



journal of biblical
perspectives
in leadership

TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP AND THE RICH YOUNG RULER: LUKE 18:18–30

Jeff Gossmann M.Div.

Using the socio-rhetorical methods of socio-cultural analysis, the story of the rich young ruler in Luke 18:18–30 yields insights applicable to Transformational leadership theory. The socio-rhetorical method reveals how Luke's Gospel portrays the church as a thaumaturgical utopian community reflecting an inaugurated eschatology. The limited good worldview of Luke's day informs the reader that Jesus gave the ruler an opportunity to repent of his greed. While the limited good worldview is not as pervasive in 21st century North America, modern-day Christians are likewise urged towards generosity to the less fortunate in their communities. Christian leaders should have modest expectations of the results of applying Transformational leadership theory. The eschatological and thaumaturgical nature of the kingdom of God is beyond the scope of Transformational leadership theory. Christian leaders should also be aware of their motives in employing intellectual stimulation. Innovation and creativity should be used to raise economic equality in the community. Unlike Transformational leadership theory, the Gospel is good news for the poor instead of promising individuals and the upwardly mobile.

I. INTRODUCTION

Leaders of Christian organizations have many leadership resources available to help them reach their goals. Transformational leadership theory stands as one of the most popular (Northouse, 2019). However, Christians self-identify as those who follow Jesus Christ, a remarkable leader. Transformational leadership theory needs to be compared to the leadership examples of Jesus found in scripture. The present project will examine the story of the ruler in Luke 18:18–30 using socio-rhetorical criticism's social-cultural analysis, according to Robbins' (1996) influential work. The exegetical

findings from Luke 18 will then be used as a lens to view Transformational leadership theory.

The socio-rhetorical method of social-cultural analysis is vast in its methodological options. The present study will focus on two relevant areas of investigation, religious sect types as described by Wilson (1963) and the limited good worldview as outlined by Malina (1987). Other social topics would be helpful to analyze, such as honor and shame texture, as well as collectivism's presence. However, the present study is limited to religious sect types and limited goods because of their saliency in the given text. The analysis of these two social-cultural perspectives will help readers look past the familiarity of the story of the ruler in Luke 18 to see the issues relevant to Transformational leadership theory.

Analysis of Luke 18:18–30

Social scientist Wilson (1963) proposed seven views of salvation (sect types) among religious groups. He listed conversionist, revolutionist, introversionist, gnostic-manipulationist, thaumaturgical, reformist, and utopian (Wilson, 1963). The Conversionist believes that the world is corrupt, and the only solution and salvation is in the personal conversion of as many individuals as possible (Wilson, 1959). Revolutionists believe the only solution to the world's ill is destruction by God and rebuilding it a new (Wilson, 1959). Adherents to this belief see their role as witnesses to the corrupt world of its impending destruction and subsequent renewing. Introversionists maintain that only a complete withdraw from the evil world to create a purer community can save oneself (Wilson, 1959). Gnostic-manipulationists hold that salvation can come to the corrupt world and its systems if they have the right information, knowledge, and the right ways of doing things (Wilson, 1959).

Thaumaturgicalists believe that salvation is a miraculous divine intervention amidst individual problems and ailments, including life after death. The attention of thaumaturgicalists is on immediate problems rather than concern for the larger society (Wilson, 1963). The reformists see the corruption of the world as a result of broken social structures. The reformists believe that God can reveal solutions to correct the social structures and thus bring salvation to the world (Wilson, 1963). The last sect type, utopian, is guided by the belief that humans can reconstruct a new society that eliminates evil. The utopian view is more active than introversion, and does not require divine destruction like the revolutionist, nor does it try to fix the current model as the reformist does. It seeks to remake the entire social world using divinely guided principles (Robbins, 1996).

Luke 18:18–30 uses soteriological concepts to advance the story. The ruler asked Jesus how he could inherit eternal life, and Jesus answered by mentioning the kingdom of God and the age to come (Luke 18:18, 25). The text begs questions about the ruler's understanding of eternal life. What is the kingdom of God, according to Jesus? How does one enter it, and what is the age to come? Did Jesus and the ruler have the same view of salvation? One must examine the greater context of the Gospel of Luke to determine what kind of soteriological conceptions are at play here.

The Kingdom of God

Jesus' ministry in the Gospel of Luke was fundamentally thaumaturgical. This thaumaturgical ministry was evidence of the nearness of the kingdom of God (Luke 11:20). In Jesus' miracle ministry, the God of Israel was present to help his people, especially the poor, the afflicted, the marginalized, and sinners (Marshall, 1994). Luke recorded twenty miracles, while Matthew reported only nineteen and Mark eighteen (Green, 1997). The three synoptic Gospels share seventeen healing miracles (including three resuscitations), six exorcisms, and eight miracles over nature (Green, 1997). His thaumaturgical ministry, witnessed in all the Gospels, brought relief to many local and personal problems for the poor and afflicted (Wilson, 1963). The miracles served as signs of the arrival of God's kingdom (Luke 10:9).

Jesus frequently taught about the kingdom of God, and because the term was ambiguous, he was often misunderstood (Luke 17:20–21; 19:11). The Judaism of Jesus' day had many different notions of what the kingdom of God would look like (Allison, 2010). A renewing of a Davidic political kingdom to overthrow Roman oppression was a widespread view during his days (Green, 2013). Jesus' own twelve seemed to hold to this misunderstanding even up to his ascension (Acts 1:6). It was not until the outpouring of the Spirit that they realized Jesus had been enthroned in heaven as Lord and Messiah (Acts 2:36), and therefore people everywhere should repent of sin and receive the gift of the Spirit (Acts 2:37). After this event, Luke narrated what salvation looked like in Acts 2:42–47. Those who were "being saved" (Acts 2:47) were the ones who repented and joined the new community centered around faith in Jesus as the Messiah. In Luke and Acts, the church was the renewed Israel, expanded to include Gentile believers (Campbell, 1997). They fellowshiped, shared possessions, broke bread, and worshiped together regularly. This image in Acts was a picture of an inaugurated eschatology (Ladd, 1978). The kingdom of God had broken into the affairs of everyday life.

In Luke and Acts, the kingdom of God is a thaumaturgical utopian society, not separate, but overlapping the broken community around them. It is thaumaturgical in that it brings miraculous divine intervention to individual problems and ailments (Wilson, 1963). The healing miracles that continue in Acts demonstrate value for divine intervention in the community. It is utopian in the sense that it is a new society centered on the Lordship of Jesus, which is ideally free of evil through repentance. The kingdom of God is a new community built on divinely guided principles (Robbins, 1996). This thaumaturgical utopian society does not seek to replace the secular world around itself, but it overlaps it.

Salvation, according to Luke, meant repentance with faith, and inclusion into the utopian community of God's people (Wilson, 1963). The image of Acts 2:42–47 is a fulfillment of Jesus' promise to the disciples in Luke 18:29–30. They had received many times as much because they had entered into the new community and gained a new family. The emphasis was on experiencing salvation in this life in the thaumaturgical utopian kingdom of God. Salvation was concurrent with inclusion in this new community (Acts 2:41, 47; 5:14). Entrance into this community required faith and repentance, and its benefits included forgiveness of sin and eternal life (Luke 18:30; Acts 3:19).

Eternal Life

The kingdom of God and eternal life are two separate concepts in Luke. The ruler did not ask Jesus how to enter the kingdom of God in this life, but how to inherit eternal life (Luke 18:18). He was not interested in changing his current lifestyle, but only gaining assurance of life after death. Jesus distinguished the two when he said, "in this age [you will receive back what you gave up] and in the age to come eternal life" (Luke 18:30). Based on the parable of the rich man and Lazarus (Luke 16:19–31), eternal life seemed to mean a positive experience in life after death. As stated before, the kingdom of God refers to a thaumaturgical utopian society in the present life.

However, the kingdom of God was not limited to this life. There would still be a greater manifestation of this kingdom in the age to come (Luke 21:25–31; Acts 3:19–21). The phrase "in the age to come" (Luke 18:30), was a reference to an apocalyptic worldview (Aune, 1993). Apocalypticism was an eschatological worldview wildly popular in Palestine in the 1st century (Crawford, 2000). In an apocalyptic perspective, the present age is corrupt, and at a certain point, God will overthrow the evil powers ruling this age and begin a new one characterized by the reign of God (Aune, 1993). At the beginning of the coming age, the righteous would be resurrected to enjoy eternal life (Dan 12:1–2). There was no concept of eternal life apart from a future resurrection in the 2nd temple Jewish theology (Van Voorst, 2000). Wilson (1963) considers this perspective belonging to a Revolutionary sect type. Revolutionists believe the only solution to the world's ill is destruction by God and rebuilding it a new (Wilson, 1959). Adherents to this belief see their role as witnesses to the corrupt world of its impending destruction and subsequent renewing. Luke's portrayal of God's kingdom included both apocalyptic and Revolutionary features (Luke 21:25–31; Acts 3:19–21). The kingdom of God inaugurated by Jesus' heavenly enthronement began an overlapping of the coming age with this present evil age ("Last Things," *Evangelical Dictionary of Theology*). Luke's view is, therefore, thaumaturgical, utopian, and ultimately revolutionary.

The ruler most likely understood the kingdom of God as political as the disciples did (Luke 1:33; 17:20–21; Acts 1:6). It is doubtful that he had any concept of a thaumaturgical utopian kingdom of God. The ruler knew enough Jewish theology to believe in eternal life and therefore, an apocalyptic resurrection of the dead (Van Voorst, 2000). Thus, the ruler had a revolutionary view of salvation, and he asked Jesus how he could be on the winning side of the future resurrection. He wanted assurance of life after death. It was a reasonable question for a religious teacher from a potential follower.

II. LIMITED GOOD WORLDVIEW

If the ruler's question was not unreasonable, a reader must ask why Jesus seemed to be so rude to him. The economic standing of the ruler colors the entire text. Some significant economic distance exists between 1st century Palestine and 21st century North America. The current readers need to examine what it meant to be a rich person in the ruler's culture.

Palestine's economic system in the 1st century was primarily agrarian and similar to the rest of the rural Mediterranean world, with large estates run by powerful families with contracted laborers (Malina, 1987). Many of the non-elites were practically peasants and therefore lived with assumptions of what anthropologists call limited good (Foster,

1965). For peasants, with the limited good worldview, all desirable things in life were considered finite and in short supply. All desirable goods, money, honor, friendship, and even health were assumed to be similar to the finitude of land, which can only be divided among the inhabitants. One only improved their life situation at the expense of someone else (Foster, 1965). This worldview produced a natural distrust for wealthy members of society. Because the rich could only have an abundance if the poor were despoiled, wealthy people were considered inherently wicked. The culture assumed the rich became wealthy only through depriving, defrauding, and eliminating others (Malina, 1987).

Limited Good in Luke

The limited good worldview colors the pages of the Gospel of Luke. Jesus was from a peasant family (Luke 2:24; cf. Lev. 12:8) and experienced a limited good childhood (Green, 2013). His peasant experience does not indicate his endorsement of the limited good worldview; however, it shows his familiarity with the frustration of lack. Because opportunities were fewer in 1st century Palestine, limited good was the experienced reality. This reality influenced which sins were condemned the most. It influenced who received the call to repentance. In Luke the rich are cast in a negative light frequently while the poor receive salvation (Luke 1:51–53; 3:7–14; 4:18; 6:20–26; 11:39–41; 12:13–19, 33–34; 14:18–23; 15:11–32; 16:1–13, 19–31; 17:26–29; 18:18–30; 19:1–10, 11–27). According to Luke 16:13, the love of money and possessions stands as the chief competitor to God's kingdom (Green, 1997). If the message of God's kingdom was good news to the poor, then it was a message of woe to the rich (Luke 6:20–26).

The kingdom of God was bad news for the rich because it signaled an imminent redistribution of wealth. This redistribution came through almsgiving and generosity caused by repentance (Luke 11:41; 12:32–34). As stated above, Luke demonstrates in Acts 2:42–47 the sharing of possessions (redistribution) as a significant characteristic of God's kingdom. Generosity to the poor was synonymous with repentance for a rich person because of the limited good worldview of 1st century Palestine. The poor were destitute and remained so because of the greed and avarice of the wealthy (Malina, 1987). Thus, the ruler could have followed the commandments from his youth and still lack one thing: he was inherently wicked because he was rich at other people's expense (Malina, 1987). True repentance for the ruler of Luke 18:18 was not to convert to any new understanding of theology but to follow through with his current religious commitment (Green, 2013). He lived in a context that was bound by limited goods, and he had not shared enough. His context determined that true repentance meant generosity to the poor.

Jesus' Response to the Ruler

The ruler approached Jesus using financial language as if he were looking to add eternal life to his current investments. Jesus answered his question using economic terms. It would cost him everything he had. The ruler determined that the price was too high. Jesus' interaction with the ruler was a fulfillment of Mary's song that set the theme

for Luke's Gospel, "He has filled the hungry with good things but has sent the rich away empty" (1:53).

The transactional nature of their conversation begs the question of what Jesus was offering the ruler. If the ruler had sold everything and given to the poor, would that have meant that he bought salvation with money? The limited goods worldview can explain why not. Jesus was not offering eternal life for sale. He was allowing the ruler to repent of his greed, and without repentance (and faith), there is no salvation (Luke 13:5; 24:47).

Limited Good in North America

The direct application of this scripture to 21st-century middle-class Americans requires a comparison between the times (Duvall & Hays, 2012). The differences between modern times and the 1st century are many. Americans are not God's people as a political entity. There is more religious plurality in North America than in 1st century Palestine. Contrary to a limited good worldview, fifty-one percent of Americans believe there are no limits to economic growth (Partisan Polarization Surges in Bush, Obama Years, 2012, June 4). Many believe technological advances have overcome any limitations to economic growth.

However, there are some similarities worth noting. There is still a significant worldview disparity between low-income households (those making less than \$45,500) compared with those making greater than \$45,000 (Fry & Kochhar, 2018). Fifty-eight percent of low-income families believe the poor are poor because of circumstances beyond their control, and 43% of the middle-class think it is because of a lack of effort. In contrast, 12% of the middle class believes it is both (Partisan Polarization Surges in Bush, Obama Years, 2012, June 4). Thus, certain features of the limited good worldview are still embraced by the majority of lower-income American households. Even though the limited good sentiment continues in America, it does not look like ancient Palestinian limited good. Eighty-eight percent of Americans agreed that they admired people who became wealthy through hard work (Partisan Polarization Surges in Bush, Obama Years, 2012, June 4). The underlying assumption is that people could dramatically improve their economic status through hard work without being considered inherently evil.

What are the implications for today since the American economy is more dynamic than 1st century Palestine? Is it still hard for a rich person to enter the kingdom of God? According to the studies above, God's kingdom manifests itself in the new community of God's people. To join this community, one must believe in Jesus and repent of their sins. In Luke's culture, repentance often meant doing one's part to undo the inequitable access to resources. Repentance meant sharing and giving to the poor (Luke 11:41). It was difficult for the rich to enter the kingdom because it meant financial sacrifice for them. They were king of the hill already, why would they want to change the social order of things by bringing in a new kingdom? Especially a kingdom where they became equals with people who were of lower status than themselves. The kingdom of God meant exaltation for the poor, while it meant humiliation for the rich (Luke 6:20-26). The principle does not change for 21st century America.

However, Jesus left a back door open. After Jesus remarked how difficult it is for the rich to enter the kingdom of God, he said, "what is impossible with man is possible with God" (18:27). How should one interpret this cryptic statement? Was Jesus implying that God can save rich people even though they cannot bring themselves to financial repentance, or was he saying that God can persuade rich people to repent even with the prospect of economic and social humiliation? Given the thaumaturgical nature of salvation in Luke's Gospel, it is most likely that Jesus meant the latter. God can bring the rich to repentance. Luke's charismatic theology has been well noted (Stronstad, 1984). The outpouring of the Spirit in Acts caused many signs and wonders that resulted in the sharing of possessions (Acts 2:42–47; 4:32–37). What was impossible for men (rich people to repent of inequalities), was possible with God because God would do the impossible (signs and wonders) to move the rich to repentance. The principle is likewise applicable to wealthy 21st century Americans. God can bring them to repentance, so they also share with the needy in the church as equals in God's kingdom.

Summary

Therefore, the bottom line for the passage is that the ruler failed to follow through with his Jewish convictions and failed to repent of his greed. He had an apocalyptic/revolutionary view of salvation. He believed in the future resurrection of the dead, and he wanted to partake in it. He wanted to inherit eternal life. Jesus was interested in more than merely a positive experience after death; he was interested in bringing a thaumaturgical utopian kingdom to fruition before the coming age. For the ruler to partake in this kingdom, he would have to repent of his greed, by divesting himself of his riches and sharing them with the poor. This true repentance would be an expression of authentic saving faith. Jesus declared that while it may be impossible for rich people to repent of their high status on their own since it would mean humiliation, God could bring them to repentance.

The passage is relevant for 21st century Americans of all classes. The thaumaturgical utopian kingdom is supposed to be alive and active in the churches of America. Rich Americans are not wealthy because they deprived, defrauded, or eliminated others by default (Malina, 1987). There are opportunities to become rich in America through ingenuity, industriousness, and sound investing practices. However, not everyone in America possesses the same opportunities for economic movement. Within the church, the rich are still to humble themselves by being generous with the community members of the people of God and sharing (1Tim. 6:17–19). Those who are willing to enter the kingdom of God, both rich and poor alike, reap the benefits of the community, and in the age to come will receive eternal life.

III. TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP

According to Transformational leadership theory, the best leaders function with four characteristics. Idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration are the behaviors that separate transformational leaders from other leadership styles (Avolio & Bass, 2001). These four characteristics

are contrasted with Transactional Leadership, which makes use of contingent reward, management-by-exception, and sometimes, *laissez-faire* (Avolio & Bass, 2001). Transactional leadership focuses on the exchange between a leader and their followers. The leader rewards followers for their fulfillment of agreed-upon expectations (Northouse, 2019). Management-by-exception refers to a leader taking note of deviances from standards and mistakes a follower makes (Avolio & Bass, 2001). This type of management can be active or passive. Passive management only intervenes after a major mistake has been made, while an active manager looks for poor performance frequently (Avolio & Bass, 2001). On the other hand, Transformational Leadership elevates the morale of the followers. It can inspire followers to move beyond their self-interests and act on behalf of the good of the organization or group's interests.

The salient features of Transformational leadership are as follows. Idealized influence speaks of the leader's ideal qualities that make them role models for their followers (Kouzes & Posner, 2017). They consider others' needs above their own and avoid using their power for personal gain (Avolio & Bass, 2001). Inspirational motivation refers to transformational leaders' ability to inspire their followers to achieve more than they would be working for their self-interest alone (Northouse, 2019). Transformational leaders help their followers envision a future where their desires are fulfilled with the organization's (Kouzes & Posner, 2017). The transformational leader provides meaning for the work of their followers (Avolio & Bass, 2001). Intellectual stimulation speaks of how transformational leaders stimulate innovation, creativity, and new solutions to old problems (Avolio & Bass, 2001). They continually look for ways to improve and include their followers in the problem-solving process (Kouzes & Posner, 2017). Intellectual stimulation increases productivity. Individualized consideration refers to the personalized attention a transformational leader gives to the followers they are developing (Northouse, 2019). The leader creates opportunities for individual growth and provides coaching and mentorship to their followers (Avolio & Bass, 2001).

Discussion

As described above, the Gospel of Luke presents the kingdom of God as an inaugurated eschatology ("Last Things," Evangelical Dictionary of Theology). Since the heavenly enthronement of Jesus, the future reign of God has overlapped the current evil age. Within the apocalyptic worldview of 1st century Palestine, the end of the age is still yet to come (Kreitzer, 1997), and with it will come the resurrection of the dead and eternal life (Daniel 12:1–3). The ministry of Jesus inaugurated the kingdom of God, and it continued through the outpouring of the Spirit in Acts 2. The thaumaturgical view of salvation came with a utopian vision of the people of God as a visible manifestation of God's kingdom. This new community was centered around the Lordship of Jesus Christ. It included many divinely inspired religious practices, the most relevant of which to this discussion, is the sharing of possessions (Acts 2:42–47).

Viewed in terms of Transformational leadership theory, Luke's vision for the kingdom of God is beyond human leadership's scope. Even the most exemplary transformational leader could not produce miracles or inaugurate an eschatological future. The ministry of Jesus Christ is not congruent with the categories of

Transformational leadership theory because the vision for his church necessitates divine presence and activity for it to be accomplished.

However, if the necessity for divine activity was suspended for the sake of meaningful analysis, one can find relevant principles between Luke 18:18–30 and Transformational Leadership theory. If Jesus' vision was to prepare the disciples for the kingdom of God that would come with the outpouring of the Spirit in Acts 2, then the story of the ruler in Luke 18 was a depiction of a failure of idealized influence to produce a disciple. Jesus Christ is the most magnanimous leader in history. He gave his life for the salvation of the world (Mark 10:45) and inspired his followers to imitate him (John 15:13). While his crucifixion had not happened yet in Luke 18, he still had a famous thaumaturgical ministry (Luke 6:18). He was the ultimate idealized influence. However, his influence was not enough to convince the ruler of Luke 18 to look beyond his self-interest.

The ruler wanted to add eternal life to his investment portfolio. Jesus wanted to inaugurate the kingdom of God, which included a redistribution of wealth by the repentance of greedy rich people. The ruler could not share this vision or see his benefit from it. Perhaps the theory of idealized influence is incomplete. No matter how compelling the vision or ideal the influence, some people will not follow. These non-followers require divine intervention to get them to follow (Luke 18:27). Transformational leaders may do their best, but only God can change some.

On the other hand, the disciples already following Jesus had bought into the vision and influence of Jesus. They had left everything to follow him (v. 28) as an extreme example of inspirational motivation. In this case, the shared vision of God's kingdom overlapped the promise of their contingent reward (vs. 29–30). Therefore, some elements of transactional leadership are at play in the kingdom of God.

Limited Good and Transformational Leadership

The ancient worldview of limited good was ubiquitous in the peasant class of 1st century Palestine (Malina, 1987). Due to the region's agrarian economic potential, the limited goods view was the real experience of most of the population (Oakman, 2018). The charge against the rich in that context was that they were greedy and wicked, storing up an abundance by depriving others who had nothing because of the surplus of the rich (Malina, 1987). The rich ruler in Luke 18 wanted to know how to inherit eternal life, but Jesus offered him an opportunity to repent of his wicked greed instead (Luke 18:22). The offer of eternal life was contingent upon his repentance.

In Luke 18, the character most resembling intellectual stimulation is the ruler. He was looking for creative and innovative ways to increase his wealth. Intellectual stimulation is a post-industrial world issue that assumes unlimited goods and growth (Oakman, 2018). Jesus and the disciples were not looking for new ways to solve old problems. They were looking for the right way to solve problems. The inequitable distribution of wealth was a problem for the majority. In their case, seeking a creative solution to increase productivity so more wealth could go around would be suspicious. The ethical solution was for the rich to repent of their greedy hoarding and share their wealth with the less fortunate. Thus, the story of the ruler in Luke 18 questions the motives behind the theory of intellectual stimulation. The kingdom of God values

integrity and righteousness over innovation and increased productivity. Intellectual stimulation is proper but must be motivated by justice and generosity.

Caution For North American Church Leaders

In light of the above research, it would benefit Christian leaders in North America to embrace Transformational leadership only with sober reflection. According to this research, the church is supposed to reflect the presence of God's thaumaturgical utopian kingdom, overlapping the current evil age (Ladd, 1978). The thinking Christian leader should consider how much of Transformational leadership theory is merely an ornament of the present age rather than a quality example to follow. There certainly are congruences between the interests of the kingdom of God and Transformational leadership. Idealized influence and inspirational motivation could be shared values between the two. If Jesus was not able to inspire the ruler based on his charisma, signs, and wonders, he pointed to God as being able to inspire rich people to repent and humble themselves (Luke 18:27). In this case, God has characteristics similar to idealized influence.

Likewise, the process of discipleship shares similarities with individualized consideration. A disciple is trained to be like their teacher (Luke 6:40). Jesus offered the ruler an opportunity to become a follower (Luke 18:22), which was not provided to everyone (Luke 9:57–62; 14:25–33). However, unlike individualized consideration, Jesus was not willing to overlook the ruler's greed and selfishness. By North American leadership standards, the ruler had good qualities. He was confident, religious, well resourced, and already in a civil leadership role (Northouse, 2019). He was full of potential, but Jesus let him self-disqualify. North American Christian leaders would do well to follow Jesus' example in allowing promising individuals to repent of besetting sins before appointing them to highly visible roles in church leadership.

Conclusion

Transformational leadership theory is useful for Christian leaders in North America today. However, the Christian leader must take measures to seriously reflect on which aspects of Transformational leadership theory are congruent with God's kingdom's values. In light of the above studies, a Christian leader should proceed with the following questions before implementing Transformational leadership theory. 1. Can the reader's Christian organization accomplish its goals without divine presence and activity? If the answer is yes, then perhaps the organization is due for a realignment of its mission towards the same as Jesus Christ's thaumaturgical utopian kingdom that overlaps the current evil age. 2. Does the reader's Christian organization desire to use intellectual stimulation to improve the lives of all within the organization, or only for a few elites? If innovation and creativity do not produce a higher level of equality, then greed might motivate increased productivity. 3. Does the reader's Christian organization give rich and powerful people opportunities to repent before installing them into leadership? If not, the organization is, perhaps, not in alignment with the kingdom Jesus came to establish. Instead, the organization might merely reflect the values of the present evil

age in promoting only the rich, talented, and attractive rather than proclaiming good news to the poor.

The next steps to continue this research would include 1. Analyze the social-cultural texture of collectivism in the Luke 18 text. A collectivist analyzation could yield some helpful insights to refine individualized consideration. Perhaps the ruler was more individualistic than the collectivistic kingdom Jesus intended to inaugurate. 2. Explore the challenge-response social-cultural texture of Luke 18. Such an analysis could speak to the appropriateness of a Christian application of management by exception. Perhaps Jesus' rebuke of the ruler could inform the way leaders conduct performance reviews.

About the Author

Jeff Gossmann (M.Div.) is a student in the Doctor of Strategic Leadership program at Regent University's School of Business and Leadership, class of 2023. He was awarded Faculty Member of the Year in 2015–2016 at Wave Leadership College for teaching Introduction to New Testament, Old Testament, and Biblical Hermeneutics as an adjunct faculty member. Jeff and his wife have four children. He is also the Assistant Pastor at New Life Church Deep Creek in Chesapeake, Virginia.
Email: jeff@newlife.global

IV. REFERENCES

- Allison, D. C. (2010). "Kingdom of God," in *Eerdmans Dictionary of Early Judaism*. p. 860. Eerdmans.
- Aune, D. E. (1993). "Apocalypticism" in *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters*. p. 27. Intervarsity Press.
- Avolio, B. J., & Bass, B. M. (2001). *Developing potential across a full range of leadership: Cases on transactional and transformational leadership*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Campbell, W. S. (1997). "Church as Israel, People of God," in *Dictionary of Later New Testament Developments*. p. 210. Intervarsity Press.
- Crawford, S. W. (2000). "Apocalyptic" in *Eerdmans dictionary of the bible*. p. 72. Eerdmans.
- Duvall, J. S., & Hays, J. D. (2012). *Grasping God's word: A hands-on approach to reading, interpreting, and applying the bible*. Zondervan.
- Foster, G. M. (1965). Peasant society and the image of limited good. *American Anthropologist*, 67(2), 293-315. doi:10.1525/aa.1965.67.2.02a00010
- Fry, R. & Kochhar, R. (2018, September 6). Are you in the American middle class? Pew Research. Retrieved from <https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2018/09/06/are-you-in-the-american-middle-class/>
- Green, J. B. (1997). *The gospel of Luke*. New International Commentary on the New Testament. p. 24. Eerdmans.
- Green, J. B. (2013). "Kingdom of God/Heaven," in *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels*. p. 470. Intervarsity Press.

- Green, J. B. (2013). "Luke, gospel of," in *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels*. p. 548. Intervarsity Press.
- Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2017). *The Leadership challenge: How to make extraordinary things happen in organizations*. John Wiley & Sons, Incorporated.
- Kreitzer, L. J. (1997). "Apocalyptic, apocalypticism," in *Dictionary of the Later New Testament and its Developments*. p. 61. Intervarsity Press.
- Ladd, G. E. (1978). *The last things: An eschatology for laymen*. Eerdmans.
- "Last Things," in *Evangelical Dictionary of Theology*. p. 479. Baker Publishing.
- Malina, B. J. (1987). Wealth and poverty in the new testament and its world. *Interpretation*, 41(4), 354–367.
- Marshall, I. H. (1994). *Luke*. ed. D. A Carson et al., New Bible Commentary: 21st Century Edition. p. 977. InterVarsity Press
- Northouse, P. G. (2019). *Leadership: Theory and practice* (8th ed.). Sage Publications.
- Oakman, D. (2018). The biblical world of limited good in social cultural and technological perspective. In *Biblical Theology Bulletin*. 48, 2, pp.97-105. DOI: 10.1177/0146107918763048
- Osborne, G. R. (2013). "Life, eternal life," in *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels*, p. 520. Intervarsity Press.
- Partisan Polarization Surges in Bush, Obama Years. (2012, June 4). Pew Research. Retrieved from <https://www.people-press.org/2012/06/04/section-3-values-about-economic-inequality-and-individual-opportunity/>
- Robbins, V. K. (1996). *Exploring the texture of texts: A guide to socio-rhetorical interpretations*. Trinity Press International.
- Stronstad, R. (1984). *The charismatic theology of st. Luke*. pp. 89-98. Hendrickson.
- Van Voorst, R. E. (2000). "Eternal life," in *Eerdmans Dictionary of the Bible*. p. 430. Eerdmans.
- Wilson, B. R. (1959). An analysis of sect development. *American Sociological Review*, 24(1), 3-15. doi:10.2307/2089577
- Wilson, B. R. (1963). Typologie des sectes dans une perspective dynamique et comparative. *Archives De Sociologie Des Religions*, 8(16), 49-63.