutionalised authority (*potestas*) in early Christianity.

Weber (1968a:241; cf Lemmen 1990:135-145) expresses his view of "charismatic" as follows:

"The term 'charisma' will be applied to a certain quality of an individual personality by virtue of which he is considered extraordinary and treated as endowed with supernatural, superhuman, or at least specifically exceptional powers or qualities. These are such as are not accessible to the ordinary person, but are regarded as of divine origin…."

Holmberg (1978:138; cf Lemmen 1990:135-137) regards charisma as "not an individual psychological trait but a strictly *social* phenomenon; without acknowledgement from a group of believers, charisma simply does not exist". In pre-modern societies some form of magical (religious) activity would attract followers to the charismatic leader. Some followers would be closer to the leader, also on account of their "charisma", and would become the "disciples". There is no system of organisation or set of formal rules governing the group. Eventualities are treated in a charismatic way. They are often regarded as having a divine origin, be it judgements or revelations. According to Holmberg (1978:139), charismatic authority is *extra-ordinary* (*außer-alltäglich*) and is contrary to the rational and traditional authority which constitutes everyday forms of authority. The wisdom instruction of a charismatic teacher is therefore inclined to subvert *conventional wisdom*. Charismatic groups tend to reject forms of traditional authority and establish a new way of life. Charismatic change is revolutionary, and comes from within. It is a totally new orientation towards life, the world, values and norms (Weber 1968a:245). "… [C]harisma in its pure form is an unstable, short-lived type of authority which very soon becomes either traditionalized or rationalized or both" (Holmberg 1978:139). This is the process of institutionalisation.

A charismatic leader brings a new message that is radical, revolutionary and causes conflict. According to Theissen (1999:6-7) "(t)he stigmatizing of the charismatic by the world around can even increase his influence…". The mission of the leader also becomes the task of his followers. Their task is to transform reality. From this self-understanding a group identity develops and the group is seen as "an anticipation or prototype of the new society or Kingdom to come, and in intense missionary zeal" (Holmberg 1978:147-148). The group now generates a charisma which ensures its existence after the death of the leader. The process of the development from a charismatic group to a body with an organization, such as a church, is called the *Veralltäglichung des Charisma* by Weber (1968a:246-254, 1121-1148; cf Lemmen 1990:137-145; Mödritzer 1994:277-284) and the *institutionalisation of charismatic authority* by Holmberg (1978:162-195).

Holmberg (1978:167-175) examines institutionalisation from a general sociological point of view. He chooses the perspective of an anthropological analysis of human interaction as worked out by scholars such as Helmut Schelsky (1965a; 1965b; 1970) and especially Peter Berger and Thomas Luckmann (1975). The process of institutionalis-ation can be described in terms of different stages:

The beginning of the institutionalisation process

Human beings are creatures of habit, in other words, their behaviour follows certain repetitive patterns. Habit provides the impetus for institutionalisation. Another human trait is typification, the mental activity of classifying according to typical acts or characteristics. When the typification is done collectively rather than individually, it can be referred to as roles. An institution is represented in and by roles. Role expectations are formed when people come to expect typical behaviours (cf Luhmann 1970:30-31). An institution exercises social control. This means that it has no formal control, but its power lies in how difficult it is for individuals to go against the system. On the one hand this social control has the effect of limiting an individual's freedom. But on the other, institutionalisation also has the effect of creating a structured world for individuals. Those contributing to institutionalisation become increasingly anonymous, are vaguely referred to as "they", and the more anonymous the authors of institutionalisation become, the more difficult it is to question the system, since nobody is responsible.

Legitimation

Legitimation occurs when the fundamental belief and value-systems that function within the institutionalised world are used to explain and validate the system. The new generation receives these explanations, and in the process they are socialised into the system. According to Holm-berg (1978:171), legitimation happens on different levels. The first level of legitimation is part of the vocabulary. The second level consists of simple wisdom, often in the form of proverbs, moral maxims, legends and songs. The third level displays theories that validate the institution. This knowledge is often preserved and imparted by "experts". The fourth level consists of symbolic universes, in other words, traditions that provide a unifying frame of reference. When it is forgotten that human beings create their social world, systematise and institutionalise, then institutions are *reified* (cf Schüssler Fiorenza 1999:64). Then the institutions are seen as a given reality beyond human control. The result is that power interests become camouflaged and ideology "naturalised".

Cumulative institutionalisation

Cumulative institutionalisation refers to the process of an institution growing and changing, becoming increasingly complex as a system. The ongoing structuring of society is the central premise of Anthony Gibbens' structuration theory. If this does not happen, the institution will deteriorate. A particular example of this cumulative effect can be seen in what Holmberg (1978:173) calls "the institutionalization of the institutionalization process" or "double institutionalization". The first part of the process can be seen in institutionalised interpretations (such as dogmas), offices and official procedures in, for example, the church. The other part is invisible and "takes place in the elementary processes of socialization and forming of public opinion. The latter part of the institutionalization process legitimates the former" (Holmberg 1978:173; cf Luhmann 1970:34). Church authority is an example of double institutionalisation: "the authority of church leaders in doctrinal, cultic and disciplinary matters, or even the existence of specific rules for how to treat those who deviate from a given norm of belief or conduct" (Holmberg 1978:173).

The power structures created by the leaders of the early church in order to institutionalise the charismatic authority of Jesus were legitimated by the authority of the Bible. The last phase of this development is that Jesus, the charismatic Messiah, was transformed into Jesus the King by the church.

Scriptures originated in the context of the ancient Near- and Middle-East, Israel, the Hellenistic Emperor Cult and early Jesus movements. In order to better understand this development, it is essential to know how power structures worked in the cultures of the Bible.

3   JESUS IS KING – THE BUILDING BLOCKS

3.1   Ancient Near- and Middle-East

Ancient Israel formed part of the ancient Orient and, therefore, authority in this setting will be examined. It was believed that the ruler was called to his task by the gods or a specific god. The city from which he ruled was the centre of the world and his kingdom would not come to an end. The ruler had to obey the god(s) who called him, and his task was to bring prosperity and justice to his people. "Justice" was viewed as a state of goodness that included prosperity. The ruler, thus seen as a benefactor, was often regarded as the shepherd of his people (see Gunneweg & Schmithals 1982:23-26). In this capacity he was seen as a saviour-figure. The divine-human ruler had a broad responsibility, which included the entire creation and the order of the cosmos (cf Taylor

[1931] 1981). He performed the rituals necessary to promote natural prosperity and fertility. In this respect he fulfilled the function of priest (cf Horsley 1995:42). Salvation by means of the rule of the divine representative was universal, therefore, no salvation was possible beyond the limits of this rule (cf Thompson 1999:168-178). Beyond the order of this rule there was only chaos.

3.2 Israel

Israel, as a small nation inhabiting a strategic spot in the ancient world, was not untouched by the surrounding nations' ideas about authority and rule. The question would then be what the extent of this influence was. Some scholars propose that Israel adopted the god-king ideology of the surrounding world and find evidence for this view in certain Psalms, for example. Others dispute such an influence (see Thompson 1999:168-178). Gunneweg & Schmithals (1982:32-33) find both these alternatives unacceptable and take a middle road. On the one hand, Israel's view on authority and rule cannot be summarily equated with that of the ancient Orient, but on the other, a definite influence cannot be denied.

The Hebrew Scriptures abound with references to "king" and "rule", that mostly denote earthly rulers and do not refer to God (see Weisman 1984:21-26). There is evidence that the king was, indeed, seen as "son of God". In Psalm 2:7b God says to the king: "You are my son; today I have become your Father'" and continues in verse 9 with the commission to rule: "You will rule them [the nations] with an iron sceptre; you will dash them to pieces like pottery". On the one hand, this does not refer to a physical father-son relationship, while on the other, it cannot be seen as only figurative language. It is probably an adoption formula, examples of which can be found in Egyptian documents and the Hebrew Scriptures (see Wulfing von Martitz 1969:401; Van Aarde 1998:150-172). In this respect the Israelite view differed from the Egyptian, where the king was physically the son of the god. What was similar, however, was that the king ruled as God's son. The king was responsible for just and righteous rule. Righteousness consisted of social justice, which includes the total order of salvation, the order among people in the world, and the order of God becoming a reality in the world. It encompassed salvation, peace, prosperity, blessings and the well-being of the people (see Lenski, Nolan & Lenski [1970] 1995:205, 207).

Though unknown to Egypt, the kings of Israel were anointed (see *inter alia* Psalm 45:7; 1 Samuel 10:1; 16:13; 1 Kings 1:39; Psalms 2:2; 18:50; 20:6; 89:20) and were specifically known as the *anointed ones of God*. This is a honorary title bestowed on kings as part of the enthronement ritual. The ritual of anointment (see Collins 1995:11-14) gave the

anointed one a part in the splendour, glory and power of the one in whose name he was anointed (see Gunneweg & Schmithals 1982:41-42). The Davidic king is said to have had enormous power, also creative power, but it is emphasised that this power comes from God (e.g. Psalm 89). The Davidic king lived in his palace on Mount Zion next to the temple where God lived. "Living next door to God, so to speak, he sits upon his throne at the very right hand of God [Hengel 1995:119-126]. This place of honor is assigned to him by his God" (Gunneweg & Schmithals 1982:44; cf Kobelski 1981). If the king does not rule "by God's grace" alone, but by his own power, he does not fulfil his function as God's son anymore, but incurs the wrath of God.

The Babylonian conquest of 587-586 BCE, which meant the end of the Israelite monarchy, changed Israel's understanding of rule and authority. The disaster was seen as God's judgement, predicted by the prophets. The predicament was attributed to Israel's sins, not because there was anything wrong with the rule of God. Even so, questions arose concerning the promise that there would always be a king on the throne of David, and the promise of salvation that went hand in hand with God's rule. For example, Isaiah 9:6-7 speaks of the new king and his kingdom. The *future* king will, however, be able to accomplish much more than even the best of the god-kings in the past. In Zechariah 9:9-10 the king is portrayed as gentle and humble, yet still a king whose rule will extend "from sea to sea and from the River to the ends of the earth" (Gunneweg & Schmithals 1982:96).

When this ruler and his new dispensation failed to come, the question remained how God's rule and human rule should be seen in the meantime. The prophet Haggai saw Zerubbabel, a descendant of David, as the present messiah (see Hg 2:20-23). This expectation led to disappointment. The two directions characteristically taken during the post-exilic period are *eschatology* (the expectation of the future rule of God – see Preuss 1978; Gowan 1986) and *theocracy* (the belief that God is already ruling in the present) (Gunneweg & Schmithals 1982:101-102). These two ideas are not necessarily mutually exclusive, and can be found together in various forms and mixtures. In the work of the Chronicler, the line of theocracy is taken. The fulfilment of the prophets' message occurred when the Persian king (as "God's anointed" – Is 45:1; cf 44:28) freed the people from Babylonian exile. God's salvation had come, was present and no future event would be needed. Ezra and Nehemiah also attested to an "actualised rule of God". The relationship of this rule with the actual rule of worldly authorities affected the organisation of Israel and also influenced the understanding of authority and rule in the early Jesus community. An example is Ezra, who reorganised the legal relationship between Israel and the Persian

authority. Both the law of God and Persian law would apply to the people. The law of God was seen as the law of the king: "Its [the law's] *auctoritas* is divine, but it is protected by the royal *potestas*, which can even impose harsh punishments to enforce its provisions (Ezr 7:26b)" (Gunneweg & Schmithals 1982:104-105). The ruling authority was no longer friendly. How should the rule of God be seen and the salvation of God experienced in such circumstances, and how should God's people act toward hostile authorities?

3.3   Hellenistic emperor cult

In Hellenistic thinking, the ideology of the god-king took a new turn. After having conquered Egypt, Alexander the Great visited the oracle of the god Zeus Ammon at the oasis of Siwa and was addressed as "son of God", the successor of the Egyptian god-kings (see Dittenberger 1960, *Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum*, II.760.7; *Oxyrhynchus Papyrus* 1453.11; see Grenfell, Hunt & Bell 1898-1927; *Orientis Graeci Inscriptiones Selectae* 655.2; Taylor [1931] 1981:142-246, 270-283; Harris 1992:28 notes 34 and 35; Deissmann [1927] 1965:345 note 4). For the first time a Greek or Roman ruler was seen to enter the realm of the divine. This was due to Egyptian influence. In a Hellenistic context the emperor was the manifestation of God. Disobedience to the ruler was seen as being disrespectful to the gods and vice versa (cf Koester 1992:9). Reluctance to participate in temple rituals in honour of the deities was considered a capital crime. The stability of the state depended on the masses respecting the gods (Alvis 1995:143). Marianne Bonz (2000:182) puts it as follows: "If Jupiter does not exist, then Rome's eternal rule is by no means assured". The lordship of rulers and the gods were perceived to be interrelated. In Egypt, before Hellenism, the pharaoh was physically deemed a divine figure. This influenced the Hellenistic culture. In the Emperor Cult the ruler now physically became a god, and titles were used to express this. For example, the emperor was called *kyrios*, son of god, and *soter*. The birth of these god-human figures was seen as "good tidings" for the people (see Koester 1992:12).

According to Mack (1993:216), "the term christ soon became only another name for their [Christians'] God … Jesus came to be thought of as a god with a right to rule over these communities...". Greek gods were, however, much closer to mortals than the God of Israel. They were not all-mighty creators. Though immortal, they were also subject to the whims of fate (Bultmann [1958] 1968:131). An example of a deified king was Julius Caesar, who was hailed by an inscription found in Ephesus (48 BCE) as: *high priest, emperor and twice consul, the god born of Ares and Aphrodite and visibly manifest and universal savior of human life* (Dittenberger 1960:760-767). After his death he was called

the divine Julius, and his son, the later Caesar Augustus, was known as *divi filius*, the son of God. He was given the title *saviour* (*soter*) during his lifetime. After Augustus and his successor, Tiberius, this cult expanded and developed (see Taylor 1981) as later rulers demanded to be worshipped, and abandoned any pretense of being there for the well-being of the people. They simply used their power (*potestas*) to their own glorification and advantage. This led to negative reactions from Roman and Israelite subjects alike. "Such claims had to lead to protest and to a collision" (Gunneweg & Schmithals 1982:53). Rulers like emperors, kings and local leaders on the national level, employed officials as *retainers* to support their position of privilege and power. These retainers mediated the interests of the rulers on the grassroots level. Among the retainers were officials such as military personnel, tax collectors, priests and scribes (see Stegemann & Stegemann 1995:77-78).

3.4   Early Christianity

The hope of a coming *messiah* escalated in the period between the two testaments. People spoke of the "Son of David", the "Servant of God", the "King", the "Son of Man". The honorific title most used for Jesus is *kyrios.* This word was used in different ways. People of high rank were addressed as *kyrios*, a slave called his or her owner *kyrios*, the military commander, the king and emperor and various gods (e.g. Osiris, Serapis, Hermes) were called *kyrios.* The Greek translation of the Old Testament used *kyrios* in order to avoid God's name. Jesus as *kyrios* in the New Testament has the meaning of ruler. The rule of Jesus is articulated in mythological language. Jesus conquered the enemies (sin and death), took away their power and dominion and became the ruler. By using such language of domination, Jesus' charismatic authority (*auctoritas*) was drawn into the realm of coercive power.

The use of other Christological titles can be explained in a similar way. This process of the elevation of Jesus to a position of power, means power as *potestas.* Power as *potestas* was attributed to Jesus after Easter, and especially in the post-Constantine period (see Crossan 1994). For example, during this period Jesus was often portrayed as *pantokrator* in literature and art. This title was previously only attributed to God (cf Rev 1:8). The "names" of Jesus developed into "titles" when the post-Easter followers of Jesus allocated power to him (see Dreyer 2000:697-722).

4 DEMYSTIFICATION AND AGENCY

Names which became titles are examples of what was referred to earlier as "resources of a symbolic and linguistic nature". The structuration theory of Anthony Giddens shows how these resources function in an ideological way to legitimate unacceptable domination. The development from charismatic authority (the historical Jesus) to institutionalised authority (the early church) is described by Theissen (1999:98) as: "a selective adaptation to the power structures of the world". This could seem to be an innocent natural process if one is not aware of the dangers it holds. In a postmodern hermeneutical process *demystification* exposes these "natural" and "legitimate" values as concealing underlying ideological motives (Adam 1995:5; 11; cf West 1985, 1989; Appiah 1991:360-367). McKerrow (1999:441) puts it as follows: "The critique of domination has an emancipatory purpose – a *telos* toward which it aims in the process of demystifying the conditions of domination" (see Michel Foucault 1972; 1980).

Schüssler Fiorenza (1999:51) describes a "postmodern version of the hermeneutics of suspicion" as follows: "… a hermeneutics of suspicion is best understood as a deconstructive practice of inquiry that denaturalizes and demystifies practices of domination …" Postmodern interpretation is suspicious of hidden ideological interests, both of the biblical texts and of the interpreters. Ideology critics focus on the social, political and economic setting in which biblical texts were produced in order to shed light on the prevalent ideologies and interests (see Schüssler Fiorenza 1985:1-17). According to Schüssler Fiorenza (1999:54), "a critical rhetorical-emancipatory process of interpretation challenges practitioners of biblical studies and readers of the Bible to become more theo-ethically sophisticated readers by problematizing sociopolitical locations and functions in global structures of domination."

This article has shown how authority and power function in society, and illustrated this with an overview of how the concept "authority" developed from a charismatic phase to institutionalisation (*potestas*). Church leadership still has the potential to take over worldly power structures as happened in the world of the Bible. Both church leaders and those who are on the receiving end of leadership should be aware of this danger. Deinstitutionalisation as a postmodern demystifying process can create a context "agents" can recommit church and society to the values of the gospel of Jesus.

Consulted literature

Adam, A K M 1995. *What is postmodern biblical criticism?* Minneapolis, MN: Fortress.

Appiah, K A 1991. Is the "post" in "postmodernism" the "post" in "postcolonial"? *Critical Inquiry* 17:360-367.

Alvis, J 1995. *Divine purpose and heroic response in Homer and Virgil: The political plan of Zeus*. Landover, Md: Rowman & Littlefield.

Berger, P L & Luckmann, T 1975. *The social construction of reality: A treatise in the sociology of knowledge.* Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Blau, P M 1963. Critical remarks on Weber's theory of authority. *American Political Science Review* 57:305-316.

Bonz, M P 2000. *The past as legacy: Luke-Acts and ancient epic*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress.

Bourdieu, P & Wacquant, L 1992. *An invitation to reflexive sociology*. Cambridge: Polity.

Bultmann, R. [1958] 1968. *Theologie des Neuen Testaments.* 6., durchgesehene Auflage. (Neue Theologische Grundrisse)Tübingen: Mohr (Paul Siebeck).

Campbell, R A 1994. *The elders: Seniority within earliest Christianity.* Edinburg: T & T Clark.

Collins, J J 1995. *The scepter and the star: The messiahs of the Dead Sea Scrolls and other ancient literature*. New York, NY: Doubleday.

Crossan, J D 1994. *The essential Jesus: Original sayings and earliest images.* San Francisco, CA: Harper.

Deissmann, A [1927] 1965. *Light from the ancient east.* English translation reprinted. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House.

Dittenberger, W 1960. *Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum*, Volume 2. 4th edition. Hildesheim: Olms.

Dreyer, Y 2000. The institutionalisation of Jesus' charismatic authority: Indirect Christology – direct Christology. *HTS* 56(2&3):697-722.

-, 2002. Women and church leadership from a pastoral perspective of friendship. *HTS* 58(1):43-61.

Eisenstadt, S N 1968. Weber and modern sociology, in: S N Eisenstadt (ed), Weber, M, *On charisma and institution building: Selected papers*. Chicago, Il: University of Chicago Press.

Eschenburg, T 1976. *Über Autorität.* Frankfurt: Suhrkamp.

Foucault, M 1972. *The archeology of knowledge*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.

-, 1980. Power strategies, in: C Gordon (ed), *Power/Knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings 1972-1977*. Translated by C Gordon *et al*. New York, NY: Pantheon Book.

Friedrich, C J 1963. Authority, reason and discretion, in: Friedrich, C J (ed), *Authority*, 27-48 (Nomos 1), Cambridge, MS: Harvard University Press.

Giddens, A 1976. *New rules of sociological method*. London: Hutchinson.

-, 1979. *Central problems in social theory.* London: Macmillan.

-, 1982. *Profiles and critiques in social theory*. London: Macmillan.

-, 1984. *The constitution of society: Outline of the theory of structuration.* Cambridge (UK): Polity Press.

Gowan, D E 1986. *Eschatology in the Old Testament*. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress.

Grenfell, B P, Hunt, A S & Bell, H I (eds) 1898-1927. *The Oxyrhynchus Papiri.* 17 Volumes. London: Egypt Exploration.

Gunneweg, H J & Schmithals, W [1980] 1982. *Authority*. Translated by J E Steely (Biblical Encounters Series). Nashville, TN: Abingdon.

Habermas, J 1984. *The theory of communicative action*, Vol 1. Cambridge:
Polity.

-, 1989. *The theory of communicative action*, Vol 2. Cambridge: Polity.

Harris, M J 1992. *Jesus as God: The New Testament use of "Theos" in reference to Jesus*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House.

Hartmann, H 1964. *Funktionale Autorität: Systematische Abhandlung zu einem soziologischen Begriff.* (Soziologische Gegenwartsfragen, Heft 22). Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.

Hengel, M 1995. "Sit at my right hand!" *Studies in early Christology*, 119-226. Edinburgh: T & T Clark.

Holmberg, B 1978. *Paul and power: The structure of authority in the primitive church as reflected in the Pauline epistles.* Lund: CWK Gleerup.

Horrell, D G 1995. The development of theological ideology in Pauline Christianity: A structuration theory perspective, in: Esler (ed), *Modelling early Christianity, 224-236*. London: Routledge.

-, 1996. *The social ethos of the Corinthian correspondence: Interests and ideology from 1 Corinthians to 1 Clement*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark.

-, [1997] 1999. Leadership patterns and the development of ideology in early Christianity, in: Horrell, D G (ed), *Social-scientific approaches to New Testament interpretation*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark.

Horsley, R A 1995. Social conflict in the synoptic sayings source Q, in: Kloppenborg, J S (ed), *Conflict and invention: Literary, rhetorical and ocial studies on the Sayings Source Q*, 37-52. Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press International.

Kobelski, P 1981. *Melchizedek and Melchiresa.* (CBQMS). Washington DC: Catholic Biblical Association.

Koester, H 1992. Jesus the victim. *Journal of Biblical Literature* 111(1):3-15.

Lemmen, M M W 1990. *Max Weber's sociology of religion: Its method and content in the light of the concept of rationality.* Hilversum: Uitgeverij
Gooi en Sticht.

Lenski G, Nolan, P & Lenski, J [1970] 1995. *Human Societies: An Introduction to Macrosociology*. Seventh Edition. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Luhmann, N 1970. System der Gesellschaft, in: Schelsky, H (Hrsg), *Zur Theorie der Institution*, 27-41. Düsseldorf: Bertelsmann.

MacDonald, D 1979. Virgins, widows, and Paul in second-century Asia Minor, in: Achtemeier, P J (ed), *Society of Biblical Literature 1979 Seminar Papers*, 169-184. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press.

Mack, B L 1993. *The lost gospel Q: The book of Christian origins.* San Francisco, CA: HarperSanFrancisco.

Maier, H O 1991. *The social setting of the ministry as reflected in the writings of Hermas, Clement and Ignatius.* (Canadian Corporation for Studies in Religion). Dissertations SR Vol 1. Ontario: Wilfred Laurier University Press.

McKerrow, R 1999. Contemporary rhetorical theory: A reader, in: Lucaites, J L, Celeste, M C & Sally, C (eds), *Critical rhetoric: Theory and practice*, 441-463. New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Mödritzer, H 1994. *Stigma und Charisma im Neuen Testament und seiner Umwelt: Zur Soziologie des Urchristentums.* (Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus 28). Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Parsons, T 1978. *Action theory and the human condition*. New York: Free Press.

Preuss, H D 1978. *Eschatologie im Alten Testament.* (Wege der Forschung). Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

Schelsky, H 1965a. Ist die Dauerreflexion institutionalisierbar? Zum Thema einer modernen Religionssoziologie, in: Schelsky, H, *Auf dem Suche nach Wirklichkeit: Gesammelte Aufsätze*, 250-275. Düsseldorf: Bertelsmann.

-, 1965b. Über die Stabilität von Institutionen, besondere Verfassungen: Kulturanthropologische Gedanken zu einem rechtssoziologischen Thema, in *Auf der Suche nach Wirklichkeit: Gesammelte Aufsätze*, 33-55. Düsseldorf: Bertelsmann.

-, 1970. Zur soziologischen Theorie der Institution, in: Schelsky, H (Hrsg), *Zur Theorie der Institution*, 9-26. Düsseldorf: Bertelsmann.

Schüssler Fiorenza, E 1985. De-centering Biblical interpretation. *Journal of Biblical Literature* 107:1-17.

-, 1999. *Rhetoric and ethic: The politics of biblical studies.* Minneapolis, MN: Fortress.

Stairs J 2000. *Listening for the soul: Pastoral care and spiritual direction.* Minneapolis, MN: Fortress.

Stegemann, E W & Stegemann, W 1995. *Urchristliche Sozialgeschichte: Die Anfänge im Judentum und die Christusgemeinden in der mediterranen Welt.* Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.

Sternberger, D 1968. Legitimacy. *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences* 9:244-248. New York, NY/London.

Swingewood, A [1984] 2000. *A short history of sociological thought.* Third edition. Hampshire: Palgrave.

Taylor, L R [1931] 1981. *The divinity of the Roman emperor.* Reprinted. Chico, CA: Scholars Press.

Theissen, G 1973. Wanderradikalismus: Literatursoziologische Aspekte der Überlieferung von Worten Jesu im Urchristentum. *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 70:245-271.

-, 1975. Legitimation und Lebensunderhalt: Ein Beitrag zur Soziologie urchristlicher Missionare. *New Testament Studies* 21:192-221.

-, [1979] 1988. *Studien zur Soziologie des Urchristentums.* (WUNT 19). 3. Auflage. Tübingen: Mohr.

-, 1999. *A theory of primitive Christian religion.* Translated by J Bowden. London: SCM.

Thompson, T L 1999. *The Bible in history: How writers create a past.* London: Jonathan Cape.

Van Aarde, A G 1998. Side-notes from Graeco-Roman and Hellenistic-Semitic literature to the notion "adopted as God's child" (υἱοθεσία). *Acta Patristica et Byzantina* 8:150-172.

Weber, M [1947] 1968a. *Max Weber: On charisma and institution building.* Selected papers edited and with an introduction by E N Eisenstadt. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

-, 1968b. *Economy and society: An outline of interpretive sociology*, Volume 1, edited by G Roth & C Wittich. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Weisman, Z 1984. The prophetic pattern of anointing kings in ancient Israel, in: Prince Takahito Mikasa, H I H (ed), *Monarchies and socio-religious traditions in the ancient Near East*, 21-26. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.

West, C 1985. The politics of American neo-pragmatism, in: Rajehman, J & West, C (eds), *Post-analytic philosophy*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.

-, 1989. *The American evasion of philosophy*. Madison, Wis: University of Wisconsin Press.

Winch, P G 1958. Authority. *The Aristotelian Society* 32:225-240. (Supplementum Volume, London).

Wulfing von Martitz, P 1969. s v uiόj, uiοθεsιa. *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, VIII.