

**EXPLORING JESUS' SOCIAL INTERACTIONS IN MARK'S GOSPEL FOR GOOD  
LEADERSHIP PRACTICE IN GHANA**

by

**JOHN KWESI ADDO JNR**

Submitted in accordance with the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

in the subject

NEW TESTAMENT STUDIES

at the

UNIVERSITY OF PRETORIA, SOUTH AFRICA

**SUPERVISOR: DOCTOR ZORODZAI DUBE**

APRIL 2019

## SUMMARY

This study explored Jesus' social interactions in Mark's Gospel for good leadership practice in Ghana. It employed Ghanaian traditional models of leadership, which hold that leadership is interaction. Jesus is situated in his macro socio-cultural context in the study, and his leadership model is re-described using social interactionism as an entry point. The study thus analysed how leadership is conveyed through interaction by observing Jesus' interaction as performed in Mark's Gospel. Social interactionism analytical tools from Goffman and Mead made it plausible to re-imagine and observe Jesus. Tools like Ritual making, Frame making, Characterisation, Encounter processing, Stage making and Role-taking informed by Ghanaian traditional notion of leadership were used to analyse the four selected passages (Mark 6:30-44; 7:1-23; 7:24-30; 10:35-45). The analysis addressed and affirmed both the main hypothesis that 'if leadership is interaction, how did Jesus interact?' And the subsidiary hypothesis that 'if Jesus' social interactions convey leadership principles, how do the underlying nuances in his social interaction contribute to leadership understanding?'

The study consists of six chapters. Chapter one is the introduction, which sets out the study and reviews literature on Jesus' leadership. It notes two gaps. First, a gap in the knowledge about the social interaction of Jesus, which could be drawn towards understanding his leadership principles. Second, a gap in filtering Jesus' leadership through the Akan cultural lens for relevant leadership practises for the African context. With these in mind, the Ghanaian (African) traditional notion of leadership and African leadership challenges were discussed. Chapter two delineates the social interactionism as the theoretical perspective for the study. Six analytical tools, stated earlier, were delineated from Goffman's Interactional Order and Presentation of Self, and Mead's Mind, Self and Society to re-imagine Jesus in the Gospel of Mark. Chapter three deals with the historical, literary and the socio-cultural settings of Mark.

It establishes Jesus in his macro socio-cultural context. Chapter four analyses the four selected passages through the analytical tools of social interactionalism informed by Ghanaian (African) traditional notion of leadership. Chapter five outlines the leadership principles gleaned from interactions in the four passages as analysed in the previous chapter. Chapter six, focuses on the implication of the Jesus-performed leadership principles on leadership in Ghana (Africa).

The study establishes that the reception of Jesus as the Son of God and Son of man are not mere Christological titles but more significantly, leadership categories. From the Ghanaian traditional notions of leadership, the study finds Jesus as reflecting the distinguished leadership categories of '*nyimpa*' and '*opanyin*'. In addition, over 104 Jesus-performed Interactional leadership principles gleaned from his interactions form the foundation for his Social Interactional Leadership model. These principles challenge the leadership being practiced in Ghana today. The study concludes that Jesus consciously fashioned his interactions to achieve his vision and mission and modelled his leadership to his associates (disciples), followers (crowd) and even his opponents. The study postulates that these principles when applied to Ghanaian (African) leadership will result in social transformation, and leaders will become reformers and builders.

**DECLARATION**

Name: John Kwesi Addo Jnr  
Student number: 16363508  
Degree: Doctor of Philosophy in New Testament Studies (06265032)  
Title: **Exploring Jesus’ Social interactions in Mark’s Gospel for Good Leadership Practice in Ghana**

I declare that the above thesis is my own work, and that all the sources that I have used or quoted have been indicated and duly acknowledged by means of complete references.

**SIGNATURE**



.....

**DATE**

**30<sup>th</sup> April, 2019**

.....

## **KEY TERMS**

Ghanaian traditional notion of leadership, Good Leadership, Impression, Jesus Christ, Leadership, Leadership orientation, Self-Giving, Self-Renunciation, Service, Social Interaction

## **DEDICATION**

This Work is dedicated to:

The Glory of God;

To the loving memory of my late mother, Maa Rebecca Entsie

And to my Father in the Lord, Rt. Dr. Kwaku Assamoah Okyere

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Coming to an end of this long and absorbing journey is a humbling experience which helps me to appreciate better how valuable we are as individuals to each other. I look back with deference for the willingness and effort of many friends and fathers who helped me through the studies. I have enjoyed the support, encouragement and contributions of many to bring me thus far. It comes to me naturally to want to acknowledge the invaluable assistance I have received.

Without the Most High God I would not have had the health, resources, strength and presence of mind to see the completion of this project. I am very grateful to God, who has given me, even me, the opportunity to complete this work successfully.

I am eternally grateful to the Methodist Church Ghana and the Presiding Bishops: Most Rev, Titus Awortwi-Pratt and the Most Rev. Dr. Paul K. Boafo for giving me opportunity to study and for paying part of my fees.

Dr. Zorodzai Dube, my supervisor and mentor, to him I say thank you for the directions, assistance and helpful criticisms. You were more than a supervisor; you took personal interest in my work and encouraged me to continue in the midst of my doubts and fears.

I cannot forget the overwhelming hospitality offered by Mr. Osei Agyeman Badu and the wife Mrs Abena Agyeman Badu. Reminiscence of Mrs Agyeman Badu's visit to my residence every Sunday when I was in Pretoria, South Africa with varieties of cooked food.

I acknowledge my Fathers and Sister in the Lord, Nana Owusu Boahene, Mr. K. K. Amoah Esq. and Miss. Mawusi Dzirasa who virtually sponsored all my trips to South Africa. I remember also the contributions of Mr. Stephen Akouko Snr, Nana Kofi Nti, Miss Nana Akua Aboagye Agyei, Prof. Dan and Mrs Golda Ofori, Miss Baaba Assan and Miss Sylvia Assan. To all I say thank you.

I am very much grateful to the editorial team: Prof. Emmanuel & Dr. Mrs Theresa Adu, you were God sent at a time I needed the technical eye to go through my work; you were there for me. It was amazing how you owned my work and spent sleepless nights just to help me submit. I am forever grateful.

I must express my thanks to Miss Christa Arhin-Andoh for her painstaking attention to details in proofreading my project.

I cannot forget the Superintendent Minister, the Society Stewards and entire congregation of St. John Methodist Church and the New Achimota Circuit for your understanding and support as I toiled away at this project. You all had to endure my absence because of my yearly travels to South Africa yet none complained. I am grateful to you.

And my sweet wife, Susanna, without whose love, patience, encouragement and prayers this thesis would not have been possible, I love you and appreciate your support.

Lastly, I will like to say thank you to my three great boys: Papa, Nana Ekow and Jojo. You had to endure my absence which emotionally was stressful for you.

Thank you all who have supported me this far.

## Table of Content

### Table of Contents

SUMMARY-----	I
DECLARATION-----	III
KEY TERMS-----	IV
DEDICATION-----	V
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT-----	VI
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS-----	XIV
CHAPTER ONE-----	1
INTRODUCTION-----	1
1.    CONTEXT OF THE STUDY-----	1
1.1    PROBLEM STATEMENT-----	5
1.2    PURPOSE OF THE STUDY-----	7
1.3    HYPOTHESIS-----	7
1.4    RESEARCH QUESTION-----	8
1.5    DEFINITION OF TERMS-----	8
1.5.1    Leadership-----	8
1.5.2    Good Leadership-----	9
1.5.3    Social Interaction-----	10
1.6    SOCIAL INTERACTIONISM PERSPECTIVE-----	10
1.6.1    How Social Interactionism will be Applied to the Markan Narratives-----	14
1.7    HOW THE PASSAGES WILL BE OBSERVED OR ANALYSED-----	17
1.8    JESUS' LEADERSHIP AS UNDERSTOOD-----	17
1.8.1    John C. Hutchison: Servant-Leadership-----	18
1.8.2    Randall Collins: Jesus as a Charismatic Leader-----	20
1.8.3    Max Weber: Jesus as Charismatic leader-----	23
1.8.4    Malina: Jesus as Reputational Leader-----	28
1.8.5    Gager: Jesus an Interactionist Charismatic Leader-----	30
1.9    AFRICAN LEADERSHIP PARADIGM OR NOTION-----	31
1.9.1    Africa's Leadership Challenges Today-----	35
1.10    GHANAIAAN TRADITIONAL NOTION OF LEADERSHIP-----	39
1.11    SUMMARY-----	45
CHAPTER TWO-----	46
THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVE: SOCIAL INTERACTIONISM-----	46
2.    INTRODUCTION-----	46
2.1    DEVELOPMENT AND HISTORY OF SOCIAL INTERACTIONISM-----	48
2.2    NOTIONS OF SOCIAL INTERACTIONISM-----	52
2.2.1    Erving Goffman's Social Interactional Analytical Perspective-----	52
2.2.1.1    Ritual Making (Social Ritualization)-----	54
2.2.1.2    People Processing Encounters-----	56
2.2.1.3    Characterisation-----	58
2.2.1.4    Frame Making-----	59
2.2.1.5    Stage Making (Dramaturgy)-----	60
2.2.2    George Herbert Mead's Role-Taking (Self-Interaction)-----	74

2.3	SUMMARY OF THE MAIN TENETS OF SOCIAL INTERACTIONISM	80
2.4	COAGULATION OF GOFFMAN'S SOCIAL INTERACTIONAL ANALYTICAL TOOLS AND MEAD'S ROLE-TAKING/SELF-INTERACTION	82
2.5	EVALUATION OF THE SOCIAL INTERACTIONISM AS AN ANALYTICAL TOOL	84
2.6	SOCIAL INTERACTIONISM UNDER CRITICAL REVIEW	86
2.7	SOCIAL INTERACTIONISM COAGULATION WITH GHANAIAAN TRADITIONAL NOTION OF LEADERSHIP	86
2.8	SUMMARY	88
<b>CHAPTER THREE</b>		<b>90</b>
<b>THE MARKAN SETTINGS</b>		<b>90</b>
3.	INTRODUCTION	90
3.1	HISTORICAL SETTING OF MARK	90
3.1.1	<i>Authorship</i>	92
3.1.1.1	External Evidence: Traditional View of Authorship	93
3.1.1.2	Internal Evidence	96
3.1.2	<i>Date of Composition</i>	97
3.1.3	<i>Place of Composition</i>	100
3.1.3.1	Galilee	103
3.1.3.2	Antioch	104
3.1.3.3	Rural and Small Town in Southern Syria.	104
3.1.4	<i>The Markan Community</i>	107
3.2	THE LITERARY CONTEXT OF MARK	110
3.2.1	<i>Orality of Mark</i>	110
3.2.2	<i>Source Criticism</i>	114
3.2.3	<i>Form Criticism</i>	118
3.2.4	<i>Redaction Criticism</i>	124
3.2.5	<i>Social Scientific Criticism</i>	129
3.3	SOCIAL SETTING AND SOCIO-CULTURAL CONTEXT OF MARK	132
3.3.1	<i>Interactional Persons and Groups in Mark</i>	134
3.3.1.1	The Urban Elite	135
3.3.1.2	Retainers	137
3.3.1.3	Urban Non-elite	138
3.3.1.4	Degraded, Unclean, and Expendables	139
3.3.1.5	The Rural Peasants and Other Villagers.	140
3.3.3	<i>Interactional Models of the Markan Social World.</i>	143
3.3.3.1	Honour and Shame	143
3.3.3.2	Patronage and Clientism	149
3.3.4	<i>Social Values that Governed Social Interactions in the Markan Social Context</i>	151
3.3.4.1	Family Centeredness	152
3.3.4.2	Dyadism	154
3.3.4.3	Communicativeness	156
3.3.4.4	Power	157
3.3.4.5	Service	158
3.3.4.6	Hospitality	159
3.3.4.7	Domination	161
3.3.4.8	Purity	162
3.3.4.9	Humility	163
3.4	SUMMARY	164
<b>CHAPTER 4</b>		<b>167</b>
<b>JESUS' SOCIAL INTERACTIONS IN MARK</b>		<b>167</b>
4.	INTRODUCTION	167

<b>4.1</b>	<b>SOCIAL INTERACTIONS OF JESUS WITHIN THE OVERALL STRUCTURE OF THE GOSPEL OF MARK</b>	<b>169</b>
4.1.1	<i>Analysis of the Interactional Table</i>	177
<b>4.2</b>	<b>LITERARY STRUCTURE OF MARK</b>	<b>178</b>
<b>4.3</b>	<b>SOCIAL INTERACTIONAL ANALYSIS OF MARK 6:30-44</b>	<b>181</b>
4.3.1	<i>The Literary Context</i>	181
4.3.2	<i>Social Interactional Observation and Analysis</i>	183
<b>4.4</b>	<b>SOCIAL INTERACTIONAL ANALYSIS OF MARK 7:1-23</b>	<b>205</b>
4.4.1	<i>The Literary Context</i>	206
4.4.2	<i>Social Interactional Observation and Analysis</i>	208
<b>4.5</b>	<b>SOCIAL INTERACTIONAL ANALYSIS OF MARK 7:24-30</b>	<b>234</b>
4.5.1	<i>Literary Context</i>	234
4.5.2	<i>Social Interactional Observation and Analysis</i>	237
<b>4.6</b>	<b>SOCIAL INTERACTIONAL ANALYSIS OF MARK 10:35-45</b>	<b>252</b>
4.6.1	<i>The Literary Context</i>	252
4.6.2	<i>Social Interactional Observational Analysis</i>	255
<b>4.7</b>	<b>SUMMARY</b>	<b>276</b>
<b>CHAPTER FIVE</b>		<b>277</b>
<b>TOWARDS A SOCIAL INTERACTIONAL LEADERSHIP MODEL:</b>		<b>277</b>
<b>JESUS - PERFORMED LEADERSHIP PRINCIPLES</b>		<b>277</b>
<b>5.</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>277</b>
<b>5.1</b>	<b>THE MARKAN JESUS AS THE EXPECTED LEADER</b>	<b>278</b>
5.1.1	<i>The Son of God</i>	279
5.1.2	<i>Son of Man</i>	281
<b>5.2.</b>	<b>THE JESUS LEADERSHIP AS PRACTISED IN THE HOUSEHOLD</b>	<b>284</b>
<b>5.3</b>	<b>THE JESUS-PERFORMED LEADERSHIP PRINCIPLES</b>	<b>285</b>
5.3.1	<i>Principle 1 – The Choice of Setting for Leader-Associate Interaction</i>	286
5.3.2	<i>Principle 2 – Characterisation of Followers</i>	286
5.3.3	<i>Principle 3 – Creation of Team Mind-Set</i>	286
5.3.4	<i>Principle 4 – Being a Part of Associates</i>	287
5.3.5	<i>Principle 5 – Indicators That Associates and Followers are Following</i>	287
5.3.6	<i>Principle 6 – The Third Eye of the Leader</i>	287
5.3.7	<i>Principle 7 – The Leader’s Concern, Care and Attention to Followers</i>	287
5.3.8	<i>Principle 8 – The Leader’s Provision for Associates</i>	288
5.3.9	<i>Principle 9 – Relational Bond between the Leader and Associates and Followers</i>	288
5.3.10	<i>Principle 10 – Compassion: A Key Value to a Leader’s Approach</i>	288
5.3.11	<i>Principle 11 – The Leader’s Critical Understanding of His Followers and Associates</i>	288
5.3.12	<i>Principle 12- Resourcefulness of the Leader</i>	289
5.3.13	<i>Principle 13 – Associates’ Reflection of the Leader’s Leadership Orientation</i>	289
5.3.14	<i>Principle 14 – Accessibility and Receptiveness are Vital Values of a Leader</i>	289
5.3.15	<i>Principle 15 – Developing Associates’ Creativity and Capacity with Challenging Task</i>	289
5.3.16	<i>Principle 16 – Facing Reality with Associates Regarding the Task of the Leadership in Meeting the Needs of Followers</i>	290
5.3.17	<i>Principle 17 – Modelling Leadership Orientation to Associates</i>	290
5.3.18	<i>Principle 18 – Defying the Odds to Meet the Needs of Followers and Realise the Mission</i>	290
5.3.19	<i>Principle 19 – Turning the Few into Many</i>	291
5.3.20	<i>Principle 20 – Hospitality is a Necessary Virtue of the Leader.</i>	291
5.3.21	<i>Principle 21- Generation of Hope and Excitement among Followers</i>	291
5.3.22	<i>Principle 22 – Creating a Sense of Equality and Interconnectedness among Followers</i>	292
5.3.23	<i>Principle 23- Creating System to Carry Vision and Mission</i>	292

5.3.24	<i>Principles 24 – The God Factor in Leadership</i>	292
5.3.25	<i>Principle 25 – Team Approach in Getting Things Done</i>	292
5.3.26	<i>Principle 26 – Every Follower Matter</i>	293
5.3.27	<i>Principle 27 – Judicious Use of Resources</i>	293
5.3.28	<i>Principle 28 – Connecting the Present State of Affairs and the Better Future</i>	293
5.3.29	<i>Principle 29 – Records Critical for Planning</i>	293
5.3.30	<i>Principle 30 – Reality of Opponents and Opposition to Mission and Vision</i>	294
5.3.31	<i>Principle 31 – Opponents and Cynics Come with a Strategy</i>	294
5.3.32	<i>Principle 32 – Culture and Leadership have Reciprocal Relationship</i>	294
5.3.33	<i>Principle 33 – Answering Critics and Opponents</i>	294
5.3.34	<i>Principle 34 – Keeping an Eye on the Opponents and Critics</i>	295
5.3.35	<i>Principle 35 – Challenging Opponents with Facts then a Riposte</i>	295
5.3.36	<i>Principle 36 – Dealing with Opponents</i>	295
5.3.37	<i>Principle 37 – Articulating the Laws and Traditions of the Land</i>	295
5.3.38	<i>Principle 38 – Exposing the Opponents</i>	296
5.3.39	<i>Principle 39 – Taking Charge of the Opposition and the Criticism</i>	296
5.3.40	<i>Principle 40 – Protecting Associates</i>	296
5.3.41	<i>Principle 41 – Preserving the Right Tradition</i>	296
5.3.42	<i>Principle 42 – Empowering the Inner Caucus</i>	297
5.3.43	<i>Principle 43 – Continuous Instruction of Associates</i>	297
5.3.44	<i>Principle 44: Public Image of the Leader</i>	297
5.3.45	<i>Principle 45 – The Leader as a Reference Point</i>	298
5.3.46	<i>Principle 46 – The Leader’s Oratory Prowess</i>	298
5.3.47	<i>Principle 47 – Challenging Associates and Followers</i>	298
5.3.48	<i>Principle 48 – Confronting Associates and Followers</i>	298
5.3.49	<i>Principle 49 – Setting High Standard for Associate</i>	298
5.3.50	<i>Principle 50 – Replication of a Leader’s Orientation</i>	299
5.3.51	<i>Principle 51 – Air of Importance</i>	299
5.3.52	<i>Principle 52 – Morality</i>	299
5.3.53	<i>Principle 53 – Attention on the Heart</i>	300
5.3.54	<i>Principle 54 – Expanding the Frontiers of Tradition Limits</i>	300
5.3.55	<i>Principle 55 – Rewriting the Negative Narrative</i>	300
5.3.56	<i>Principle 56 – Reaching Out to those whom Tradition Ostracises</i>	300
5.3.57	<i>Principle 57 – Strategic Moves to Unchartered Area.</i>	301
5.3.58	<i>Principle 58 – Friendship Disposition</i>	301
5.3.59	<i>Principle 59 – Relevance and Resourcefulness of the Leader</i>	301
5.3.60	<i>Principle 60 – The Leader as a Solution</i>	302
5.3.61	<i>Principle 61 – Earning and Commanding Respect as a Leader</i>	302
5.3.62	<i>Principle 62 – Being All Things to All People</i>	302
5.3.63	<i>Principle 63 – Followers’ Confidence in the Leader</i>	302
5.3.64	<i>Principle 64 – Challenging Abusive and Discriminatory Stereotypes</i>	303
5.3.65	<i>Principle 65 – Followers’ Faith in the Leader</i>	303
5.3.66	<i>Principle 66 – Committing to Responsibility and Keeping an Open Mind on Right</i>	303
5.3.67	<i>Principle 67 – Following the Leader’s Lead</i>	304
5.3.68	<i>Principle 68 – Going Beyond Human Barriers to Act for Human Good</i>	304
5.3.69	<i>Principle 69 – Acknowledging Followers</i>	304
5.3.70	<i>Principle 70 – The Power of the Leader’s Words</i>	304
5.3.71	<i>Principle 71 – Connecting Words and Action – Integrity</i>	305
5.3.72	<i>Principle 72 – Credibility Issues of the Leader</i>	305
5.3.73	<i>Principle 73 – Personal Interest and Personal Agenda of Followers</i>	305
5.3.74	<i>Principle 74 – The Real Intention</i>	305
5.3.75	<i>Principle 75 – The Leader’s Ability</i>	306

5.3.76	<i>Principle 76 - Keeping an Eye on Followers</i>	306
5.3.77	<i>Principle 77 – Probing Followers Intentions</i>	306
5.3.78	<i>Principle 78 – Firmness of the Leader</i>	306
5.3.79	<i>Principle 79 – Tolerance as a Critical Virtue for Dealing with Followers</i>	307
5.3.80	<i>Principle 80 – Keeping an Eye an Close Associates and Family</i>	307
5.3.81	<i>Principle 81 – Use of Discretionary Powers</i>	307
5.3.82	<i>Principle 82 – Associates Lobby</i>	308
5.3.83	<i>Principle 83 – Institutional Knowledge of the Leader</i>	308
5.3.84	<i>Principle 84 – Guiding the Thoughts of Associates and Followers</i>	308
5.3.85	<i>Principle 85 – Helping Associates and Followers to Rethink their Position</i>	308
5.3.86	<i>Principle 86 – Keeping to Agreed Processes and Procedures</i>	309
5.3.87	<i>Principle 87 – Disclosing both the Blessing and the Cost</i>	309
5.3.88	<i>Principle 88 – Truth in Leadership</i>	309
5.3.89	<i>Principle 89 – Staying Within the Limit of Authority</i>	309
5.3.90	<i>Principle 90 – Compromising the Rule on Personal Grounds</i>	310
5.3.91	<i>Principle 91 – Anticipating Future Danger</i>	310
5.3.92	<i>Principle 92 – Dealing with Potential Sources of Conflict among Associates and Followers</i>	310
5.3.93	<i>Principle 93 – Regrouping the Team</i>	311
5.3.94	<i>Principle 94 – The Leader as a Unifier</i>	311
5.3.95	<i>Principle 95 – Re-Energising the Team of Associates or Followers</i>	311
5.3.96	<i>Principle 96 – The Core Tenets of Leadership Philosophy</i>	312
5.3.97	<i>Principle 97 – The Leadership Culture of Establishment</i>	312
5.3.98	<i>Principle 98 – Jesus’ Leadership Culture</i>	312
5.3.99	<i>Principle 99 – The Leader’s Commitment</i>	313
5.3.100	<i>Principle 100 – The Leadership Task and Personal Interest</i>	313
5.3.101	<i>Principle 101 – The Leadership Task and the People</i>	313
5.3.102	<i>Principle 102 – Foundations of Jesus’ Leadership Philosophy</i>	313
5.3.103	<i>Principle 103 – Destiny of the Leader</i>	314
5.3.104	<i>Principle 104 – The Epitome of Leadership Task</i>	314
5.4	<b>SOCIAL INTERACTIONAL LEADERSHIP MODEL</b>	314
5.5	<b>SUMMARY</b>	315
<b>CHAPTER SIX</b>		<b>316</b>
<b>SUMMARY, RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSION OF THE STUDY</b>		<b>316</b>
6.	<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	316
6.1	<b>THE LEADERSHIP ORDER OF JESUS</b>	317
6.1.1	<i>Leadership as Interactional and Relational Endeavour</i>	317
6.1.2	<i>Leadership is Developing and Resourcing Associates</i>	318
6.1.3	<i>Leadership is Teamwork</i>	319
6.1.4	<i>Leadership is Caring and Being Compassionate</i>	320
6.1.5	<i>Leadership is Being Insightful and Knowledgeable</i>	321
6.1.6	<i>Leadership is Being Accessible and Receptive</i>	321
6.1.7	<i>Leadership is Meeting Needs and Solving Problems</i>	321
6.1.8	<i>Leadership is Creativity and Ingenuity</i>	322
6.1.9	<i>Leadership is Fairness, Equity and Justice</i>	322
6.1.10	<i>Leadership is Judicious Use of Resources</i>	322
6.1.11	<i>Leadership is Records Keeping</i>	322
6.1.12	<i>Leadership is Defeating Opponents and Critics with Wisdom, Knowledge and Intelligent Arguments</i>	322
6.1.13	<i>Leadership as Being Ethically and Morally Upright</i>	323
6.1.14	<i>Leadership is Being a Reformer or a Transformer</i>	324

6.1.15	<i>Leadership is Advancing and Increasing Territorial Influence</i>	325
6.1.16	<i>Leadership is Humility</i>	325
6.1.17	<i>Leadership is Producing Great Results</i>	325
6.1.18	<i>Leadership is Being Credible and Motivational</i>	325
6.1.19	<i>Leadership is Good People Management</i>	326
6.1.20	<i>Leadership as Right Use of Power and Authority</i>	326
6.1.21	<i>Leadership is in Orientation and Culture</i>	327
6.2	<b>THE IMPLICATIONS OF JESUS' LEADERSHIP PRINCIPLES FOR GOOD LEADERSHIP PRACTICE</b>	328
6.2.1	<i>The Call for Transparency and Accountability</i>	328
6.2.2	<i>The Challenge of Poverty and Underdevelopment</i>	329
6.2.3	<i>The Challenge of Dysfunctional Leadership</i>	329
6.2.4	<i>Corruption Laden Leadership</i>	330
6.2.5	<i>Privilege Oriented Leadership</i>	330
6.3	<b>RAISING LEADERS WITH NEW ORIENTATION</b>	331
6.4	<b>CHALLENGING THE STATUS QUO OF AFRICAN LEADERSHIP</b>	331
6.5	<b>CONCLUSION</b>	332
6.6	<b>RECOMMENDATION</b>	334
<b>BIBLIOGRAPHY</b>		<b>335</b>

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

### **Targum**

Tg Neof – Targum Neofiti 1

### **New Testament Apocrypha and Early Christian Writings**

Ant. – Jewish Antiquities

Ap. - Against Apion

War – The Jewish War

Did - Didache

Mart. Ascen. Is. – Martyrdom and Ascension of Isaiah

Haer. – Adversus Omnes Haereses

H. E. – Historia Ecclesiastica

### **General Abbreviations**

Cf. – confer, compare

et al – et alii and others

LXX – Septuagint

Q – Quelle (Saying source for the Gospels)

Qidd - Qiddusin

MSS – Manuscript (s)

SSC - Social Scientific criticism

SILM - Social Interactional Leadership Model

OT – Old Testament

### **Commonly Used Periodicals, Reference Works and Serials**

ETL – Ephemerides theologiae lovanienses

HDR – Harvard Dissertation in Religion

HTS - *Theologese Studies/Theological Studies*

Int – Interpretation

JETS - Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society

JSNT – Journal for the Study of the New Testament

JSNTS - Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplementary

NovT – Novum Testament

NTS – New Testament Studies

TDNT – G. Kittel and G. Friedrich (eds) Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, tr., G. W Bromiley, 10 vols.

WD - Wort und Dienst

ZNW – Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft

### **Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Texts**

1QS – Serek hayyahad (Rule for the Community, Manual of discipline from Qumran cave 1)

CD – Cairo (Genizah text of the Damascus Document)

1QM - Milbāmāh (War Scroll) from Qumran Cave 1

1QSa – Appendix A (Rule of the Congregation to 1QS)

### **Commentaries**

WBC – Word Biblical Commentary

## CHAPTER ONE

### INTRODUCTION

#### 1. Context of the Study

This study uses Ghanaian models of leadership based on social interactionism as an entry point to re-describe Jesus' leadership model. In doing so, I seek to provide an alternative lens that rivals the traditional Christological view in understanding Jesus' model of leadership. The study builds on the Ghanaian model of leadership arguing that, in Ghana, leaders are perceived from the manner in which they interact with people – talking, greeting, helping and many other culturally understood gestures. In Ghana, a leader performs. Given this background, the study seeks to use the Ghanaian context as heuristic model to re-describe Mark's Jesus' model of leadership – hypothesising that, in Mark, Jesus' leadership model, similar to the Ghanaian context, was modelled or performed. The rationale for invoking the Gospel of Mark and Jesus in a Ghanaian context is because Mark is the shortest and most action-packed Gospel. It is curved as a story which succinctly narrates the interactions of Jesus without much theological embellishment. Jesus is this mix, is a leadership character whose leadership is not in doubt among theologians and the world at large. Therefore, understanding his leadership through his social interactions in Mark may offer the standard or model that may affirm or challenge leadership in the Ghanaian context.

Often, understanding Jesus' leadership model has been argued from the perspective of Christology. Regarding this and in connection with the gospel of Mark, Telford (1995:31) identifies three broad approaches to Mark – historico-psychological, historical study of religions (*Religionsgeschichte*), literary – critical with its variants such as historical-critical, source, form and redaction criticisms. More recent approaches which use methods and models

from other disciplines like anthropology and Sociology have emerged. Perhaps, this explains why reviews of Markan studies indicate abundance of research on the theology of Mark, especially in the areas of Christology and discipleship.

Kee (1978:353) rightly stated, “The history of recent research on the Gospel of Mark can be seen as the record of an attempt to discern the aim of the Evangelist and discovering the perspective, which gives coherence to all the features of the Second Gospel.” Many studies on the Markan Jesus Christ have tended to centre on his divinity; focusing on the various interpretations of the Christology of the Gospel of Mark. Markan scholars have sought to answer the question of the identity of Jesus which also means dealing with the Christology of the Gospel of Mark. For instance, in his article *Jesus of the Gospel of Mark: Present State of Research* which focused on scholarly literature on Markan Christology, Naluparayil (2000:191) notes that the Markan portrayal of Jesus has been the source for several Christological theories.

Three main approaches he argued, have been dominant. First, the search for the Christological titles outside of the Gospel narrative itself, which is its historical context. Second, championed by Wrede (1971), sought to understand the Christology of the Gospel of Mark by examining the theological interests of the author often in conjunction with redaction criticism. And third, also advanced by Perrin (1974), Tannehill (1980), Roads and Miche (1982), Kingsbury (1989), Davidson (1993), Broad (1994) and Miller (1995), looks for the meaning of the Christological titles within the narrative (Naluparayil 2000:192). He concludes that ‘there appears almost a consensus, both within the redactional and narrative approaches, in ascribing a high Christology to Mark’ (Naluparayil 2000:217).

However, if high Christology' implies a Christology in which Jesus is portrayed as divine, then, Johansson (2010:364) disagrees with his conclusion, arguing that the Synoptic Gospels display 'low' Christologies. Johansson (2010:364) believes that Markan scholarship on Christology falls into three epochs with each asserting Jesus in particular conviction. First, the critical scholarship of the latter part of the nineteenth century saw Mark's Jesus as a mere human being. Second, being the period between 1900–1970 when a majority of exegetes argued for a high Christology in Mark, and third, from 1970 to the present time, which first saw scholars again contending a low Christology, a position that soon was challenged once more.

More recent approach to Markan research has been the use of social scientific methods which have tilted the discourse on the Markan Jesus toward the social context of the text (Elliott 2001:11). This type of Markan scholarship is led by R. L. Rohrbaugh, Bruce Malina, Halvor Moxnes, Jerome H. Neyrey, and J. H Elliott, among others. It focuses on an aspect of the exegetical task which analyses the social and cultural dimensions of the text and of its environmental context. The social scientific paradigm presupposes a relationship between the text and the socio-historical environment from which it originated (Elliott 2001:88). With this approach, meaning of words in the Markan text is understood in terms of the social system in which they are used. The assumption is that words being used in a text always contain an anthropological component (Rohrbaugh 1996:11, Malina 2001:12-13). Such discourses shift the focus of Markan scholarship and explore the kind of human being Jesus was, his social actions, and his interaction with other human beings. It is in this light that the social interactions of Jesus in Mark has caught my attention to research to glean some of his leadership principles and practices

Scholarly works based on Mark about Jesus' leadership are quite scarce. Leadership research on Jesus has come under broad categories usually based on his:

- Teachings
- Inferences
- Allusions and
- His models to his followers.

One may come across themes such as *The Servant Leadership Style of Jesus: A Biblical Strategy for Leadership Development* by Dale Roach (2016), *Jesus on Leadership: Timeless Wisdom on Servant Leadership*, (C. Gene Wilkes 1998), *Jesus as Charismatic Leader* (B. J Malina 1984), 'The Charismatic Leader and His Followers' (Martin Hengel 1981), *Compassionate Leadership: Rediscovering Jesus' Radical Leadership Style* (Ted W Engstrom and Paul Cedar 2006), *In Jesus' Briefcase: Business Essentials for Missional Leaders* (Stephen Rosenberger and Cindy Metzger 2011), *Incarnate Leadership: 5 Leadership Lessons from the Life of Jesus* (Bill Robinson and Eugene Peterson and Eric Peterson 2009), and *Jesus CEO: Using Ancient Wisdom for Visionary Leadership* (L.B. Jones 2001) among others. Leadership research based directly on Mark is inundated with the servant-leadership concept. In this study, I argue that re-imagining the Markan Jesus and observing him practically live out his leadership traits, behaviours, influence, principles, values and model through his everyday social interactions may lead us to an Interactional model of leadership. Thus, this study focuses on discovering Jesus in his social interactions with various groups and identities.

Methodologically this study is a literature-based research while theoretically, it is set within the ambience of social scientific studies but differs in a significant way. While Social scientific researches have concentrated on the cultural context and the concomitant anthropological issues, that is, what kind of worldview did Jesus operate in and how therefore can we

understand the activities of Jesus in that context? This study starts with Jesus' actions and how they were performed, interpreted, or understood by those first century people with whom he interacted. How did what he did influence the people and how can his leadership principles and values be garnered from them. The focus thus, is the dynamics of the text itself as an expression of Jesus' social interactional performance; what it meant and what it means for leadership.

### **1.1 Problem Statement**

Surely, Jesus is the leader to follow; yet available researches on his leadership have mostly looked at leadership from the angle of his divinity and have drawn principles which come to the 21st Century individual as idealistic. Marr (2017:1) has observed, rather sadly, that "much of the written literature in this area originates with modern principles and insights considered best practices and remakes Jesus in that image." It means that a lot more have pushed assumed contemporary best leadership practices upon Jesus without discovering him in his true leadership performance. A gap thus exist, for observing Jesus in his character traits and interactions with people to determine if there are demonstrable qualities and approaches that are beyond time and may be applicable and relevant for any leadership setting of Ghana. This is the gap this study proposes to fill. This study, based on the Ghanaian model of social interactionism, is researching how the social interactions of Jesus may demonstrate his leadership principles. It is the presupposition of this study that Jesus of Nazareth manifests character traits in His speech and actions that reflect leadership and transcend time and culture. In effect the study undertakes a Social Interactionism hermeneutic of leadership toward a Social Interactions Leadership Model (SILM) as evinced by Jesus.

The gap in the knowledge about the social interaction of Jesus when plugged, most probably would illuminate our understanding of his leadership principles and could lead to reflections such as: how did Jesus interact with other people in terms of words, actions, and performance?

Could his way of interaction help in developing or exploring particular leadership principles and practices? How do the interactions of Jesus reveal his leadership principle and practice? Are there underlying nuisances in the social interactions of Jesus which contribute to understanding leadership? Such understanding may provide resource for African (Ghanaian) leaders in terms of performativity in leadership to enhance leadership delivery. Again, there is paucity of information on studies that examine the social interactions of Jesus in order to understand him from his social world, so his practical leadership principle can be identified.

Across Africa, dysfunctional leadership has denied many societies and institutions the much desired progress and success. Asamoah-Gyadu (2014) writing on leadership in Ghana has rightly observed that increasingly, “the model of ecclesial leadership adopted today is a synthesis of traditional sacralised chieftaincy and the CEO model associated with secular politics and business organisations.” Such leadership culture defeats the real essence of leadership, making it necessary to search for a new leadership culture.

Darteh-Baah (2015) has rightly noted that leadership is a concept in which its practices and interpretations are culturally framed. Darteh-Baah’s view makes relevant effort to bridge the historical chasm of the two millennia involving that of Jesus and ours today. It reminds us of the importance of socio-cultural context and the unstated values for leadership settings (Marr 2017:2). Marr’s view makes a valid case for observing Jesus perform and analyse his interactions in his own cultural setting, thus, it gives the impetus to undertake this study employing the Social Interactionism perspective informed by the Akan traditional leadership notion. There exists a gap in filtering Jesus’ leadership through the Akan cultural lens for relevant leadership principles for the African context, thus making a case for the study of Jesus’ interactions in Mark for relevant leadership principles.

While there are many Biblical narratives that offer insights into Jesus' leadership practices and priorities, four of such passages: Mark 6:30-44, 7:1-23, 7:24-30 and 10:35-45 are selected for analysis. These passages are purposively selected as the researcher sought passages which reflected Jesus' interactions. Each narrative provides an encounter of Jesus with other persons that provides a glimpse into the character of Jesus' leadership. Kingsbury (1987:57) asserts that the canonical Gospels are commonly referred to as "the story of Jesus" and as such are the sources of texts useful for an exploration on Jesus' interactions.

## **1.2 Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study is threefold: first, to use Ghanaian social interactionism as model and site for good leadership. Second to theorise social interactionism through the use of Ritual making, Frame making, Characterisation, Encounter processing, Stage making, and Role-taking delineated from Goffman's Interactional Order and Dramaturgy or Presentation of Self, and Mead's Mind, Self and Society, and use these in re-describing the social interactions of Jesus in the Gospel of Mark from a Ghanaian perspective. Third, it is to glean leadership principles from Jesus' social interactions. The principles harnessed in this venture will be used to showcase their implications for good leadership practice in Ghana and Africa at large.

## **1.3 Hypothesis**

The main hypothesis that will orientate this study is that leadership is interaction, therefore, if in Ghana leadership is interaction, how did Jesus interact? What is the nature of the social interactions of Jesus in the Gospel of Mark? The subsidiary hypothesis is, Jesus' social interactions convey his leadership principles, and thus, if Jesus' social interactions convey leadership principles, how do the underlying nuances in the social interactions of Jesus contribute to understanding leadership?

## **1.4 Research Question**

The research seeks to answer the question: what is the nature of the social interactions of Jesus in the Gospel of Mark? To answer this question, the following sub-questions will be investigated:

- Are there underlying nuances in the social interactions of Jesus which contribute to understanding leadership?
- Does his way of interaction help in developing or exploring particular leadership principles and practices?
- In what ways can the possible leadership principles from Jesus' social interaction redirect leadership practice in Africa?

## **1.5 Definition of terms**

The topic of this research contains three terms that need to be explained for a better understanding on how they will be used. They are: Leadership, Good Leadership, and Social Interactions.

### **1.5.1 Leadership**

Grundy (2007:19) provides that 'leadership comes from an old English word *laedan*, which has its origins in the idea of travelling together and making pathway through a new place.' Today, leadership has come to mean different things to different people. Scholars have defined it in terms of the position or status, from the perspective of influence and in terms of the observable results leadership achieves (Banks & Ledbetter 2004:16). It has been understood over the centuries from the Great Man theory (born leader), through Personality Traits, Charisma, Contingency (Situation), Transformational, Transactional, Servant, to Organic or Social Capital (Van Zyl 2009:4-5). Ciulla (2004: xv) stated, "leadership is not a person or

position; but a complex moral relationship between people, based on trust, obligation, commitment, emotion and shared vision of the good”. Ciulla’s definition does not recognise abilities and achievement of goals.

Hunter (1990:634) defines it as a “process of influencing the actions and behaviour of persons and or organisations through complex interaction toward goal achievement”. Hunter’s definition captures what many leadership definitions leave out, that is ‘interaction’, while acknowledging influence and goal achievement. However, he does not acknowledge the abilities and skills of the leader used in the interaction to produce the influence. According to Shonhiwa (2006:16), “leadership focuses on the ability to influence people and resources in a manner that will result in the achievement of identified goals. With leadership comes vision, intelligence, ability to command the respect of others, effective communication skills and the capacity to influence people.” Shonhiwa has much of the ingredients of leadership yet fall short of interaction. In this study, leadership is understood as a multifaceted and delicate ethical interactional relationship between individuals or group of individuals or an individual and an organisation in which, with diverse abilities and acquired skills, an individual influences others and harness corporate energy to achieve an identified goal to improve the well-being of a given Organisation, Institution or Community.

### **1.5.2 Good Leadership**

Ciulla (2004:308) makes the point that the ultimate question about leadership is not, “What is the definition of leadership?” Rather the whole point of studying leadership is to answer the question, ‘what is good leadership?’ He posits that “the use of the word ‘good’ here has two senses, morally good leadership and technically good leadership (i.e., effective at getting the job at-hand done)”. A good leadership thus, is being astute in interactional influence, moral,

effective and efficient in leading. In the Christian context, a good leader is defined as being astute in interactional influence and morally strong, effective and efficient, and reflects Jesus' orientation in leading.

### **1.5.3 Social Interaction**

According to Goffman (1983:2), social interaction is defined 'narrowly as that which uniquely transpires in social situations, that is, environments in which two or more individuals are physically in one another's response presence (Presumably the telephone and the mails provide reduced versions of the primordial real thing).' Response presence implies face-to-face interaction. To Charon (2010:140) social interaction is a "means that actors take one another into account, symbolically communicate to one another, and interpret one another's actions." Yet, Turner (1989:13-14) understands social interaction as "a situation where the behaviours of one actor are consciously reorganized by, and influence the behaviours of, another actor, and vice versa." Social interaction is a dynamic, changing sequence of social actions between individuals (or groups) who modify their actions and reactions according to those of their interaction partner or partners (Heatherton and Walcott 2009: vii). This study takes the view that Social Interaction is the dynamic social situation between individuals or groups, where they take each other into account, while each in a complex way of influence affect the other in the behaviour formation by way of response and reaction while in each other's response presence informed by cultural and social norms.

### **1.6 Social Interactionism Perspective**

Before discussing the social interaction perspective, it will be necessary to establish an understanding of the term perspective in the context of this study. Perspective is "more encompassing ways or styles of theorizing" (Elliot 1986:7-8; Van Eck 1995:161), in that it offers practical ways of seeing phenomena or realities of the world from a particular value

position. From that value position a choice of theory and model is made to interpret social phenomena. Perspective is a point of view (Charon 2007:3). It acts as a lens through which everything around us is perceived and interpreted. Perspective comes as conceptual framework leading to various assumptions and value judgement on reality. Reality for an individual hinges a lot on the perspective being used. Elliot (1986:7) considers the sociological orientation of structural-functionalism, conflict theory and symbolic interactionism and other styles of theorizing as theoretical perspectives. Van Eck (1995:161) agrees with Elliot (1986) by stating that perspectives themselves are not models but influence the models used, through the choice of certain theories and research objectives. In this sense perspectives are the overarching view point from which realities are observed and analysed.

Theory as a tool of perspective, is explained by Carney (1975:8) as basic prepositions through which a variety of observations or statements can be explained. The prepositions are based on axiomatic laws which is self-evident laws and state general principles. This leads to the understanding that theory is generalised statements about reality that explain in a provable way why something happens. Perspectives and theories come in a triad with models. Carney (1975:8) explains ‘model’ as a kind of conceptual map for putting in order the stimuli which have come through the cognitive filter. That is models are consciously structured concepts organized in a systematic way to analyse complex arrangements by some form of pattern matching. They are basically abstract instruments which approximate reality, taking the form of descriptive outline or inductive and even deductive generalization. He maintains that models use one or more theories to provide a simplified explanation to relevant data. They cannot be true or false but are validated through application of data. Malina (1981:19) defines models as “abstract, simplified representation of more complex real-world objects and interactions”.

Models are designed based on a concept for action, outlines patterns in explaining happenings or interactions in practice in a general way. The forgoing discussions suggest that complex social realities are explainable through a perspective which dedicates the use of a particular theory working through a model. Social Interaction perspective employs Ritual making, Frame making, Characterisation, Encounter processing, Stage making, and Role-taking among other approaches, and thus, holds the potential of elucidating Jesus' social interaction in the Gospel of Mark.

Social Interactionism as a perspective is believed to have been first shaped by George Herbert Mead and further developed and practised by Erving Goffman as a new field of social analysis called microsociology, or social interaction. According to him (Goffman 1983:2), it involves being physically in one another's response presence. Response presence implies face-to-face interaction. In addition, Turner (1989:13-14) considers it to involve behaviours of an actor in a social situation. Behaviour according to him, in its broadest sense includes the overt movements of individuals in space, the covert or "mental" deliberations of individuals, and the physiological processes of individuals. His argument is that social interaction can be at intense and low intense levels as well as at the most intense level. It is the process whereby the overt movements, covert deliberations, and basic physiology of one individual influence those of another, and vice versa and at the less intense level; social interaction would, of course, have lower values for one or all of these basic dimensions of behaviour.

Charon (2010:140) gives further clarity on social interactionism perspective. He explains social interactionism as a certain kind of encounter between two or more actors involving constant definition and redefinition of the acts of others and one's own acts. This perspective posits that in a social situation each actor acts in part through adjusting to what the other actor does. Each actor is influenced by what takes place. Charon (2010:142) maintains that the presence of

others and the actions they take become events that actors use to guide their own actions. Actors in the social situation of that particular time exchange effects on each other; actors are both subjects and objects. When actors interact overtime, a great influence is exerted on all actors which ultimately modify their actions or cause them to adjust their perspectives, views, interests, abilities, goals, and actions toward their own selves and others.

What is social about action? Charon (2010:142) explains that an action is conceived to be social when the actor considers others as he or she acts. As it were, others make a difference to what individuals do in any situation. Others in a social situation become what Charon calls 'social objects' to the actor. To elucidate the above, Charon rightly suggests that when we try to influence others, convince them of our view point, when we share something with them, help them or hurt them, reject or accept them, give support to them; we become social actors. In this sense the Markan Jesus can be construed as a social actor.

Blumer (1953:194) calls social action as 'taking others into account as we act.' For him it is the 'raison d'être of human association.' Blumer (1953) argues that the awareness of another person in this sense of taking him and his acts into consideration becomes the occasion for orienting oneself and for the direction of his one's own conduct. The fact that each of the two individuals in the social situation is taking the other into continuing account is very important. It means that the two individuals are brought into a relationship of subject to subject, not object to object, nor even of subject to object. Each person has to view the conduct of the other from the standpoint of the other. One actor's action is directed as he or she takes into account the other. Contrary to Blumer's (1953) view that two individuals are not brought into mere 'object to object' relationship, it can be argued that subject acts on object so if both individuals are having effects on each other, then they stand as object as well as being subject to each other.

Charon (2010:142) further explains, social action as an act of symbolic communication (interaction). When an actor controls what he or she does in order to communicate something to others, this is social action and it is symbolic communication. Turner (1988:12) believes that the process of interaction among individuals is considered to involve extemporaneity, impulsiveness and indeterminacy, thereby making it immune to the positivists' assertions. This does not preclude the fact that people enter social interaction on purpose and even sometimes with determinacy.

Charon (2010:143) has noted first, that symbolic social interaction is a relevant part of what people are, to the extent that many of the great treasures of human life such as love, friendship, helping, sharing, encouraging, working, discussions and giving, all involve social interaction. Incidentally these social actions which are treasures of life, also find expression in Jesus' ministry in the Gospel of Mark. Second, symbolic social interaction of the world is changing because social interaction has been revolutionized by cell phones, world travel, outsourcing, and internet. The success of many groups and organization today is dependent to a great extent on the social interactions that people are involved in. This underscores the dynamism of social interaction; that people in history, particularly, first century Mediterranean communities and in our own milieu have taken on roles other than the ones we have. Such roles need to be understood from some presuppositions and inferences made. Social Interaction involves thus, social situation, actors, responsive action, taking others into account, effects, emotions, extemporaneity, impulsiveness, indeterminacy, and interpretation of each other's action. It is these interactions which create the larger society. This relevant perspective has evolved overtime with different scholars contributing and placing emphasis on some aspects.

### **1.6.1 How Social Interactionism will be Applied to the Markan Narratives**

The Social Interaction (Symbolic Interactionism) Perspective will be applied to the selected passages of the Gospel of Mark with consciousness that one perspective will be insufficient to

analyse all the nuances of a literary text. I am reading Jesus using social interactionism as an Akan New Testament researcher. Therefore, social interactionism perspective is borrowed and shall be induced in its application with Ghanaian understanding of interaction. The importance of borrowing from other disciplines to study leadership has been aptly observed by Burns in his foreward to Starrat's book '*The Drama of Leadership*' that the study of leadership calls for the most resourceful use of a variety of disciplines – history, philosophy, psychology, politics, sociology, theology (Starrat 1993:viii). Applying social interactionism perspective to Mark's narrative will yield many insights: insights such as the uniqueness of Jesus' social interaction as a leader, the nexus between interaction and leadership, Jesus' interaction ritual as a problem solver, and Jesus as a sincere performer.

My approach will be limiting in the sense that, for an African Biblical scholar, the motivation for the study is only relevant to the degree that the sociological perspective illuminates the interactional encounters of Jesus and gives further insights into understanding and articulating the Gospels from an African perspective. This study also wants to apply its results with regard to Jesus' interaction, to illuminate the manner in which leadership principles and practices are handled in an African context.

The bodily movement of Jesus, his gestures, words, actions and interaction are situated in that large socio-cultural milieu. The social scientific studies have focused on the cultural context, the anthropology, that is, what kind of world view did Jesus operate in and how, therefore, can we understand the activities of Jesus in that context? But this study starts with Jesus' actions and how they were interpreted or understood by those people with whom he interacted. How did, what he did influence the people and how can it influence leadership today? In other words, the study is about the dynamics of the text itself; what it meant then, and what it means now.

The plausibility of using the Social Interactional Perspective (SIP) is to walk with the inside narrator of the stories in the Gospel of Mark. The narrators of these Gospel stories, as has been established by Narrative Criticism, were as if they were observing Jesus Christ and were part of his drama and what was happening around him. Ryken (1987:53) has observed that the interconnection of the characters, plot, and setting of a story or text that narrators present in a story is the narrators' way of articulating a reality experienced by them somehow to the readers. Rhoads (1982:421) explains this point that "the narrative reveals the point of view of the narrator, and the narrator in turn shows us the points of view of the characters, in the course of telling the story". Van Aarde (1991:102) clarifies it even further that "the narrative discourse is constructed from the relations between the writer and the narrator, between the narrator and the (implied/idealized) reader, between the narrator and the narrated characters, and among the narrated characters themselves in their binary relations". Therefore, from that perspective what has been done in narrative criticism on the stories will bring me into the interaction stories as an inside observer. It is possible from the narrative perspective to revisit and observe the gestures of Jesus and his bodily movements and therefore to decode the meaning from that perspective.

Therefore, I will argue that the perspective of social interactionism may be helpful in the sense that it observes, decodes, and encodes behaviour and is able to assess those behaviours as morally good or not. In this light, Jesus' leadership must not be construed as the best to the effect that He was a healer or miracle worker but looked at in terms of his behaviours and the interpretation and meaning the other interactants gave to it.

From the above, the analysis of the passages shall involve two aspects. For instance, in looking at the Mark 7:24-30 passage where Jesus was talking to the Syrophenician woman, this interaction will involve two levels of discussions. First, to subject all the happenings in the

interaction under the lens of the key principles of Role-taking/Self-interaction, Dramaturgy and Interactional Order. When this is done we will be able to determine the interactional approach Jesus adopted and the kind of impression He sought to foster on the Syrophenician woman. Second, from the African understanding of the perspective an assessment of the interaction will be done. Questions such as where was he? What were the taboos that hindered that interaction? Why was he alone talking to this woman or from the Akan tradition could Jesus exude notions of care in this interaction?

### **1.7 How the passages will be Observed or Analysed**

The observation or analysis of the four selected passages (Mark 6:30-44; 7:1-23; 7:24-30; 10:35-45) shall be done creatively, involving a foundational analysis which will consist of the establishment of the literary context and scholarly views on the narrative, and second, subject the passage to social interactional observational analysis by applying its selected five tenets as an heuristic tool. This will be laced with the Akan traditional notion of leadership. None of these elements of the analysis will be done in isolation, they shall be woven together in order to gain a holistic view of Jesus' interactional leadership.

### **1.8 Jesus' Leadership as Understood**

This section explores Jesus' leadership found in extant academic literature. While literature abounds on the leadership of Jesus, there appears scarcity of academic leadership research based directly on the Gospel of Mark on the person of Jesus himself. Such studies have focused on the leadership traits, behaviours, power influence, and situational approaches to leadership found in the life of Jesus Christ (Self 2008:2). Research on trait focus on personality, motivations, competencies, values, and skills (Yukl 2002). Jesus has been identified as one who is unique by a number of scholars (Smothers 1985; Scott 1998; Sparks 1998). To Smothers

(1985) Jesus is the “heir of all” (Mark 12), and “agent of creation” (John 1:3). Sparks (1998) believes that Jesus was every Jewish person’s hero rolled into one unique personhood. Koenig (2007) argues that Jesus’ uniqueness stems from his charisma. Researchers who have focused on Jesus’ leadership behaviours are those interested in his service to others, and specifically as viewed through the lens of servant-leadership (Sendjaya & Santos 2002; Patterson 2003; Koenig 2007). Some ways in which Jesus’ leadership has been studied are examined below:

### **1.8.1 John C. Hutchison: Servant-Leadership**

Many commentaries and analyses of Mark 10:35-45 and its parallels have variously affirmed ‘servant-leadership model’ as a leadership concept suggested by the passage. The theme of servanthood saturates the Gospel of Mark, as reflected in Jesus’ teachings and actions (Hutchison 2009:54). Greenleaf who is credited with the concept of servant-leadership emanating from his essay ‘The leader as a servant’; acknowledged a number of writers who inspired his development of the servant leadership model but never mentioned Jesus Christ. It is explicit from the Gospels that Jesus presented the concept of servant-leadership over two thousand years ago (Hutchison 2009:54). Jesus taught servant-leadership and modelled it for His followers and the need for them to demonstrate servanthood and sacrifice.

Hutchison (2009:55) holds that “in Mark 10:42–45 Jesus challenged His disciples to a radical and paradoxical form of leadership and showed that He Himself would provide the ultimate example through His suffering and death”. This kind of leadership is one committed to meeting the needs of others. As Sanders (1994:15) explains further that, “true greatness, true leadership, is found in giving yourself in service to others, not in coaxing or inducing others to serve you....true spiritual leader is focused on the service he can render to God and other people, not on the residuals and perks of high office or holy title’. Wilson (1976) argues that Jesus’

servanthood began as a kenotic process – emptying himself of outward display of deity, following the will of his Father (Philippians 2:6-8). Sendjaya and Santos (2002) opine that Jesus as a servant leader is most expressed in his washing of his disciples’ feet and Russell (2003) considers Jesus as the epitome of a servant-leadership. Koenig (2007:29) asserts “it has become a truism that Christian leadership must be none other than servant-leadership”.

Jesus’ call to servant-leadership required deep, personal humility, and it violated foundational cultural values related to honour and shame and patronage that were entrenched in Jewish and Greco-Roman society (Hutchison 2009:57). Those words of Jesus were not only paradoxical; they might have sounded absurd to the disciples and the Romans of the first century. From Jesus’ perspective, authority and leadership are demonstrated through servanthood, selflessness, and sacrifice for others (Hutchison 2009:65).

Jesus’ teaching on greatness contrasted with Roman cultural standards of success and greatness (Hutchison 2009:65). He demonstrated a new leadership paradigm he sought to inculcate into the disciples when he made it clear that the Messiah would assume the role of a dying saviour as well as that of a victorious King. This contradiction defied human logic within societal norm of the first century; it required the paradox of a different value system to appreciate and understand what Jesus meant. Perhaps, the countercultural nature of Jesus’ leadership concept explains why Hutchison (2009) maintains that in practice servant-leadership is rarely practised. History has shown that left to themselves, most leaders do not follow the principles of servant-leadership (Hutchison 2009:69). The call to Jesus’ disciples to this model was one of the most difficult commands for them to understand and obey in their cultural situation (Hutchison 2009:69).

Khoza (2009:19) takes the issues with the nomenclature ‘Servant leadership’ arguing that in Africa and maybe the United States of America the master servant relationship raises the spectre of slavery and racial dominance. The term “servant” is demeaning, whereas what one wants to get at is the idea of service to the community (which is also a traditional concept of leadership). It may be argued that while servant-leadership model provides the leadership narrative or criteria in theory and actually appears great, the weakness of this leadership understanding is its failure in praxis. The balance between the position of a leader and the position of a servant has been difficult to attain. In effect, the two hardly converge in praxis. Hutchison (2009) affirmed this when he argued, ‘many leaders instinctively seek out positions of control over others and try to avoid showing weakness or vulnerability’. Thompson (2015:54) is even more explicit with its weakness, the phrase “servant-leadership” has always been something of an oxymoron. For example, Greenleaf (2008:9) asks, “Servant and leader. Can these two roles be fused in one real person, in all levels of status or calling?” This tension is very real for pastors and other leaders who struggle to balance serving their people on one hand with providing strong, task-oriented leadership on the other hand.

### **1.8.2 Randall Collins: Jesus as a Charismatic Leader**

In the article ‘Jesus in Interaction: The Microsociology of Charisma’ Collins (2015) analyses the dynamics of Jesus’ charisma in social interaction through an examination of ninety-three social situations in the Gospels in which Jesus confronts specific individuals face-to-face. Collins (2015:3) concludes “Jesus is a charismatic leader – indeed, he is the archetype of charisma.”. He explains charisma as total dedication, having it and imparting it to others. Above all, charisma, is the power to make crowds resonate with oneself. It might be more useful to say that charisma has its home base, it centres in enthusiastic crowds, even when the charismatic leader is sometimes cut off from base” (Collins 2015:17). To him, Jesus was a

master of the crowd. Jesus as archetype of the charismatic leader demonstrates how a charismatic movement is organized. Jesus' charisma is not a display put on for the crowds with the help of his staff; he is charismatic all the time even at the backstage (Collins 2015:11-13).

Collins (2015), admittedly, saw Jesus in his social interactions as one who was always quick and absolutely decisive, seizes the initiative by doing something unexpected, anticipated what the other person is intending and is a master of crowds. Besides, Jesus won victory through interacting suffering, and brought transformation through Altruism (Collins 2015:1). Based on John 8:1-11 Collins (2015) saw Jesus as the best described of all charismatic leaders. In the passage Jesus is confronted by the Pharisees, the righteous upholders of the traditional rituals and the law with a woman caught in adultery. The Pharisees make her stand in front of the crowd, and they said to Jesus, "Teacher, this woman was caught in the act of adultery. The Law commands us to stone her to death. What do you say (verse 5)?" Jesus does not look up at them but continues to write in the dirt with his finger, this would be unusual to them. Jesus finally looks up and says, "Let whoever is without sin cast the first stone (verse 7)." Then he looks down and continues writing in the dust; one by one, the crowd starts to slip away.

Commenting on Jesus' social interaction, Collins says "Jesus is a master of timing" (Collins 2015:3), who does not allow people to force him into their rhythm or their definition of the situation. He argues that Jesus perceived what they are attempting to do, their intention beyond the words then made them shift their ground. Collins' description of Jesus is what Georg Mead calls self-interaction. Jesus interacted with himself and virtually pre-empted what the Pharisees had in mind with a response they did not expect. Jesus' interaction strategy was clear; He did not allow the encounter to focus on himself against the Pharisees. He knew that they were testing him, trying to make him say something that would promote breaking of the law or else back down in front of his followers. Rather, Jesus throws it back on their own consciences,

their inner reflections about the woman they are going to kill (Collins 2015:3). By this act, Collins aptly sees Jesus in his interaction as individualizing the crowd, causing them to drift off one by one, breaking up the mob mentality. It can be added that Jesus really brought the interaction to the micro level. Collins' survey of Jesus reveals him as one who understood social interaction; as Erving Goffman as noted, we can successfully participate in social situations and interact well only if we come along with our bodies and their accoutrements (Goffman 1983:4). Jesus, fully aware of the dynamics of face-to-face interaction and the enablement and risks integral to bodily presence, it remains to be said, that he knew how to manage his ritual resources and minimize his ritual vulnerabilities.

Collins (2015:22) further discusses the miracle encounters of Jesus focusing on what a microsociologist can see in the details of social interaction, especially what happens before and after a miracle. He outlined miracles that are described in detail, including twenty-two healing miracles, all of which happened in big crowds: three logistics miracles, in which Jesus provides food or drink for big crowds; five nature miracles, which take place when Jesus is alone with his inner twelve disciples or some of them; and two apparitions: one with three close disciples, one in a crowd (Collins 2015:22). Collins limited his argument to sociological observations and noted that demon-possessed individuals in the Bible act like Goffman's mental patients, shouting or staying mute and disturbing normal social situation (Collins 2015:24). He suggests that Jesus used his charismatic techniques of interaction to cure them. Jesus pays attention to them, focusing on them wholly and steadily until they change their behaviour and come back into normal human interaction; in every case that is described. It must be added that Jesus focusing on them was not limited to silence but inclusive of gestures and words. The combination of these ensured that the demon-possessed who interacted with Jesus left the interaction better than they came. Collins concludes rightly that Jesus in his interaction has the power to inspire crowds, to recruit followers, to work a moral revolution and reveal a life-goal

that is not of the world as people knew before. Collins posits, in short, that Jesus had the power of charisma (Collins 2015:22), I will argue that he had extraordinary interactional skills.

### **1.8.3 Max Weber: Jesus as Charismatic leader**

Max Weber was the first to ascribe the features of the charismatic ideal type to Jesus as a leader.

He sought to understand Jesus' leadership through the concept of charismatic behaviours and implications. Weber himself borrowed the Christian concept of charisma and charismatic authority from Rudolph Sohm who was a German law and Church historian (Piovanelli 2005:401). Weber adopted the idea and used it to explain the illogical captivation exercised by every kind of extraordinary leader. The Greek word charisma, originally meant 'gracious gift, favour' has now assumed the technical sense of 'gifts of grace, spiritual gift' given by the Spirit to the members of the Christian community. At the religious level, charisma and charismatic categories involved a wide range of phenomena involving direct and unmediated contact between the inspired individual and the supernatural being. From the religious point of view there is no doubt in placing Jesus within the charismatic category, given the exceptional nature of Jesus' authority and leadership.

Scholars believe that it was from this religious presage that sociologists developed a sociological perspective of analysis to describe under the label of 'charisma and charismatic', the extraordinary relationship which exists between a magnetic and acknowledged superhuman leader and his or her bewitched followers (Piovanelli 2005:397). In the primitive period such extraordinary, supernatural and the superhuman qualities were labelled as magical powers. Based on these generally accepted exceptional qualities, the individual concerned is treated as a leader.

The concept of a charismatic leader was developed by Max Weber as a means of explaining a type of effect in behaviour not rooted in traditional authority that is status or legitimate authority (Bruce 1984:55), yet allows persons to oblige others. Authority is understood as the socially recognized right to oblige others. It is derived from traditional warrants (status) or rational principles (law, custom). This type of effect of behaviour not rooted in status or rational principles was what Weber called charisma. According to him, charisma “is the quality of extraordinariness inhering in some person, object, or social institution imputed, ascribed and consequently recognized in that person, object, or institution by a collectivity of people sharing an emotional form of communal relationship” (Weber 1968:243). These attributes are not available to ordinary people, they are regarded as of divine origin.

In Weber’s works charisma appears in both the sociology of religion and sociology of domination. Under sociology of religion, Weber identified three kinds of charisma namely magical, prophetic, and routinized. Magical charisma refers to the ascription of special status to certain persons or objects by a group because of the group’s recognition of them as having extraordinary powers. Prophetic charisma denotes the ascription of special status to a person or object because of the group’s recognition of them as having extraordinary claims deriving from definitive revelations, missions, or doctrines. Routine charisma refers to the ascription of special status to certain social institutions because of a group’s recognition of them as having extraordinary powers or doctrinal claims (Bruce 1984:55).

Weber distinguished three types of authority: traditional, alternative and legal in either religious or political context. In religious context traditional authority was considered magical, legal authority was priestly and alternative authority was considered prophetic. In the political context traditional authority was seen as patriarchal, legal authority was bureaucratic and alternative authority was charismatic. Piovanelli (2005:400) believes that Weber was not able

to draw sharp boundaries between the religious functions of the prophet and the magician. Weber's description of the prophet Jesus was primarily one of a magician endowed with a magical charisma, that is, with extraordinary powers.

In the context of sociology of domination, the distinguishing features of prophetic charisma includes:

- “Only persons can be called charismatic
- Charisma entails a relationship between leader and followers
- The leader-follower relationship is marked by complete and personal devotion on the part of the followers.
- The followers form a charismatic community
- In its most potent forms, charisma is non-rational, value-free, disruptive of rational and traditional authority, inverting all notions of holiness, of value hierarchies, of custom, law and tradition; in sum charisma is revolutionary.
- Charisma always has to do with mission” (cited in Malina 1984:55)

Willner (1984:409) in agreeing with Weber stated that the attributes that can be inferred from Weber's charisma model are illustrative, empirical, and dynamic.

Weber's classical examples of charismatic leaders are Jesus Christ, Joseph Smith, and Kurt Eisner. Jesus' kind of charismatic leadership is manifested as legitimate domination as evident in the authority he exercised, his ability to perform miracles and riposte abilities in contrast to other forms of authority like legal (bureaucratic) and traditional (patriarchal) authority. Piovaneli concludes that the strength of the Weberian charismatic approach lies precisely in the universalistic and idealistic fashion in which it has been elaborated. As for the usefulness of this particular model in the case of the first-century Galilean healer, sage, prophet, and religious leader, Jesus of Nazareth, I firmly believe that it is the one that provides not only the most plausible explanation to the variety of his historical facets but also the best starting point to the multiple trajectories taken by the different post-Ester Christologies. Piovaneli (2005:407) has noted that irrespective of the criticism by some authors that charisma is ‘nothing but illusory’, ‘concrete expression of alienation’ and ‘neither desirable or necessary’;

charismatic leadership is applied in many contexts to explain extraordinary power of captivation by leaders of the day either in politics, business, tradition or religion.

Charisma and charismatic leader understood from Weber's perspective creates an impression that Jesus, as a charismatic leader, appears to erupt rather than systemically evolve. This is questionable, since Jesus, being a typical prophetic charismatic leader used his acknowledged extraordinary power, message, and revelation to make for himself instantaneous followers. In as much as Jesus fits into many of Weber's descriptions of a charismatic leader the assertion of eruption may be farfetched. For Jesus in his responses to the Pharisees in most of their conflict engagements proved he understood the culture and traditions of his people. This is understandable having 30 years learning before public ministry.

Miyahara (1983) and Malina (1984) have also critiqued Weber's analysis of Jesus as a charismatic leader. Miyahara (1983:383) is sceptical of the charismatic leadership concept and denounces the reality of charisma describing it as illusory. In his survey of the Weberian charisma, Miyahara argued that charisma is 'a collective illusion, indicative of group alienation that enables the charismatic community to ascribe a quality to some person or object regardless of their actual condition, and endow that quality with supernatural factuality (Malina 1984:56). In his view, both authentic and inauthentic charisma are illusory so any distinction is not necessary. Miyahara (1983:384) concluded that as a concrete expression of alienation, charisma is neither necessary nor desirable. While Miyahara dismisses charisma altogether however, unjustified as he is, as charisma is a real attribute people demonstrate, Malina questioned the deference to higher human authority. Malina holds that as Jesus ministered in a cultural context which overtly disdained glorification of a personality, complete deference to higher human authority was questionable, and every form of power was scrutinized. To propose Jesus as a charismatic leader, Malina (1984:56) inquired, were such barriers to charismatic

attraction overcome? Besides, Jesus did not exercise power over people but over demons and he had impassioned loyalties on the part of his followers, for example one betrayed him, another denied him and the others fled from him in his time of need (Malina 1984:58).

In line with other critics, Fiorenza (1983:105) believes that the Jesus movement was a conservative revival, aspiring not to the creation of a new order but to the restoration of Israel and its previously held values and institutions. Jesus, thus, did not use his talent in a situation of chaotic disorder, rather it was a context in which traditional values could not be effectively realized. In agreeing with Fiorenza (1983), Malina (1984:58) further describes Jesus as a 'conservative revivalist, devoted to the preservation rather than to the radical change of his society's political culture'.

The portrait Malina (1983) paints of Jesus is: Jesus was a healer but not extraordinary, honourable teacher and master of riposte, a faithful conservative revivalist who was committed more to safeguarding than radical change, his leadership contained no authoritarian elements, he distinguished himself not by exploits, did not try to attain power over others rather he avoided power. For instance, he avoided the messianic power roles (Mark 8:11-12, 33) and with enthusiasm he empowered others, sending out the 12 (Mark 6:7-13) and sending out the 70 (Luke 10:1-12). And he asked the healed to return home and be his followers there (Mark 5:19).

Finally, his core group certainly did not form a charismatic community because they were hardly unwavering, they were concerned with their recompense (Mark 9:35-39, Malina 1984:58). Malina (1984:61) then concludes that all these characteristics point away from Weber's typology of charisma; thus, Jesus was more of first century reputational legitimate leader and the very contrast of Weber's charismatic leader. While the Weber's great charismatic leader exudes confidence in his extraordinary abilities, thrives on power and

glorification and, lacking ties to the established social order, seeks to effect its radical change, the great reputational legitimate leader, exemplified in Jesus, affirms the traditional values and structures of his society by repudiating personal power, Malina (1984) asserts.

#### **1.8.4 Malina: Jesus as Reputational Leader**

Malina (1984) and others have also analysed the leadership of Jesus concluding that Jesus was a reputational leader. In his view, the Weberian basic model of a charismatic leader along with its subsequent development are not suitable to describe Jesus' authority and leadership. Malina (1984:57) in disagreeing with Weber, first identified the process of legitimization of authority through broadly encompassing norms which includes: the will of God, hereditary succession, or lineage, kinship, seniority, election by all members of a group, election by only the devoted elite, election by propertied elite, ownership, special competence and so forth.

According to Malina (1984), legitimate authority involves not merely tolerant approval but active confirmation and promotion of social pattern of behaviour in terms of common value, whether pre-existing social patterns or those that emerge communally in the course of social interaction (Malina 1984:57). While personal legitimate authority inheres a person or befalls a person and not under the individuals control for example birth right, impersonal legitimate authority is acquired by means of some skill or competence deemed pertinent and useful to the realization of the ends of the institution in which authority is embedded.

Malina (1984) identified reputational authority, as the third form of authority which normally emerges in a situation where cultural values cannot be realized in normal human living. This authority is derived from the successful criticism and dislocation of the higher order norms which legitimatise the authority prevailing in a given society. Reputational authority is thus rooted in a person's ability to influence a change in the broadly encompassing norms that

constrain recognition of legitimate authority (Malina 1984:57). It is the reputational authority that is often called charismatic authority. This is misleading since very non-charismatic persons have acquired and wielded it without illusory extraordinary qualities (Malina 1984:57). Reputational authority emerges from a person's effective ability to convince members of a given society to no longer recognize some higher order norm as binding, usually in a situation of crisis in which existing cultural values and institutions are successfully called into question. It is rooted in a 'person's ability to influence a change in the broadly encompassing norms that constrain recognition of legitimate authority' (Piovanelli 2005:405). For example, if in a given society, 'office holders occupy their office because of divine will, a reputational authority will successfully demonstrate to the community that divine will is not the issue at all, but a force, deception, collusion, conspiracy, or some other principle' (Piovanelli 2005:405).

Malina (1984) further argues that Weber's charismatic model of leadership is a pure construct of the Teutonic cultural context or north European tradition instead of a social, historical reality belonging to any ancient or modern Mediterranean movement. He reinterprets Weber's patriarchal and bureaucratic authority as personal or traditional authority and impersonal or rational authority. Piovanelli critiques the simplistic method used by Malina as he adopted Schwartz's table. The only changes to the original work was to replace Washington with reputational legitimate social leader. Piovanelli contends that the features of a reputational leader assigned by Malina are so "managerial and bureaucratic that, with or without any eventual attribution of collective sacred character or charisma of function, they could not be easily applied to the Jewish religious leader who lived and acted, presumably from around the year 4 B.C.E to the year 30 C.E, in a Galilean and, then, Judean context" (2005:420). Despite its methodological challenges Malina's reputational legitimate leader is a useful sociological model in understanding the leadership authority of Jesus Christ.

### **1.8.5 Gager: Jesus an Interactionist Charismatic Leader**

Gager is recognized as the first scholar from North America to have used theoretical sociological and anthropological models to study early Christianity. Gager adopted the ‘processes of the social reconstruction and maintenance of reality’ (Piovanelli 2005:402) and other models. In applying his models to Jesus as a charismatic leader, Gager deviated from Weber and concluded that Jesus was a charismatic leader not based on his personal, objective quality rather from more of a social recognition conferred by followers. This conviction was derived from Worsley interactionist model. This model orates that

“charisma can only be that which is recognized by believers and followers, as charismatic in the behaviour of those they treat as charismatic. Charisma is thus a function of recognition: the prophet without honour cannot be a charismatic prophet. Charisma, therefore, sociologically viewed, is a social relationship, not an attribute of individual personality or a mystical quality.”  
(Gager 1975:28-29)

Piovanelli (2005:403) commenting on Gager’s argument stated that Gager’s ‘slight but significant modification of the Weberian definition of charisma allows him to bypass the shadows of the historical Jesus’ self-understanding and to conceive him as a true charismatic prophet’. The argument that shifts the proof of charisma from extraordinary qualities to solely the views of followers on a leader as has been expressed that a prophet without followers cannot be a charismatic prophet. It agrees with Jesus’ own view that a prophet has no honour in his town, mostly due to other considerations but that does not delete the exceptional qualities that the prophet may possess. True recognition of charisma must be both from the consideration of followers as well as the supernatural qualities of the individual concerned. Willner, like Worsley, in reconstructing the original Weberian definition of charisma insisted on the interactionist aspect of the charismatic phenomenon, emphasizing the enthusiastic response of the followers rather than the exceptional features of the leader. Willner (1984:10-11) believes that ‘not all charismatic leaders must be revolutionary in the conventional sense of the term’.

Theissen and Mertz on their part analysed and reconstructed who Jesus was from a sociological study of his interaction with His followers and the ministry of the disciples in the first century describing them as wandering charismatics who demonstrated the radical ethic of the Gospels to make a mark in Society. They radically renounced home, family, and possession for what they had received from Jesus. Theissen and Mertz concluded that if the radicalism of their wandering life goes back to Jesus himself then Jesus himself was the first wandering charismatic (Piovanelli 2005:398). Theissen and Mertz (1996:235) maintain that 'Jesus was a charismatic who had an almost inexplicable aura: fascinating to followers but provocative to opponents'

Jesus' leadership as understood and expressed variously by scholars and outlined above leads to the suggestion that there is no shortage of literature on his leadership (Milavec 1982; Jones 1992; Briner & Pritchard 1998; Blackaby & Blackaby 2001; Winston 2002; Mays 2003). However, understanding his leadership from an African perspective does not have the same abundance of research. Attention, thus is here given to observing Jesus in his interactions to understand his leadership base on Ghanaian (African) traditional notion of leadership.

### **1.9 African Leadership Paradigm or Notion**

*"Africa is beyond bemoaning the past for its problems. The task of undoing that past is on the shoulders of African leaders themselves, with the support of those willing to join in a continental renewal. We have a new generation of leaders who know that Africa must take responsibility for its own destiny, that Africa will uplift itself only by its own efforts in partnership with those who wish her well." .....*Nelson Mandela

This section explores African leadership philosophies put forward by African writers vis-à-vis the current leadership situation in Africa. Mandela has aptly stated, Africa brings a special perspective to the universal issues of leadership (Khoza 2005: xxviii). African leadership wisdom can certainly impact world leadership concerns. He orates that African leadership is communal in nature and calls for the leader, as an individual, to be resolute and absolutely

devoted to pursuing strategies that many followers may not initially understand or agree with (Khoza 2005:xxx). The African leadership style is ideally suited to the African context (Khoza 2005: xxx). Such leadership style is discernible from leadership architecture that exist in the traditional African Society (Khoza 2005:10). Gumede (2017:87) takes recognition of this view, and states that an African leadership must be based on African-centred orientations. By African-centred orientations, he meant that the context regarding ways of life in communities in Africa is privileged over any others with what is in the best interest of Africans being the only reference point. The Afrocentric context obviously includes histories, African philosophies, and cultural practices.

This is particularly so because the worldview of people largely determines the leadership that works. For instance, the Western-American worldview promotes the individual hero, who through his individual independence, confidence and aristocracy works to save his or her community and organisation from its fate. The axiom here is, 'I am because I, the individual hero, dream and do'. Similarly, the European worldview upholds rational and scientific thinking, their maxim is 'I am because I think I am.' The African worldview however, focuses on people and their dignity as of the highest significance; the focus is on the collective brotherhood of mankind (Khoza 2005; Mbigi 2005; Van Zyl 2009:33). Within this world, before the disruptions of Christianity and subsequent colonialism, Khoza (2005) believes African leadership was mostly predicated on philosophies such as *Ubuntu*. Ubuntu, he explains to mean a philosophy of life and a worldview. It is an all-inclusive mode through which reality is constructed and shared and identified by such values as caring, reciprocity, sharing, compassion, hospitality, cohabitation, cooperation and tolerance (Khoza 2005:xxii). There are dynamic relationships within Ubuntu expressed with the individual being immersed in the collective yet maintains an identity as an empirical being. This translates to "I am because you are, and you are, because we are". Idioms and proverbs that express Ubuntu abound in Africa

(Khoza 2005: xx). Akans from Ghana for instance will say '*nyimpa ye dɛw*', which literally means 'human being is sweet'. This statement is made when an individual has need for another human being. The presupposition is that a person draws on a fellow human for excitement in life, daily strength, encouragement, and for solving everyday life problems.

Ubuntu is commitment to humanism (Khoza 2005:9) likewise the leadership that evolved from it. Khoza (2005:19) postulates the end values of Ubuntu in corporate leadership are visible relevant features such as Servent-leadership, Cohabitation, Social arbitrage, Emotional intelligence and Paradox. These tie in with the African value systems; they resonate with the essential principles of African leadership: humanity, harmony, respect, and integrity (Khoza 2005:19). Ubuntu is a source of effective teamwork and in the spirit of Ubuntu teamwork leadership replaces individual effort as the driving force for creativity (Khoza 2005:12). Put another way, in Africa, leadership became a function to be shared by all villagers or community members, rather than a leadership invested in one person (Masango 2002:710).

Citing the Globe's studies on Sub-Sahara Africa on the nature of leadership, Bolden and Kirk (2009:72) notes that empirical data on leadership styles, revealed a preference for charismatic/value-based, team-orientated, participative and humane approaches. They conclude that perhaps with the exception of the last, this is no different from profiles across much of the rest of the world. It may be argued, it is the humane factor which is the African unique orientation to leadership. It should be noted that in an African village, the hierarchical leadership structures are formal and well defined, with a king at the top of the structure, ruling and leading the villagers (Masango 2002:708).

In another dimension, O'Malley argues, African society had until it was disrupted by the combined blight of slavery, colonialism, racism and exploitation a highly effective leadership system backed by traditional customs, philosophies, rituals and taboos. Africa's leadership got

diluted when western explorers, travellers or settlers sought to interpret its societal institutions and leadership systems according to the mind-sets and value-judgements of the foreign explorers, travellers or settlers. A more contemporary challenge to African leadership concept has been post-modernity with foreign ideas and concepts almost to dislodge Africa's indigenous concepts and ideas on leadership (O'Malley 2009:8). In the course of time, leadership shifted from kings, priests, rulers and diviners to teachers, nurses and ministers of religion. The corollary of colonialism forced our traditional leaders to choose collaboration with colonial leaders, and they lost their powers among the villagers and communities (Masango 2002:711). Some leaders and the people adapted to Western concepts, and some abandoned their African religious values, customs and their own culture (Masango 2002:712).

The very basis of modern knowledge of African leadership is oral tradition. As scholars point out, it is unfortunate that the communities of Africa did not keep or transfer their wisdoms, customs, and ritual systems in written form (O'Malley 2009:8). Undoubtedly, "Our ancient ancestors sat around the fire and heard stories about their forebears - about the time when life first emerged in the universe, about lessons for living their lives" (Masango 2002:712). These fireside stories became effective model of moulding young leaders. Young people listened in the evening to powerful stories of brave men at war, and as they listened, they developed leadership skills (Masango 2002:712). "An African Leadership Model has been motivated by a widely shared belief among contemporary Black leaders that it is time for Africa to produce leaders with the requisite capacity for high performance and moral impact to ensure that the people of the continent secure their fair share of opportunities in the twenty-first century. Sadly, for decades Black leaders have watched leaders of rival communities transform" (O'Malley 2009:3). Khoza (2005:4) maintains Africa's people and institutions have the capacity and responsibility to master their own destiny.

### 1.9.1 Africa's Leadership Challenges Today

In his preface to the book, *Let Africa Lead: African Transformational Leadership for 21<sup>st</sup> Century Business*, Thabo Mbeki says,

“We need...leadership predicated on an authentic understanding of our history, culture and contemporary challenges.... We need to meet prevailing global challenges from within our own worldview and proceed to action from our own authentic possibilities based on the culture and competencies of Africans themselves” (Khoza 2005: xi).

In this sense, contemporary African leaders must translate their African origins into effective action then embrace their identity and face ahead. Such endeavour calls for the need to take the African heritage of ideas, practices and beliefs and turn them to good account (Khoza 2005). It is a fact that identity of a cultural group is its traditions yet these revered traditions can act as a brake on change and under the wrong leadership can force people into the dark ages of fundamentalism (Khoza 2005:11). Gumede (2017:84) expressed a similar idea, when he said, a leader ought to contend with the reality that there are different cultures that could make work as a leader difficult. Khoza (2005:4) wonders, though African philosophy is rich and extensively rooted in a deeply moving history and culture, however one has to be curious whether the principles that guided our ancestors still apply to us today.

Khoza's wondering appears to receive response in Van Zyl (2009:32) who, on African leadership cultural value system, holds that ‘subordinates expect their leaders to display a heightened sense of ethics, fairness, transparency and accountability. Unfortunately, many leaders today fail to uphold these values’. Ayittey (2005:402) is even more harsh and emphatic that

“Africa is a mess-economically, politically, and socially. Despite Africa's vast natural resources, its people remain mired in the deadly grip of poverty, squalor and destitution while buffeted by environmental degradation and brutal tyranny. Most Africans are worse off today than they were at independence in the 1960s. African leaders have failed Africa. African intellectuals have failed, too. The failure is monumental...dysfunctional continent by wretched institutions and execrable leadership”

Rotberg (2004:14) has similar things to say, that “Africa has long been saddled with poor, even malevolent, leadership: predatory kleptocrats, military-installed autocrats, economic illiterates, and puffed-up posturers”. He further states that in many other African countries, leaders begin their presidential careers as democrats only to end up, a term or two later, as corrupt autocrats: Bakili Muluzi of Malawi, Moi of Kenya, and, most dramatically of all, Robert Mugabe of Zimbabwe. Other leaders, such as Sam Nujoma of Namibia and Yoweri Museveni of Uganda, may be heading in the same direction (2004:16). Gumede (2017:77) argues that Africa has leadership challenges, but sees beyond traditions and culture and considers external influence as being responsible. He argues that the problem of external influence is a critical issue connected with weak leadership suffused with challenges of corruption and so on. “It would seem that our leaders think more about the privileges of being in high office” (Gumede 2017:83). It could be added that we have privilege-oriented leadership rather than server-oriented leadership as proffered by Khoza under Ubuntu. The dire picture painted by Ayittey, Rotberg and Gumede shows Africa’s problems hang on bad leadership across the continent. The Western world has justifiably looked at the African continent as one plagued by corruption; dictatorship; military coups; rebellious leaders; misuse of power; greedy; and incompetent, politically unstable leaders - in effect, suspicious leaders who undermine their own democracies (Masango 2002:707). Has bad leadership with its associated problems come about as a result of the African philosophy of leadership or culture? Are there beliefs and practices that culturally account for our apparent incurable corrupt tendencies? Dalglish believes that Culture is slow to change, but it does change. These changes mostly come about in response to external factors, like changes in climate or ways of making a living, such as moving from agriculture to industry. But for these changes to be lasting they need to build on what came before. “Leaders create this bridge” (cited in Khoza 2005:52). Masango (2002:708) rightly

maintains that Africa is faced with a challenge of nurturing and shaping new models of leadership and not neglecting our Africa heritage.

Raising this critical leadership consciousness among Africans requires genuine deconstruction and reconstruction of the African sense of being apart from political apathy, collusion with the domestic and transnational elites in perpetuating the current unequal and unjust order, satisfaction with mediocrity, gullibility to vague political promises and some leaders fanning the ember of the ugly nationalism, tribalism and the xenophobic dependencies developing in the West, East, or the South (lately). Such leadership will chart away from dependence on development assistance, uncritical acceptance of exogenously scripted development strategies, and general acquiescence-cum-susceptibility to neo-imperial designs (Gumede, 2017:81).

These leaders with new orientation are to help Africa to become innovative, for leadership is effective when through it the problems afflicting followers are resolved. Not lost on the current crop of Africans is the need to build an infrastructure of new leaders, where older leaders share their wisdom and pass on good African values to the next generation. Gumede (2017:717) posits “good leadership in Africa always shares life to others”. His belief is that this kind of leadership will lead others back to the basics of African resurgence and be a reflection of the moral African virtues that produces lasting benefits for the continent (Gumede 2017:718).

Academics are not alone in the knowledge of the urgent need for a new leadership movement for Africa, Rotberg (2004:16) has noted with delight that an African Heads of State meeting in 2003 decided to confront the continent's pathology of poor leadership with deeds as well as words and proposals for the African Union. He recalled, the Code of African Leadership, for example, says in its first commandment that leaders should "offer a coherent vision of individual growth and national advancement with justice and dignity for all, encourage dissent and disagreement, respect human rights and civil liberties, strengthen the rule of law, promote

policies that eradicate poverty and improve the well-being of their citizens, ensure a strong code of ethics, refuse to use their offices for personal gain, oppose corruption” (Rotberg 2004:17).

In sum, “the task facing researchers of African leadership is which of the enduring traditional African concepts and ideas can be salvaged for adoption or re-use in a situation where Africans continue to experience ongoing conflicts between foreign and indigenous concepts and ideas” (O’Malley 2009:9). O’Malley continues, a people's philosophy mirrors the essence of who they are and where they are going in the light of their history, values, ideals, self-image and the nature of their relationships with the world around them. As Gyekye has noted that a given culture becomes the source of a philosophy and creates the controlling and organising categories and principles for philosophising (O’Malley 2009:11). Leadership is central to these social dynamics and relationships (O’Malley 2009:10). It is important to agree with O’Malley that

“The affirmation of the existence of African leadership does not imply that this brand of leadership is totally different from, inferior or superior to the Western or oriental brands of leadership. The affirmation is brought about by the need to allow Africans to apply and adopt and adapt different leadership practices or styles to circumstances that are uniquely African” (O’Malley 2009:12).

While at it African symbolism for boldness and forthrightness, cultural categories for heroism, the symbolism for courage, truth and creativity and the principled life leadership in our cultural orientations can be allowed space in the new African leadership.

In subscribing to the pristine African leadership orientations as espoused by the scholars above, the inherent challenges today and the great hope ahead of Africa, the question remains, how was leadership carried out in the traditional African setting? A search for a response to this question points to the Social Interactional Perspective adopted by this research from the Akan worldview. To the Akans of Ghana leadership is interaction, thus, social interactionism is being

used as a heuristic tool to observe the Markan Jesus in order to understand his leadership and give fresh impetus to leadership in Ghana (Africa).

### **1.10 Ghanaian Traditional Notion of Leadership**

“Leadership in the cultural perspective is exercised not so much by scientific management as by guarding essential values of the culture, by reminding people in the organization of the essential meanings of the culture, by promoting rituals and celebrations which sustain those essential meanings and values of the organization” (Starratt 1993:5). Starratt’s view is adopted here as an essential understanding for the use of the Ghanaian traditional notion of leadership. The Ghanaian traditional notion of leadership is nothing other than the humane leadership cherished across Africa and is best expressed through interaction. I build my argument on the Ghanaian interactionism model, how are good leaders known or judged in the Ghanaian cultural context? The fact is, in Ghana and perhaps the rest of Sub-Saharan Africa leaders are understood from interaction – how they treat others, relate and so on. To traditional Ghanaians culture leadership is seen in light of interaction. Put another way, traditionally to the Ghanaian (Akan) leadership is about interacting with people. It may not be simplistic to say, in the African context that interaction is leadership, in that articulate, intelligent and skilled person is not necessarily viewed as a good leader if his or her interactions does not point to that. Social Interactional performance is crucial to the African understanding of leadership. This is often unrecognized for what it is, that leadership from African perspective particularly the Akan is not by certificates and whatever. Leadership within an African context is service, service that is embodied in interactive performance. And the people though do not have a dictionary of ticking the boxes or indexing performance, they have a way of decoding the performance of a leader in all those activities in the public space; in this case, their front region according to Goffman.

As noted earlier, the persuasiveness in the use of the social interactionism perspective lies in the fact that previous approaches have emphasized the cultural context of Jesus without looking at his interactions in the text. From an African (Akan) perspective two cultural typologies namely *nyimpa* (A being), *panyin* (elder or leader), illuminate leadership as interaction. '*Nyimpa*' (A being), does mean the physical being but has metaphorical meaning too. It is how a person treat others and relates, it is in interactions that the Akans are able to tell whether one is '*Nyimpa*' or '*Nyimpan*' (Not a being), hence, one is able to function as an effective leader. In this sense, a being is not what he or she says he or she is, but how he or she performs in the Akan social context, and therefore what Jesus might have said is more plausible from an African perspective if it is understood from how he performed, how it was understood and how it was decoded. Given that from a Ghanaian Akan point of view leadership is understood from the perspective of interaction; words, gestures, and emotions in interaction as it were are not ordinary, words follow gestures then a behaviour is formed which yield discernible leadership pattern. The performance of the individual in terms of clothes, how he or she wears shoes, gestures and mannerisms, how he or she talks with the opposite sex, how he or she addresses the elderly among others are all part of the interactions that speak to the African understanding of leadership. To the Ghanaian (Akan), is Jesus '*Nyimpa*' (a being) or '*Nyimpan*' (not a being) in his leadership? Is Jesus humane in his leadership performance?

*Opanyin* (an elder or a leader) in the Akan cultural paradigm connotes a synergy between a leader and the aged of the community. Every elder in the Community is an assumed leader whose duty it is, to help socialize the young and preserve societal norms. In the same thinking, when one is appointed a positional leader irrespective of age one is received as an elder. There is therefore, appointed leaders like chiefs and collective leadership by all the elders of the Community. In Ghana, what we find is that leadership is at the village level and the village is led by the elders, incidentally elders in the Communities see themselves as such. There are

good and bad elders – What is the criteria of a good elder? – He is an elder who greets people, who is caring, who embodies the cultural values of the Akan that is the being of the person. The elder, is the one who uses cultural values to ensure justice and prosperity of his people. A good elder is actually an epitome of good interaction, and advances family and community.

In the Ghanaian (African) context, people might decode all of these in determining whether this particular leader is *nyimpa* or not. Could Jesus be a leader who is *nyimpa* and *opanyin* from an Akan perspective? Our blockage to such reality is the text; to get to understand Jesus could be accomplished through the application of social interactionism perspective laced with African insights. So social interactionism will help us to read the text but also to revisit Jesus' identity in interaction in the public space and to assume how those interactions were understood.

The private space, or the background of a leader also comes into assessment in an African (Ghanaian) context - the way he raises his family, the way he treats his wife; the way we see him treat his kids, does he not smoke or drink? This is how the African understands leadership, and therefore people like Kwame Nkrumah are lifted up as social examples because of the way they did all these things. Equally, persons who are not good leaders are also measured in the way they have acted privately and publicly. Drawing on the Ghanaian traditional notion of leadership, this study acknowledges the difference between cultural practices as in the way things are done now pertaining to leadership and cultural values, and the way things should be done.

The Akan cultural practices and values provide the context for leadership formation and practice in the Akan community. The Akan cultural values are informed mostly by concern for human welfare which, welfare is appreciated in the light of collective well-being of the people

(Gyekye 1996:57). Cultural practices such as chieftaincy, family connectedness, care for others, greetings, and many others are derived from the experiences of the people in living together. These cultural practices are based on cultural and traditional values comprising - sharing, mutual aid, caring for others, interdependence, solidarity, reciprocal obligation, hospitality, faithfulness, and truthfulness. Others are actions which bring peace, justice, dignity, respect, happiness, social morality and social harmony (Gyekye 1996:35, 57-58). The communal cultural values of solidarity, mutual helpfulness, interdependence, and concern for the well-being of every member of society have been best expressed within family relationships (Gyekye 1996:75). Unfortunately, some of these cherished cultural values have been adulterated and corrupted in practice over the years. It is these corrupted cultural values which have inadvertently become the leadership ambience by which young leaders are socialized into leadership in the contemporary Akan Society.

For instance, the Akan leaders' bid to demonstrate these values in the revered family centeredness or connectedness has given rise to nepotism in leadership. Being respectful and polite to elders and authority appear to have resulted in uncritical, sycophantic followers and overbearing leaders who in everyday interactions see themselves above critical and probing questions from followers. The Akan culture prescribes respect for age. As laudable as this is, it seems to have created a system where persons in authority see age as another strand of authority for them. In some cases young people outside of leadership get bullied by elders in leadership and young persons in leadership get bullied by elderly followers because they are seen as their children. Probably, the elderly in the Akan culture are emboldened by adages such as 'ɔpanyin nndzi fɔ wo abofra enyim' (literal meaning, the elderly cannot be guilty before the young).

Again, family centeredness expressed in adages such as ‘wo na ba wɔ eguabadua do a, nndzi eguaba bun’ which, literally means (if your brother is on a guava tree you do not eat unripe guava). Perhaps, the import of the adage is that one must use one's office or position to help one's relations. It creates a wanton expectation of help in family relations, favours and help are expected from each other especially those in authority. ‘Sɛ afa-na-afa nnka, ɔnnkyere dɛ ɔnana mmbeba nnko (if two on the same side or family do not agree, it does not mean that a stranger can come and take the bounty away). The effect of these adages or philosophies is the corruption which has become endemic in the Ghanaian society today. Leaders tend to engage their family members, friends and loved ones around them in public office and so are unable to crack the whip whenever anything goes wrong.

Furthermore, certain cultural inhibitions placed on leaders like chiefs and queen mothers render them not easily accessible to members of the community. Gyekye (1996:109) has rightly observed that the taboos relating to the chief or the queen mother's conduct and mannerism are all intended to remind him or her and his or her subjects and others that the position he or she occupies is sacred. Some of these taboos and inhibitions have cut off some Akan leaders from their community members, and others have employed the taboos as tools with which they lord it over their people. For example, a chief is not permitted to laugh out loud in public. He is required to demonstrate some form of composure and control over himself. The stern outlook a chief is supposed to portray, cuts him off from the many as unsociable, it makes the people feel that the chief is different from them, and not just the first among equals. Hierarchy is deliberately created as a result of these taboos.

There is an inordinately long protocol one has to go through in order to see the chief, the plight of the common people is exacerbated by the hefty fines placed on them when they have made

mistakes before the chief or queen mother even in speech. There are some chiefs who hardly mingle with members of the community and some live in secluded places.

Some Akan leaders actually lead through intermediaries, because they hardly talk in public. If they have to, they do so through linguists. This practice is anchored in the accepted cultural value that the chief should not make mistakes in public, thus, the linguist speaking on his behalf insulates the chief from mistakes. The resultant interaction can be argued to be between the linguist and members of the community. Some do not greet through handshakes in public, and a chief is not to walk alone. Some are approached from a distance.

In spite of challenging cultural practices, there is a rich repertoire of traditional Akan values emanating from the chieftaincy systems, through clan leadership to Asafo (Warrior Group) leadership, some of the leadership markers are:

- Paternalistic leadership style – where the leader is seen as a father of the community
- Spearheading – the leader is expected to go ahead in communal labour, funerals among others.
- Community minded – ensuring the well-being of all in the community without discrimination yet hierarchical.
- Role-modelling – the leader is to set an example in all things
- Sacrificing for others – the leader is to sacrifice for or help others.
- Servant of all – the function as a servant to the clan, tribe or community
- Decent language
- Treating others like relations – due to the high sense of collectivism in Akan culture.
- General comportment and mannerism in private and in public.

These markers are not expressed in formalized ways but in the everyday interaction of the leader with the people. This traditional Ghanaian notion of leadership will inform the analysis of Jesus' social interactions in Mark.

### **1.11 Summary**

By researching the topic “Exploring Jesus’ Social Interactions in Mark’s Gospel for Good Leadership Practice in Ghana”, I wish to make a contribution on how leadership is conveyed through interaction by observing Jesus’ interaction as performed by the early church in the Gospel of Mark. And as noted earlier the tool for observation is social interactionism specifically employing Ritual making, Frame making, Characterisation, Encounter processing, Stage making and Role-taking delineated from Goffman’s Interactional Order and Dramaturgy or Presentation of Self and Mead’s Mind, Self and Society (see chapter two for details) from a Ghanaian perspective, which is delineated in the next chapter. This study agrees that there are many facets to Jesus’ leadership. As such its main thesis holds that leadership is interaction, so observing and interpreting Jesus’s interaction as performed by the early church is the beginning of discovering the true nature of his leadership which can lead to interactional leadership model. By extension, it is also the beginning of a solution to the contemporary leadership problems that plague Africa.

## CHAPTER TWO

### THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVE: SOCIAL INTERACTIONISM

#### **2. Introduction**

This chapter proceeds with establishing the rationale for the choice of social interactionism perspective as the analytical tool for this study. It delineates the perspective, which process will involve four aspects. The first, traces its historical development that will lead to the identification of the analytical concepts or notions which, with their heuristic properties shall offer the needed lens to explore Jesus' interactions in Mark. To this end, social interactional analytical perspective espoused by Erving Goffman which includes ritual making, social ritualization, people processing encounters, characterisation, frame making, and stage making (dramaturgy) will be outlined. In addition, George Herbert Mead's role-taking (self-interaction) will also be delineated as a credible social interactional analytical tool. The second, involves a further articulation and delineation of the perspective which shall bring into focus the coagulation of Goffman's social interactional analytical tools and Mead's role-taking. The third, comprises the coagulation of social interactionism perspective and the Ghanaian traditional notion of leadership will be discussed with a view to establish them as plausible fused analytical tools. The fourth, consists of the summary of the key tenets of the social interactionism perspective, and provides an evaluation of social interactionism as a credible and relevant analytical tool for the study.

#### **2.1 Rationale for the use of Social Interactionism Perspective**

Social interactionism (symbolic interactionism) is developed here as a theoretical perspective to re-imagine Jesus' social interactions in Mark's Gospel, with a view to glean his modelled leadership principles for good practices in Ghana. Social interactionism is being used with a sense of an African understanding of leadership. There are two challenges to this hypothesis,

first, how do we re-look at Jesus when memory only exists to us through the memory of the first century church? Second, which performance of Jesus, given that we have three, if not four varieties of memory performances (the Gospels)? We draw on Oakman's (2008:125) view to respond to the first challenge. He maintains that "one of the methods employed for getting past socially anachronistic interpretations of the gospel tradition has been the use of the rich body of knowledge, models, and theory that the social sciences have to offer". The use of such social science oriented informed biblical approaches and perspectives have attracted sharp critique<sup>1</sup> though it has much more positive responses. Malina makes an important point that biblical exegesis has always been multidisciplinary, so Social Science informed approaches are not novel venture and are not deviating from common practice. The advent of critical biblical investigation in the eighteenth century came with the need for historical biblical scholars to master a range of disciplines like proficiency in ancient (at least Hebrew, Greek, Aramaic and Latin) and modern languages like German, literary theory (ancient, medieval and modern), theology (ancient, medieval and modern) and philosophy (ancient, medieval and modern) as part of their toolkit of their craft. The essence of all these was to ensure that historically oriented biblical interpretation discovers what the ancient biblical document (the Bible) meant to its original audience. This same purpose give impetus for social science informed perspectives of hermeneutics. This endeavour is even more embolden given that it has been established that biblical interpretation, indeed, is a form of cross-cultural study. The interpretation of

---

<sup>1</sup>For detail critiques of Social Science informed approaches of biblical exegesis see Judge, E. A., 1980. "The Social Identity of the First Christians: A Question of Method in Religious History", *JRH*, 11, pp.201-217.  
Rood, C.S., 1981. "On Applying Sociological Theory to Biblical Studies", *JSOT*, 19, pp95-106.  
Stowers, S. K., 1985. "The Social Sciences and the Study of Early Christianity", in *Approaches to Ancient Judaism*, Green W.S., ed, and *Studies in Judaism and Its Greco-Roman Context* 5, pp149-181, Atlanta, Scholars Press.  
Tidball, D. J. 1985. "On Wooing a Crocodile: A Historical Survey of the Relationship between Sociology and New Testament Studies", *Vox Evangelica*, 15, pp. 95-109.  
Mosala, I. J., 1986. "Social Scientific Approaches to the Bible: One Step Forward, TwoSteps Backward", *Journal of Theology for South Africa*, 15, pp.15-31.

documents from alien times and cultures has always been multidisciplinary. It is the recognition of the reality among others, that meaning resides in the social system of a particular people, and that a distinctive system of meaning of various human societies derive from and maintain their distinctive social systems is what makes the case for Social Interactionism as a perspective for this study appropriate (see Malina 1996:xi-xii).

Social interaction involves large number of behaviours, to the extent that it is usually divided into five categories: exchange, competition, cooperation, conflict, and coercion. Social interaction can be analysed between groups of two (dyads), three (triads) or larger social groups. A place to start is looking at how the early Christian communities performed the Jesus narrative and how such performances were dramatized as paradigm of social interaction. Such analysis involves the bodily movement, gestures, words, actions and other interactional practices; those of the Markan Gospel for that matter Jesus, are situated in that large first century socio-cultural milieu.

## **2.1 Development and History of Social Interactionism**

Social Interactionism is a sociological perspective often referred to as symbolic interactionism yet symbolic interactionism is only an aspect of it. The term social interactionism was coined by Herbert Blumer to indicate analysis of social interaction. It is believed to have roots in the American philosophical tradition of pragmatism in the late 19th century, advanced by William James, John Dewey, and Charles S. Peirce. It became a prominent theoretical perspective in American sociology during the 1960s as a contrast to Functionalism Perspective. Intellectually, Social Interactionism has its foundation in the works of George Simmel, Robert Park, William Isaac Thomas, Charles Horton Cooley, John Dewey, and George Herbert Mead, and Max Weber (Wallace & Wolf 2005:199). Others include Robert E. Park, William James, Florian

Znaniecki, James Mark Baldwin, Robert Redfield, and Louis Wirth (Blumer 1969:1). However, its greatest advocates have been United States sociologists George Herbert Mead and Herbert Blumer, with Erving Goffman, a Canadian, as its primary practitioner (Wallace & Wolf 2005:198). This perspective examines meaning, action, and interaction at the micro level, and was developed by the works of Mead on “Self”, “Self-interaction”, “the Development of Self”, and “Symbolic Meaning” which set the foundation for this perspective (Wallace & Wolf 2005:204). Symbols contain information or concepts that the individual in interaction intends to convey, or does convey to interactional participants.

Blumer (1969) continued with his work on interpretation; dealing with structure, process, and methodology of symbolic interactionism. Goffman’s ‘ritual making’ frame making and “stage making” advance the perspective further. The work of Arlie Russell Hochschild Smith has expanded the horizon of social interactionism; her research on Sociology of emotions introduced a new micro-level perspective. Similarly, Patricia Hill Collins use of self-definition to analyse race, class, and gender as they affect African-American women has brought another dimension. The Social Interactionism Perspective methodologically, has broadened to include contextualised discourse analysis, ethnographic observation, ethnomethodologies, content analysis, textual analysis, performance studies, and autoethnography. Interactionism has also become a more prominent perspective in a diverse array of disciplines.

In his work, *A Theory of Social Interaction*, Turner (1988) took the approach of synthesising all the aspects of the social interactionism. He maintains that Social interaction is the most basic unit of sociological analysis (Turner 1988:14). Social Interaction involves conceptualisation of interaction unit acts as the most basic elements of sociological analysis. Sociological analysis develops abstract laws and models that explain the operative dynamics

of human interaction. Turner argues that social interaction is a series of processes, each of which requires separate theoretical principles. However, earlier theories about social interaction have tended to be universal as one scheme is often proposed for all aspects of this process. For example, Parson's action theory (Parsons, 1951) analysed social interaction as static typologies of interaction, in this sense avoiding the detailed analysis of its constituent parts. Other theories have seen social interaction in terms of process, whether it is exchange (Homans 1961), ethnomethodology (Garfinkel 1967), symbolic interaction (Blumer 1969), stage making (dramaturgy) (Goffman 1959), or interaction rituals (Collins 1986). Turner (1988:15) notes that these approaches do conceptualize a variety of processes, but these processes are rarely viewed as separate topics of theorizing. Consequently, social interaction often denotes as a unitary phenomenon. On the contrary, Turner (1988:15) maintains that social interaction should be viewed as involving three separate but interrelated aspects: motivational, interactional process, and structuring. He opines that if these aspects are collapsed together into one process, our understanding of social interaction is reduced.

The motivational aspect implies the varying degrees and in diverse ways, how individuals are energized and mobilized in their interactions with others (Turner 1988:15). The fact is, individuals are either willing, or unwilling, to put in energy in their dealings with each other hence the varying intensity of individual's interaction with others. What accounts for the difference is the motivation. By interactional processes, Turner (1988:15-16) meant, what people actually do when they influence each other's behaviour, involving the controlled operation of humans' behavioural capacities. These capacities involve gesturing a course of behaviour and, at the same time, interpreting both one's own behavioural signals and those of others. To buttress his view, he argues, for instance, exchange theory in both its behaviourist (Homans 1961) and utilitarian (Coleman 1972) forms is a theory of motivation, telling us why

individuals mobilize varying degrees of energy in an interactional situation. Symbolic interactionism (Blumer 1969) is primarily a theory of interactional processes. To the extent that one views social interaction only in exchange-theory or symbolic interaction terms means a theory of motivation or interaction process will be imposed upon other critical processes (Turner 1988:16). The structuring aspect of social interaction refers to the fact that social interactions are often repeated across time as well as organized in physical space. How and why social interactions become structured need to be explored on its own (Turner 1988:16).

The interrelationship between motivational, interactional, and structuring processes is obvious. The manner in which people signal and interpret are related to their motivational energies. In turn, motivation is limited by prevailing structural arrangements as well as by the course of signalling and interpreting; and the structure of an interaction is very much determined by the motivational profiles of individuals as these affect their signalling and interpreting activities (Turner 1988:16). Analytical models as they are known, are highly abstract but represents general classes of variables and their causal relations. Accordingly, Turner (1988:17) argues that each of the three constituent processes of social interaction: motivational, interactional, structuring should have its clearly constructed model delineating the relevant classes of variables and their most important causal relations. Such models could provide a picture of processes of how variables influence each other across time and space while giving a view of complex causal processes.

Flowing from Turner's argument this study finds it plausible employing the notions of Goffman's ritual making, characterisation, frame making and stage making, along with Mead's role-taking to observe and analyse Jesus' performances the interactional processes, motivation and interactional structure in the selected passages (Mark 6:30-44; 7:1-23; 7:24-20; 10:35-40;

and 15:1-20) in the Gospel of Mark. The delineation of the ideas contained in three aspects of the Social Interactionism Perspective provides a plausible heuristic lens with which to observe Jesus and glean his leadership principles and practices as underpinned his interactional approach.

## **2.2 Notions of Social Interactionism**

Social Interactionism like any other perspective consist of different notions with which social phenomena are analysed. The strand of social interactionism as a perspective for analysing social interaction carefully selected for this study as advanced by Goffman and Mead are delineated below:

### **2.2.1 Erving Goffman's Social Interactional Analytical Perspective**

The Goffman's social interactional analytical perspective is defined in his works, the "Presentation of Self" (1959, Dramaturgy), "Interaction Ritual" (1967), "Frame Analysis" (1974) and "Interactional Order" (1983). The perspective analyses everyday life and social interaction. It involves Ritual Making, Frame Making and Stage Making, People Processing Encounters, and Characterisation as analytical tools. This mode of micro analysis offers creative conceptual insights into how people interact. It underscores, by example and illustration, what actors do in interactive contexts structured by the macro universe (macrostructures and collective orientation) wielding overriding influence but unexpressed. Goffman's link of interaction to the influence of macrostructures is what distinguishes him from other Interactionists who object to macro structuralism and functionalism modes of analysis. He looked at modern symbolic interactionism's over-concern with self-conception (self as the causal force in organizing how individuals signal and interpret) with suspicion along with role theory, ethnomethodology, critical theorists and European structuralism's reduction of social structure to the dynamics of speech, language, and linguistics (Turner 1988:91). Yet

he does not subscribe to full structuralism and functionalism<sup>2</sup>, the dominant sociological paradigm in the 1950s which were advanced by Spencer (1820-1803) and Durkheim (1858-1917) and their followers (A. R. Radcliffe-Brown 1881–1955); Bronislaw Malinowski (1884–1942); Talcott Parsons (1902–1979) and Robert Merton (1910–2003).

In his work on Interactional Order within Social Interaction, Goffman made a great contribution to analysis of Society. According to him, Interactional Order is the social domain of face-to-face interaction which uses microanalysis as its main method. He calls for the recognition of interaction as a distinct social domain for the analysis of Society. While promoting the acceptance of this face-to-face domain, he was convinced that Interactional Order is an analytically viable one (Goffman 1983:2). Interactional Order analytical domain is concerned with the structure, process, and product of social interaction. For Goffman (1983:11), interactions have their own structure and a critical feature of face-to-face gatherings is that in them and them alone we can fit a shape and dramatic form to matters that are not otherwise palpable to the senses. Order as used by Goffman (1983:5) refers to a domain of activity that is a particular kind of activity without inferences to how "orderly" such activity ordinarily is. For instance, through appearance, costume, gesture, and bodily alignment we can show and represent a heterogeneous list of immaterial things about an individual.

Goffman maintains that the reality of our human condition is that, for most of us, our daily life is spent in the immediate presence of others; in other words, that whatever they are, our doings are likely to be, in the narrow sense, socially situated to the extent that activities pursued in utter privacy can easily come to be characterized by this special condition (1983:2). This

---

<sup>2</sup> In sociology, functionalism was a theoretical perspective that emphasized that the parts of a social system are interrelated in such a way that none of them can be fully understood except in terms of their effects on the others. The relationships between the parts of a social system constitute the structures of that system, and social structures, social processes, and other social phenomena are to be explained in terms of their functions, which are, for most theorists, their contributions to the continued stable existence of the system (See International Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences, 2nd Edition).

denotes that whenever individuals come into each other's presence they are in a social situation. Social situation according to him covers ambulatory units, contacts, conversational encounters, formal meetings, platform performances, and social occasions.

Borrowing from Durkheim (1858-1917) and Schutz (1932), Goffman argues that individuals possess a large inventory of shared understandings and orientations which is used in daily interactions. These shared understanding and orientations denote the cultural categories which are internalised by individuals. They inspire the vehicle for signalling and interpretation tools which are ritual making, frame making, stage making, people processing encounters and characterisation in social interaction. The processes of mutually signalling and interpreting are the vehicle by which actors influence each other's responses. Therefore a theoretical analysis of interaction of necessity must explain the dynamics of signalling and interpreting of gestures (Turner 1988:83). These five vehicles and interpretational tools are summarised below:

#### ***2.2.1.1 Ritual Making (Social Ritualization)***

In social interaction, Goffman argued for analysis of social ritualization. Social Ritualization is 'the standardization of bodily and vocal behaviour through socialization, affording such behaviour – such gestures, if you will – a specialized communicative function in the stream of behaviour' (Goffman 1983:3). Ritual is understood as the line an individual in a social encounter, either face-to-face or mediated, act out in a kind of pattern verbal or nonverbal, consciously or not, by which he expresses views of the situation and by it evaluates participants (Goffman 1967:5). For Goffman ritual permeates every aspect of daily life, including the most ordinary interactions. Social interaction in whichever form involves some opening and closing rituals. Rituals signal entry into a social situation and actors' involvement in a social context. They ensure the ordering of interaction in this context, and reinforce the larger cultural and

structural context. In Goffman's thought, a great deal of signalling in interaction revolves around ritual-making.

This allows for gleaning each other's actions through observation. In social interaction, Goffman believes that whenever individuals, for whatever reason, come into one another's immediate presence, a fundamental condition of social life becomes pronounced, particularly its evidential character involving appearance and manner (1983:3). Our appearance and manner in interaction do provide evidence of our status and relationships. He further suggests that the line of our visual regard, the intensity of our involvement, and the shape of our initial actions, allow others to glean our immediate intent and purpose, and all this whether or not we are engaged in talk with them at the time. Correspondingly, the actor is constantly in a position to facilitate this revelation of himself or herself or block it, or even misdirect our viewers (1983:3). In each other's presence individuals share a joint focus of attention, perceive that they do so, and perceive this perceiving through contact rituals, namely, perfunctory or things done routinely, brief expressions occurring incidental to everyday action. This, in conjunction with their capacity to indicate their own courses of physical action and to rapidly convey reactions to such indications from others, provides the precondition for something crucial: the sustained, intimate coordination of action, whether in support of closely collaborative tasks or as a means of accommodating closely adjacent ones.

Speech immensely increases the efficiency of such coordination, being especially critical when something does not go as indicated and expected. Speech, of course, has another special role, allowing matters sited outside the situation to be brought into the collaborative process, and allowing plans to be negotiated regarding matters to be dealt with beyond the current situation, but that is another and forbiddingly complex issue (1983:3). The social ritualization provides plausibility of knowing and following Jesus in the Mark corpus. In that it enables this study to

explore for possible performance rituals in Jesus' interaction in the selected passages. What was Jesus' appearance and manner in the interaction process? What were his visual regard, the intensity of his involvement and the shape of his initial actions in the interactional process? What are the observable contact rituals that is the perfunctory and brief expressions? How did he use speech in the interactional process? What gestures were used in these interactions? What did that signal mean unto those in whose immediate presence He was? The speeches and the words of Jesus in these interactions appear very forceful: what kind of front did he want to present and what kind of impression did the other actors gather from their interpretation of Jesus?

#### ***2.2.1.2 People Processing Encounters***

A further analytical dimension of interactional order is what Goffman calls 'processing encounters' (Wallace & Wolf 2006:245). Goffman (1983:8) explained people-processing encounters as those "encounters in which the 'impression' subjects make during the interaction affects their life chances". Impressions are how subjects present themselves in the interaction. This kind of social interaction has subjects (individuals whose fate are determined in the process) and gatekeepers or deciders in the mix. People processing encounters has formalized, institutionalized, or more structured forms like the placement interview as conducted by school counsellors, and courtroom officials. However, the focus of microanalysis is on the less candid, less structured or the more situational forms of people processing encounters. Goffman describes processing encounters as ubiquitous in that they happen everywhere between any two or more individuals; in this sense, everyone is a gatekeeper regarding something. For example, something as informal as a marriage proposal to a woman is a processing encounter. It works this way, as Goffman explains, as individuals come into people processing situations whether in an institutionalized setting or not, deciders are equipped with vast experiences from their

cultural context of facts and fantasies of indicators bordering on status, character, and impression somehow making persons readable.

This is so because as Dubois (2004:3) has rightly observed, participants play their role according to the attributes defined at the macro level that are presented and perceived during the interaction. Based on their perception according to Dubois, the other participants' attributes which are mostly informed by their perception of the perceptions of their own attributes by other participants could be noted. This constitute the way to account for the presence of the social order in the interaction order. That is why the social situations tend to provide us with evidence of a participant's various attributes. The situational dimension of the processing encounters is "the evidence they so fully provide of a participant's real or apparent attributes while at the same time allowing life chances to be determined through an inaccessible weighting of this complex of evidence" (Goffman, 1983:8).

In the social situation of processing encounter, deciders could use open-ended list of rationalizations to conceal from subjects the mix of considerations that feature in their decisions, especially relative weight assigned to the several determinants; a quiet sorting occurs. This subjective value placed on many social attributes, irrespective of these attributes being officially relevant or not, and whether they are real or fanciful, provides a micro-dot of puzzlement. It is important to state that the structural attributes, openly or covertly employed, do not mesh fully with personal ones, such as health or vigour, or with properties that have all of their existence in social situations like looks, personality, and the like. This process of impression making and subjective weighting of social attributes leads the decider to make signals which affect the life chance of the subject. As Goffman noted, the processing encounters does affect the person involved as well as the social institutions (1983:8). People

processing encounter provides a window of analysis of the interaction performance of Jesus in the selected passages (Mark 7:24-30 where Jesus is gatekeeper or decider) in the Markan Gospel. A number of issues can be raised for observation and analysis: Were there processing encounters in his social interactions? If there were, was Jesus a subject or decider? What social impression did the subjects of Jesus in the interactions make of him? What factors were possibly used in the weighing of the social attributes? What effects did these processing encounters have on the subjects and social structure of the Jewish people? Could there be observable leadership principles implicit in Jesus' interactions in these people processing encounters that could be unravelled?

### ***2.2.1.3 Characterisation***

Interactional Order's cog of characterization also provides a lens to observe and analyse the interactions of Jesus. Characterisation, a quintessential aspect of the interactional process is placing the individual before one's immediate presence in certain social category based on one's assumption of him or her. According to Goffman (1983:3), the characterization that an individual can make of another because the one is able to directly observe and hear the other involved in the interaction carries two essential kinds of identifications. He calls the first, Categorical characterisation, which is a kind of characterization involving placing the other in one or more social categories. The second, Individual characterisation, consists of putting the individual in one's immediate presence in uniquely distinguishing identity via his or her appearance, tone of voice, mention of name or any other person-differentiating device.

Categorical characterisation in a particular social situation appears obvious; we can almost always be categorically identified in our ways on entrance like age, race, class, gender and many others. The perceptibility of these traits in social situations cannot be seen as entirely

accidental. In most cases, socialization, in subtle ways, ensures our placement in these regards (Goffman 1983:14). He further explains that the reality of social interaction is such that the choice of words, phrases and interactional devices is according to what the “categoric or individual identity of our putative recipients allows us to assume they already know, and knowing this, do not mind our openly presuming on” (Goffman 1983:4). This means characterisation largely suggests one’s gestures, bodily movement, words and performance in the interactional process. Characterisation makes it possible to understand some of the interactional performance of Jesus and other interactants in the Gospel of Mark. It should be possible with the tool of characterisation to ask – In the immediate presence of each other, what categories did Jesus and his other interactants find themselves in per each other’s characterisation? How apropos were Jesus and his other interactants characterisation? To what extent are the performance of Jesus based on his characterisation of the other interactants? What effect did Jesus’ decision have on the social structure of the Jewish community where it was not only a taboo for religious leaders to engage women directly let alone a non-Jew?

Goffman did not only observe the interactional process in terms of the order, he also saw individuals in social interaction as actors on the social stage who are performing like actors on a theatrical stage, that which he called dramaturgy.

#### ***2.2.1.4 Frame Making***

Goffman (1974) submits that as individuals gesture and produce rituals, they frame an interaction. He illustrates his point with an analogy of a picture frame that encloses a subject matter and marks the boundaries of what can and cannot occur. The kind of gestures, rituals individuals in a social situation choose to express is a way of frame making the interaction, which is determining what is acceptable and excluding what is excluded in the interaction. Framing is not static, humans' dynamic deliberative capacities allow them to shift frames rather

easily, broadening, narrowing, or even changing their substantive content (Turner 1988:93). The mechanism of framing and reframing interaction allows for interpersonal flexibility and redirection of existing structures. Framing is also influenced by the knowledge store of actors about gestures, varying frames and contexts. The framing tool allows for the enquiries: did Jesus use framing in his interactions? What was the nature of the framing he used?

#### ***2.2.1.5 Stage Making (Dramaturgy)***

The general idea that we make a presentation of ourselves to others is scarcely new in the interactional task that we all share (Goffman 1971:244). An interactional process (face-to-face interaction) may be defined “as the reciprocal influence of individuals upon one another’s actions when in one another’s immediate physical presence” (Goffman 1971:244). The interactions constitute an encounter, which may be defined as “all the interactions which occur throughout any one occasion when a given set of individuals are in one another’s continuous presence” (Goffman 1971:244).

In Goffman’s (1971) study of social interaction he adopted an approach often referred to as dramaturgy; meaning that he viewed social life as something like a staged drama. To him interaction takes place on a social stage (Charon 2007:174-175). Goffman (1971) saw staging and dramaturgical or stagecraft dimension as means of signalling in interaction. Interaction is like a stage, with actors entering and exiting front and backstage regions forming impression and making impression. On the stage gestures are released to create a performance informed by the macrostructure and shared cultural orientations. Various physical props of the stage are used to enhance a performance, that is to say interaction revolves around people's use of relative positioning of bodies, movement back and forth between backstage and frontstage regions. Stage making indicates to others what to expect from an individual and what is expected in return for a specific performance (Turner 1988:93).

The stage presents things that are made-up. Presumably, life presents things that are real and sometimes not well rehearsed. Impressions are how subjects present themselves in the interaction. The individual will act in an intentional calculating manner, expressing himself or herself in a defined a way in order to foster the kind of impression to others that is likely to evoke from them a specific response. In fact, while we are forming impressions of others on the basis of the expression of self, they are also doing the same of us. Dramaturgy considers social interaction as impression making.

From this drama point of view, individuals in interaction are seen as performers. These social performers require information about each other for successful interaction, which information they do not ask for but perceive from each other's acting and interpreting actions to inform each other's actions. If the individual in another's immediate presence is not previously known, the other observes clues from conduct and appearance which creates the possibility of applying his or her previous experience of persons somewhat similar to the one before him or her and also to relate untested stereotypes to the other. Dramaturgy is an attempt to press a mere analogy using some language of theatrical performance including performance and audience, routines and parts, performance coming off or falling flat, cues, settings, backstage and frontstage, role taking, dramaturgical needs, dramaturgical skills, and dramaturgical strategies. Hence the everyday life of individuals is like social stage where everyone is acting a role (Goffman 1971:26).

At this point, it is necessary to explain some of the dramaturgical terms. Dramaturgical interaction involves first, a performance. 'Performance' denotes all the activity of an individual which occurs during a period marked by his continuous presence before a particular set of

observers, which impart the observers. The performer or the constructor of impressions is involved in the human task of staging performance.

Performers can be honest or cynical. They are described as cynics when they do not believe in the impression fostered by their own performance, but are sincere when they believe in the impression fostered by their own performance. Cynics will do so for self-interest or private gain. The Character – the character is the figure, usually fine one, whose spirit, strength, and other sterling qualities the performance is designed to suggest. Performance uses front. 'Front' is that aspect of the individual's performance which frequently functions in a general and fixed fashion to describe the situation for those who observe the performance. Front, then, is the expressive equipment of a standard kind intentionally or unwittingly employed by the individual during his performance. Front is in two parts: Settings and Personal front. 'Setting' comprises of the furniture, decor, physical lay-out, lighting and other background items which provide the background and stage supports for the sequence of human action played out before, within, or upon it. A setting tends to stay put, geographically speaking, so that those who would use a particular setting as part of their performance cannot begin their act until they have brought themselves to the appropriate place and must terminate their performance when they leave it.

'Personal front' – is those items of expressive equipment, the items that individuals most closely identify with the performer himself or herself and that they naturally expect will follow the performer wherever he goes. As part of personal front we may include: insignia of office or rank; clothing; gender, age, and racial characteristics; size and looks; posture; speech patterns; facial expressions; bodily gestures; and the like. Personal front is made up of stimuli. Stimuli is that which a person carries or is around him or her in another's presence which gives

information about him. Stimuli can be divided into Appearance and Manner. Appearance provides evidence of status and relationship. 'Appearance' may be taken to refer to those stimuli which function at the time to tell us of the performer's social status. Stimuli shows the individual's momentary ritual state that is, whether he or she is engaging in formal social activity, work, or informal recreation, whether or not he is celebrating a new phase in the season cycle or in his life-cycle (Goffman 1971:15). Observers can glean clues from his conduct and appearance which allow them to apply their previous experience with individuals roughly similar to the one before them or, more importantly, to apply untested stereotypes to him. And Impressions are how subjects present themselves in the interaction.

Considering a particular participant and his performance in relation to those who contribute, the other performances will render the other performers audience, observers, or co-participants. Goffman believes that these situational terms can easily be related to conventional structural ones. Considering that an individual or performer plays the same part to the same audience on different occasions, then a social relationship is probable to develop. This analogy in which, Goffman (1971:246) claims the world as a stage is adequately common to many with its limitations known and tolerant of its presentation. A character played in a theatre is neither in some ways real nor does it have the equal kind of real consequences.

Goffman's dramaturgical approach places Jesus and other interactants as observable characters coming to life through the memory of the early church which was kept through Orality and Performance. Seven of its strands, are here, delineated as they hold sway in observing Jesus in interaction and providing the critical lens for interactional analysis.

First, dramaturgy's notion of the individual in a social situation as a performer and a character provides a plausible tool to observe the actions of Jesus and his interactants in the Gospel of Mark. Goffman views the individual as having two basic parts: one as the performer and the other the character. The performer is the constructor of impressions involved in the human task of staging performance. The character is the figure, usually fine one, whose spirit, strength, and other sterling qualities the performance is designed to suggest (Goffman 1971:244). Incidentally, society fairly equates the character one performs with one's self. It should be understood, that the performed self is the image which the individual presents on stage and the character is what the individual effectually attempts to induce others to hold regarding him or herself (Goffman 1971:244). The self is not derived from its possessor but imputed to the individual by the audience based on the image or the attributes fostered through the whole correctly staged and performed scene of the individual's actions.

To this end, the self is not specific to a location but a dramatic effect arising diffusely from a scene that is presented. It is a 'collaborative manufacture' (Goffman 1971:245), and the body is a mere receptacle of the self. This means the self emerges from the collaborative work of the shaping tools at the back region, the props at the front region, activities of a team of persons on stage (team collusion) and the interpretative activities of the audience. The individual as a performer and a character leads to an enquiry of, what kind of self did character Jesus foster in his interactional performance? What was the nature of his interactional performance? How does the character Jesus performed in his interactions project a profile of leadership?

Second, Goffman maintains that the interpretation is crucial to the interaction process. This makes demands on the interactants to seek information of each other through observation. This information seeking through observation of the front, manner and setting offers an insightful

lens to observe and analyse Jesus' interaction. Dramaturgy takes as its starting point the conviction that, when individuals come into the immediate presence of others they seek information about him or her or bring into play information about him or her already possessed. Goffman says that the information about the individual helps to define the situation, enabling others to know in advance what he or she will expect of them and what they are to expect of him (Goffman, 1971:13).

Charon (2007:175) adds that even with individuals well-known to us when they come into our immediate presence we are inclined to determine their current mood, their views about us and which of their many social identities they deem relevant at that particular time. We need to acquire even more information of those we do not know at all. The information is acquired through what Goffman calls an individual's front or appearance, manner and the setting where we meet to define the situation (1971:22-33). When an individual appears before others his or her actions will influence the definition of the situation which they come to have. The individual will act in a thoroughly calculating manner, expressing himself or herself in a given way solely in order to give the kind of impression to others that is likely to evoke from them a specific response.

In fact, while we are forming impressions of others on the basis of the expression of self, they are also doing the same with us. Informed in these ways, each other will know how best to act in order to call forth a desired response from each other (Goffman 1971:13). Goffman points out that when individuals are in the presence of others during the period, few events may occur which directly provide the others with the conclusive information they will need if they are to direct wisely their own activity. He was quick to add however, that there are many other crucial facts which lie beyond the time and place of interaction or lie concealed within it, like the true

or real attitudes, beliefs, and emotions of the individual which only obtained indirectly, through his affirmations or through what appears to be involuntary expressive behaviour (Goffman 1971:13). The information seeking aspect of interaction leads legitimately to the questions: what front or appearance or manner did Jesus present in his interactions? What kind of setting did Jesus prefer for his interactions?

Third, dramaturgy considers social interaction as impression making. This cog makes it possible to understand Jesus' interactions in terms of the impressions he gave and received from his interactants. According to Goffman, the individual actively creates an impression of himself or herself for the audience through the front he or she puts up. In the presentation of the self, an individual consciously, in a calculating manner, expresses himself or herself in a given way solely in order to give the kind of impression to others that is likely to evoke from them a specific response he is concerned to obtain (Goffman 1971:14). That is to say, the individual controls the impression others should have of him or her. The point is through appearance and manner or personal front individuals manage others' impression of himself or herself through their definitions of situations, and affect their conduct (Charon, 2007:176).

Impressions can be conveyed in signs; which some are relatively fixed across a period of time and do not vary for the individual from one situation to another. Others are sign vehicles which are relatively mobile and transitory like facial expression, it varies from one moment to the next. Goffman describes those activities by the individual which influence others' impression of him or her as performance. The point is that the expressive component of social life of an individual in interaction portrays an impression given to or taken by others. The impression, thus, becomes a source of information about unapparent facts and as a means by which the recipients can guide their response to an actor without having to wait for the full consequences

of the actor's actions to be known. Expression then plays a communicative role during social interaction. While the social actor, like theatrical actor, depends on costume, makeup, body carriage, dialect, props, and dramatic devices to express himself or herself.

From the expressions as Goffman argues, the other individuals in the social interaction use cues, tests, hints, expressive gestures, status symbols, among others as predictive devices to gather relevant social data on the actor (Goffman 1971:241-242). The impression which is a substitute for reality can be manipulated in the social interaction. Though this can be done, individuals are concerned with morality, and to Goffman, actors are merchants of morality. The duty and the honour of appearing in a positive moral light and of being a socialized character, enjoins individuals to be the sort of person who is presented in the ways of the stage (Goffman 1971:244). The impression fostered by the actor on theatrical or social stage is managed. The actor tries to avoid incidence such as gestures, inopportune intrusions, faux pas, and scenes which tend to give negative impression (Goffman 1971:205). Actors also adopt the defensive measures, and the protective measures used by the audience to help manage the impression. Impression is fostered through performance involving intentional actions and the communication the actor gives.

A performance may be defined as 'all the activity of a given participant on a given occasion which serves to influence in any way any of the other participants' (Goffman 1971:26). When an individual plays a part he or she secretly is requesting his or her observers to take seriously the impression that is fostered before them, asking them to accept that the attributes being portrayed by the performer are true of him or her (Goffman 1971:26).

Goffman considers front as that part of the individual's performance which commonly functions in a general and fixed way to define the situation for those who observe the performance. Front, then, is a means of a standard kind of the performer, intentionally or unintentionally used by the individual during his performance (Goffman 1971:32) to define the social situation. Goffman maintains that the stimuli which makes up a person's front. Stimuli are the agents, objects, actions or conditions that elicit a physiological or psychological activity or response from the one exposed to it. Stimuli can be divided into appearance and manner (Goffman 1971:34). Appearance refer to those stimuli which function within the period to inform observers of the actor's social statuses. They tell of the individual's temporary ritual state that is, whether he is engaging in formal social activity, work, or informal recreation, whether or not he is celebrating a new phase in the season cycle or in his life-cycle (Goffman 1971:34). Manner involves those stimuli which function within the period to suggest the interaction role the actor is likely to play in the on-coming situation. For example, a humble, apologetic manner may give the impression that the performer expects to follow the lead of others, or at least that he can be gotten to do so (Goffman 1971:35).

A further significant aspect of performers is the impression they foster on the audience making them believe that they are related to them in an ideal way than it is usually the case. Performers foster the 'impression that the routine they are presently performing is their only routine or at least their most essential one' (Goffman 1971:56). The audience, in their part, often accept that the character projected before them is all there is to the individual who presents the projection for them (Goffman 1971:57). Performers also tend to create the impression that their present performance of their routine and their relationship to their present audience have something special and unique about them. These impressions implicitly endear the performer to the audience.

For a successful impression to be created through performance, the individual divides the social stage into back region and front region. Social interaction as impression making by means of expression and performance is really vital to appreciating Jesus' interactive tool kits. What interactive tool kits (on costume, makeup, body carriage, dialect, props, and dramatic devices) did Jesus deploy to convey his impressions to the other interactants? What impression did he give and received? What cues, tests, hints, expressive gestures, status symbols, among others as predictive devices help to gather relevant social information on Jesus? Given the motif of actors in performance to foster impression it is crucial to ask, was Jesus an honest or a cynical performer in his interaction?

Fourth, the social role concept is also an illuminating key to our observation and understanding of Jesus' interactions in the Gospel of Mark. Involved in the performance is the social role. Social role is the portrayal of rights and duties attached to a given status by the actor to the audience; because social role will involve one or more parts and that each of these different parts may be presented by the performer on different occasions to the same kinds of audience or to an audience of the same persons (Goffman 1971:27). In a social setting the actor demonstrates a routine. A routine or a part is the pre-established pattern of action which is unfolded during a performance and which may be presented or played through on other occasions (Goffman 1971:27).

It is noteworthy that the performance is moulded or socialised to meet the expectation of the society within which the performance is done. In Goffman's (1971:44) view, a part of the socialisation pact is abstract claims made on the audience which transcends presentation of one front to another through performance of a routine. Others, he noted, includes the tendency of

the actor to forge an impression which is idealised in different ways (Goffman 1971:45). For instance, when the social actor comes into the immediate presence of others his performance tends to carry some officially recognised values of society. To the extent that a performance conveys some common values of society, Goffman sees it with Durkheim and Radcliffe-Brown as a ceremony. A ceremony which revives and reaffirms the moral values of society (Goffman 1971:45).

In the presentation of the idealised front the individual may have to forgo or conceal actions which are incongruous with the ideal standards he or she seeks to express. Again, errors and mistakes are corrected before the performance in order for an impression of infallibility to be accentuated. As a case in point, the exquisitely finished product is usually presented by individuals whose interaction involves the presentation of product, inadvertently moving the audience to see him in the light of the polished, finished product. All the dirty work is hidden from the audience. There is a further idealisation of impression which involves performers with ideal motive and ideal qualification for the impression they foster. Such performers are not likely to suffer any indignities, insults, and humiliation in order to acquire the role (Goffman 1971:54-55). This kind of performance, in part, fosters the impression that the licenced practitioner is someone set apart from other men (Goffman 1971:55), for example, the highly skilled professionals or one like Jesus Christ. The social roles performers implicitly or explicitly play in social interaction unwittingly reveal their identity. What social roles can be gleaned from Jesus' interactions? How do these social roles translate into his leadership principles and practices?

Fifth, the front and back regions of the social setting also provide the means by which Jesus' interactions can be analysed. Goffman reveals that the way we commonly divide social settings

into front region where performance is given and back region where impression is fostered as evidence of the staged character of everyday social life. By the way, setting is foundational to a performance as the choice of setting also helps in defining the situation.

A region may be defined 'as any place that is bounded to some degree by barriers to perception (1971:109). In the front region, the individual's performance projects and maintains a certain standard. Politeness and decorum are ways by which the performer interacts with the audience (Goffman 1971:111).

A back region may be defined as a place, relative to a given performance, where the impression fostered by the performance is knowingly challenged as a matter of course. It is here that the capacity of a performance may be thoroughly fabricated; it is here that illusions and impressions are openly constructed (Goffman 1971:114). In this region, performance is straightened up, for instance as Goffman puts it, the team can run through its performance, checking for offending expressions when no one is present to be affronted by them. Here poor members of the team, who are expressively inept, can be schooled or dropped from the performance. Here the performer can relax; he can drop his front, forgo speaking his lines, and step out of character (Goffman 1971:115). It is a venue and opportunity to practise the technique of impression management. Be it as it may, social performance, like theatrical performance, can involve others to form a team in fostering the desired impression. The foregoing does agitate one's mind to want to ask, did Jesus have front and back regions? What happened in his back region? What might have happened in Jesus' back region? How did he manage the front region?

Sixth, the idea of a team cooperating to stage a single routine to foster impression for the organisation resonates with Jesus and his disciples on one side and other interactants on

another. The team notion is helpful to observe, understand and analyse the kind of team impression Jesus and his disciples possibly fostered. Goffman notes that besides dramatically acting the roles and character, social actors also manage others' impression of the groups and, establishments, organisations, and bodies they represent. On the social stage, almost all of us act in teams at different places and time, so the personnel of such bodies constitute a performance team that cooperate to stage a single routine to foster impression for the organisation (Goffman 1971:85). The critical feature of a social team is cooperation: a team's continuous cooperation is necessary if a given projected definition of the situation is to be maintained. Goffman explains that though a team is a grouping it is not in relation to social structure but to an interaction or series of interaction which depends on definition of the situation. Teams in dramaturgical way, besides cooperation, keep secrets regarding how they cooperate to maintain a particular definition of the situation (Goffman 1971:108). Social interaction also takes place among teams. When teams come into each other's immediate presence for interaction, team members make it possible by staying in role and character, and suppressing all backstage familiarities in order to maintain the formalities for the interaction.

The seventh notion is the capacity for the direction of another in interaction, for one thing, individuals are able to direct the activities of others in interactions by creatively keeping strategic secrets from them. Moreover, if one individual attempts to direct the activities of others by means of example, enlightenment, persuasion, exchange, manipulation, authority, threat, punishment, or coercion, it will be necessary, regardless of his power position, he or she conveys effectively what he or she wants done, what he or she is prepared to do to get it done and what he or she will do if it is not done. Power of any kind must be clothed in effective means of demonstrating it, and will have different effects depending upon how it is dramatized.

In social interaction power is a means of communication not merely a means of an action (Goffman 1959:241)

In brief, dramaturgy supposes that human action is best understood by seeing individuals as actors on a social stage who foster an impression of themselves to others through their interpretation in the interactional encounter. The impression is created through action or non-verbal communication or performance. The impression usually involves the presentation of an idealised self, through impression management strategies. The individual uses a variety of theatrical tools for his or her performance. The performance can be sincere or contrived. Like the theatrical drama, the individual has divided the social interactional platform into back region and front region, the back region is used to create and perfect the impression and the front region is the actual interactional space where the individual presents his or her front. The value of dramaturgy is the fact that human interaction is without doubt, extremely complicated. Such that an appropriate way to study human interaction is to explore the individual focusing the efforts the individual makes to maintain a desired public identity.

Dramaturgy provides some tools to carefully analyse Jesus' interaction: back region, front region, performance, impression and impression management, and idealised self. One can wonder: was there idealization (common moral values) that Jesus' interaction celebrated? Could Jesus be that performer who had ideal qualification and ideal motives for the impression he fostered?

Goffman's Interaction Order and Dramaturgy could be considered as potent tools by which human social interactions could be observed and analysed. However, among other things, it is

acceptance of Mead's Self-Interaction as another means to explore the interactions of Jesus which provide plausible understanding of Jesus' self in the interactional process.

### **2.2.2 George Herbert Mead's Role-Taking (Self-Interaction)**

Mead's Self-Interaction notion like Interaction Order and Dramaturgy is a way of understanding and analysing human social interaction. This concept was developed by George Herbert Mead in 1934 and advanced by his student Herbert Blumer in 1975. Mead's concept of self-interaction involves the self which, the self responds to a gesture that carries a symbolic meaning, and meaning is discerned through self-interaction by taking on the role or attitude of others which in turn helps the individual to organise and reorganise his or her action by way of response. The concept makes it possible to analyse social interactions which are unstructured and are not affected by previously established social order.

To begin with, self-interaction is the inward interaction one has with oneself, it is the means by which human beings take issues or reality into account and organize themselves for action (Wallace & Wolf 2005:192). Mead explains self-interaction as a process in which the human actor indicates to himself matters that confront him in the situation in which he acts, and organizes his actions through his interpretation of such matters (Blumer 1975:68). It works by the individual himself assuming the role of the other person whom he so excites and influences through interaction. Through taking the role of the other (assuming what the other person will say or do), the individual is able to come back to himself and so directs his own process of communication (Mead 1934:256). Self-interaction thus, forms the basis for role-taking in Mead's conception of the human act in interaction.

Role-taking on the other hand is a means by which self-interaction forms the basis of human action in social interaction. The actor engages in this social interaction with himself, according to Mead, by taking the roles of others, addressing himself through these roles, and responding to these approaches (Wallace & Wolf 2005:205). Blumer puts this idea of Mead's together much succinctly in a sense that 'human act is formed through self-interaction, in the course of which the actor may note and assess any feature of the situation, or any feature of his involvement in the act. The act is constructed through the process of self-interaction, irrespective of whether the construction is done intelligently or stupidly. The subjection of the act to self-interaction impart the career to the act. The act may be stopped, restrained or abandoned, resurrected, postponed or intensified, concealed, transformed or redirected" (Blumer 1975:60).

Mead believes that people, through self-interaction, form and guide their own actions. Mead maintains that basic to human social group is communication involving participation in the other. This requires the attitude of the other in the Self, the identification of the Other with the Self, the reaching of self-consciousness through the Other (Mead 1934:253). The individual communicates assuming the attitude of the other individual as well as calling it out in the Other. The individual himself in the role of the other person whom he is so exciting and influencing. When the individual takes the role of the other person he is able to talk to himself and so direct his own communication process.

Mead (1934:254) points out that another major consequence of the role taking is that it allows the individual to exercise control over his own response. The control of the response of the individual by himself through taking the role of the other brings out the value of this type of communication. The control can take the form of self-criticism, which helps the individual to

conform to social process of experience and behaviour. To Mead, the self-criticism is essentially social-criticism, and behaviour controlled by self-criticism is essentially behaviour controlled socially because of the internalisation of the generalised other (Mead 1934:256). The Self-Interaction concept makes it possible to ask what are the possible internal interpretational questioning and analysis of issues or realities or the self conversation that took place within Jesus in his social interactional situation? What possible attitudes of other interactants are assumed by Jesus in his interactions?

The next component in Mead's thoughts of Role-taking is the Self. The Self is viewed as central to social interaction (symbolic interactionism) in the sense that the Self is active and not a passive organism that merely responds to stimuli. The Self in Mead's thought "is far more than an internalization of components of social structure and culture" (see Wallace & Wolf 2005:205). Rather the Self is active, creative and a key determinant of the social process. To Mead (1934:135) the 'Self' is a social construct; 'self is something which has a development; it is not initially there, at birth, but arises in the process of social experience and activity, that is, it develops in the given individual as a result of his relations to the social process as a whole and to other individuals within that process'. This means that the self is a product of social interaction and functions within social interaction.

Mead argues that the Self has two parts; the 'I' and 'Me'. The 'I' is considered as the unorganized response of the individual to the attitudes of others. And the 'Me' is the set of organized attitudes of others that the individual himself assumes in turn, that is those perspectives on oneself that the individual has learned from others. Attitudes of Others constitute organized 'Me' and one's reaction toward them is unorganized 'I' (Mead 1934:173-174). Generalised Other comprises of the organized attitudes of the whole community. Mead

explains that the matured-self arises when a Generalised Other is assimilated so that the community exercises control over the conduct of its individuals (Wallace & Wolf 2005:209).

It must be noted that Structural-Functionalism perspective of the Self allows for only 'Me' pertaining to the Self. The 'I' is Mead's contribution to our understanding of the Self. An essential fact about the 'I' is that it is spontaneous. The spontaneity of the 'I' allows for certain degree of innovation, creativity and degree of freedom from control of others or society (Mead 1934:210). Mead (1934:177) explains the 'I' as follows: the "I," is something of a response by an individual to a social situation which is within the experience of the individual. It is the answer which the individual makes to the attitude which others take toward him when he assumes an attitude toward them. Now, the attitudes he or she is taking toward them are present in his or her own experience, but his or her response to them will contain a novel element.

The "I" gives the sense of freedom, or initiative. The 'I' is a natural response, it can act outside of established social norms and values. Therefore, there is freshness or originality in the responses of the 'I'. Self, comprising of the 'I' and the 'Me' is a principal component of the social process. There are outcomes of the 'I' which deeply violate entrenched expectations, and may necessitate a paradigm change (Wallace & Wolf 2005:191). For example, Roentgen is known to have accidentally discovered X-Ray. In analysing why Roentgen continued his accidental discovery of X-Ray instead of explaining it away though it was outside of the exiting scientific paradigm of the time, Mead will credit Roentgen's Self-Interaction for it. The question is what did Roentgen say to himself: how did the phenomenon happen? (Wallace & Wolf 2005:192). Wallace and Wolf (2005:191) underscored the relevance of self-interaction in the analysis of social interaction when they stated that "the novel in experience enables the analysis of behaviour that is unstructured and not from previously established conventions".

The Self element of Self-interaction thought is a tool that could illuminate our understanding of the many novel responses of Jesus in His various interactions in the Gospel of Mark. It can help examine how Jesus uses His interactions to set new standards and values for both social and religious lives of the people of His time. Again, Role-taking/Self-interaction can provide a basis for evaluating how Jesus appears as an expert in role-taking for which reason He has apt responses in the various interactions thus, seems not to have lost any argument.

Another dimension of the concept of Role-taking/Self-interaction is symbolic meaning. Mead considers gesture as the first element of an act and sign of the whole act; particularly in social interaction. A gesture here is a symbol used in interaction from which meaning is derived (Mead 1934:47). To explain the relationship between gesture as a symbol, meaning, and self-interaction, Mead cites an example of a person who threatens or uses a foul word at another person, and gets knock down after a while by the one at whom the threat or the foul language was issued. Mead believes that in response to the insult or the threat, the individual takes the attitude of the community and responds to it in this interaction with the gesture of a blow.

Wallace and Wolf articulate further Mead's argument: to them the key element of that interaction is the meaning of the word (in this case, an insult). The word becomes "the stimulus whose response is given in advance", because in the community in question, the implications of that word and the intentions implied by its use evoke a blow or a violent reaction as the appropriate response from the person so addressed. Another crucial element of the Role-Taking/self-interaction that is occurring in this process, is the conversation of gestures that is going on in the mind of the individual (Wallace & Wolf 2005:196). Mead maintains that the gestures in this interaction are the vocal gestures (Mead 1934:181). The gestures are significant symbols, and by symbol he means something that lies outside of the field of conduct. When

gestures are internalized by individuals in a society, they are important symbols for interactants as they have the same meaning for all individual members of a given society or social group. They generate the same attitudes in the individuals making them as they generate in the individuals responding to them (Mead 1934:47).

In human interaction, conventional or significant gestures are used, in that the signs communicated among individuals mean the same thing to both the sending and the receiving individual (Turner 1988:74). This means gestures call forth similar responses, whether covert or overt in both interactants. The gestures evoke the thinking that goes on inside of us, which is a play of symbols in the above sense. Through gestures responses are called out in our own attitude, and the moment they are called out they evoke, in turn other attitudes (Mead 1934:181). A thinking goes on through role-taking or interpreting the conventional gestures of others and mentally take or assume the perspective and likely course of action of others (Turner 1988:74). Turner (1988:74) further explains that in self-interaction individuals can view themselves as objects in a situation by reading their own gestures as well as those of others; and they can use this sense of self as a guideline to organizing their responses to others. If that response can be given in terms of an attitude utilized for further control of action, then the relation of the stimulus and attitude is what can be called a significant symbol (Wallace & Wolf 2005:196). Self-interaction borders on human's capacity of mind to imaginatively rehearse alternative lines of conduct, foresee varying outcomes, inhibit what are seen as inappropriate responses, and select an appropriate line of conduct (Turner 1988:75). Again, human's capacities for role-taking and mind, stretches to individuals' ability to within themselves assume the perspective of generalized others or communities of attitudes and use this perspective as a framework for self-evaluation and choosing an appropriate line of conduct (Turner 1988:74-75). In short Mead's concept of self-interaction begins with a gesture which

carries a symbolic meaning and, meaning is discerned through self-interaction by taking on the role or attitude of others which in turn helps the individual to organise and reorganise his or her action by way of response. Mead's way of observing social interaction leads the researcher to analyse Jesus' social interaction in Mark by asking what were the gestures used in the interactions? What symbolic meaning were possibly derived? What were the likely self-interactions that took place within Jesus? Were Jesus' responses conventional or carried the elements of spontaneity? Analysis of gesture may provide a unique lens in interpreting Jesus' actions.

### **2.3 Summary of the Main Tenets of Social Interactionism**

In sum, social interactionism perspective (Charon, 2005:29) can be said to be based on six key tenets emanating from various contributions scholars have made to shape the perspective.

First, the social interaction takes as its key conviction that the human being is understood as a social person. It is the continuous lifelong social interaction which informs individuals to do what they do (interaction order). Interaction is the basic unit of study rather than personality characteristics of individuals or how society causes human behaviour. Social interaction is fundamental to what we do, society itself is created from social interaction.

Second, the individual is understood as a thinking being. Human action is not caused by interaction among individual alone, it is also caused by interaction within the individual (self-interaction). Unlike the Functionalist, the individual is not seen as merely conditioned, or influenced by those around him or a mere product of society. Rather the individual is seen as one who thinks. The conviction is that if you want to understand the cause focus on self-interaction.

Third, human beings define the situation they are in. The situation may actually exist, but our definition of it is most important. Definition does not simply randomly happen, instead, it results from ongoing social interaction and thinking. The definition of the situation determines the action to take.

Fourth, the assumption is that the cause of human action is the outcome of what is occurring in our present situation. Reason of action unfolds in the present social interaction, present thinking, and present definition. It is not society's encounters with us in past that originate action, or is it our own past experience that does. It is, instead, social interaction, thinking, and definition of the situation which take place in the present.

The fifth tenet is that human beings are active beings not passive in relation to their environment. In contrast to social scientific perspective, humans are not thought of as passive in relation to their surroundings, but actively involved in what they do and happens to them. The presupposition is that individuals control what we do through social interaction, self-interaction and definition of the situation.

The sixth can be added, that individuals act based on the meaning they gave to something. Action depends on meaning and different people can give different meaning to things. We give meaning to things based on social interaction. The meaning individuals give to something is not permanent, it can change based on everyday life.

In sum, to understand human action, we must focus on social interaction, human thinking or self-interaction, definition of the situation, the present, the active nature of the human being, and the meaning we assign to things.

#### **2.4 Coagulation of Goffman's Social Interactional Analytical Tools and Mead's Role-Taking/Self-Interaction**

The combination of Goffman's Social Interactional Analytical tools and Mead's Role-Taking/Self-Interaction will help understand Jesus better. There appears a natural synergy between Ritual making, Frame making, Characterisation, People processing encounters, Stage making and Role taking. They are aspects of one face-to-face encounter between individuals. Within social encounter an individual is likely to manifest these interactional markers. Connecting ritual making, frame making and stage making, characterisation, and people processing encounters makes possible the assertion that the self exerts considerable influence on both signalling and interpreting in social interaction. For instance, Goffman in his work, "Presentation of Self in Everyday Life" gives indication that people's conception of themselves as a certain kind of person has strong causal effect on how they present themselves on stage, and ostensibly how they frame and produce rituals. By the dynamism of human ability to interact, the individual possess multiple and contextual self that he or she seeks to affirm through stage-making, frame-making, and ritual making, and processing counters.

Turner (1988) sees Goffman agreeing with Mead on role-taking. Goffman's work that suggest self as exerting great influence on how individuals interpret the gestures of others is what Mead calls role-taking. So Goffman's analysis, how individuals interpret the staging, framing, and ritual activities of others is, to some degree because it is influenced by self, hence construed as role-taking by the self (1988:94). This means that actors' conception of themselves defines how they interpret their own gestures and those of others by ritual-taking, frame-taking, stage-taking and processing encounters and even characterisation.

Analysing interaction from Social Interactionism Perspective with insights from Ghanaian traditional notion of leadership obviously raises the question as to the primary analysis. Social

Interactionism perspective observes or analyses social interactions at the micro level. It will help look at the Markan texts themselves to segregate the various interactional markers and not social or cultural background. Ghanaian traditional notion of leadership brings in the cultural and structural categories which usually people in interaction carry and implicitly inform the interaction thus, it becomes critical to how the interactions are analysed. Combined with knowledge of the 1<sup>st</sup> Century ancient Mediterranean biblical world, this methodological approach adopted puts the study within a context making the researcher a plausible emic reader of the Markan text.

Together, they will offer a holistic comprehension of Jesus' social interactions as each element emphasises aspects of understanding social interaction as presented in the biblical text. The focus on the text is supported by Petersen (1978:20), who has argued that the text itself must be analysed and understood in its own terms, likewise discussions on the background of the text, whether in relation to the time of writing or in relation to the events being referred to. This means the text could be examined on its own merit and could be suggestive of its specific situation. The language of the text as noted earlier in this chapter constitutes the communication code, carrying within it a specific social context. In order to comprehend and do an effective analysis of Jesus' social interactions in the Gospel of Mark and apply the resultant leadership principles to the Ghanaian and the African context. There is the need for an appreciation of the Markan narrative as heard and interpreted by its first century audience, hence, an emic approach is employed. In this sense, the researcher creatively imagines himself as an inside reader and identifies with the Gospel's initial audience. The emic approach suggests that the Markan narrative must be told from an insider standpoint. Emic, according to Elliott (1993:129), is an anthropological term which belongs to the field of phonemics, which are kinds of thoughts and explanations of groups that are studied. An emic narration is from the point of view of those

studied or those about whom the story is. Mark gives his audience an emic account of events through the role of characters and institutions (Moxnes 1991:251, Nyiawung 2010:125-126).

The methodological point of departure of this study involves a reading of the text from an African point of view and then an application of social interactionism perspective to the biblical text for analysis. Unlike most biblical researches using sociological methods, this study analyses the text not the social or anthropological settings of the text. This will portray both unique individuality and the unique moments of Jesus' interactions. This is possible because as Scheff (1990:119) has observed, texts have both inner and outer experiences that can be explored. The Bible gives some detailed rendering of episodes of Jesus' interactions, which report both inner and outer as well as subjective experiences of interactional participants.

## **2.5 Evaluation of the Social Interactionism as an Analytical Tool**

The objective of this evaluation is to assert the validity of the choice for social interactionism perspective with insights from African understanding of social interaction. What appears a challenge to the use of this perspective for this study, is the fact that previous users have tended to apply it through participant observation of the phenomenon of social interaction. Thus, the question of the propriety of the application of this perspective to an ancient document like the Gospel of Mark comes into focus. However, it will be legitimate to argue that the history of the use of this perspective does not in any way limit the plausibility of analysing a text using its tenets and principles.

In practising social interactionism perspective, it must be said, Mead and Goffman both did mainly participant observation. However, followers of their tradition have sometimes analysed literary texts. For instance, Thomas Scheff, *Microsociology* (1990), analyses a text from

Goethe's *Werther* where it describes social interaction. Specific to application to a biblical text, Collins who remains in this tradition, using the theory of interaction rituals, developed in sociology by Emile Durkheim, and subsequently by Erving Goffman, and more recently himself and others, has analysed ninety-three social encounters of Jesus in the Gospels in his article, *Jesus in Interaction: The Microsociology of Charisma*.

In his recent work, *Napoleon Never Slept: How Great Leaders Leverage Social Energy*, Collins applied the theory focusing on micro-techniques for success from Jesus to Steve Jobs. These provide impetus for this study to add unto this fledgling area of research. Here, this study is confined to a consideration of Jesus' interactions with an inclination to identify his leadership principle and practices embedded therein. The perspective does make it possible to do microanalysis of Jesus' interactions in a way which no other perspective will allow. To this end, the question of the best approach in New Testament interpretation might not be necessary. Each approach is heuristic and can develop and add on the options in the field of Biblical hermeneutics. It is therefore not in doubt that biblical research is replete with the use of sociological approaches in analysing biblical data. Rodd (1985:95) has rightly categorised the work done in biblical research which draws on sociological approaches. Rodd has observed that a quick survey of biblical researches which contain sociological approaches to the Old and New Testaments does reveal that they fall into three categories. He identified these categories as one, researches which are history inclined, he examined the evidence with an awareness of the influence which social forces have upon individuals and groups in society. Two, works which utilize explicit macro sociological concepts such as "millenarian cult", "sect", "class", "role" or "charismatic authority" to describe biblical happenings. Three, works which use specific sociological theory to a particular problem. I suppose my approach falls outside Rodd's

observation, as the social interactionism perspective is applied here to analyse the biblical text itself.

## **2.6 Social Interactionism under Critical Review**

As a sociological method, Goffman's social interactional analysis is critiqued on the ground that it lack clarity on its relationship with social order. Dubois (2013:1) notes that Goffman's response to the question, what then is, the relationship between the interaction order and the social order (or social macrostructures)? To which he said, there is a "nonexclusive linkage — a 'loose coupling' — between interactional practices and social structures" (Goffman 1983:11). Dubois (2013:1) finds though that the response is fully consistent with Goffman's position, it is disappointing, because it remains somewhat vague or at least open to interpretation. Goffman's "Asylums" (1968), focuses on individual interactions tends in this case, account for a structural pattern of the functioning of the psychiatric institution, which precisely proceeds by individualizing the treatment of the patients in a series of face-to-face interactions yet he discounts functionalism. Moreover, Turner (1988:94) believes that Goffman's unwillingness to conceptualize a 'core self' represents, smacks of a weakness in his scheme, making his "actor" too interpersonally glib and facile. These notwithstanding, Turner (1988:90) asserts that Goffman's approach to the study of micro social processes is probably the most widely read and cited of contemporary theorists. Turner's view proves how valuable Goffman's social interactional analytical perspective to understanding social interactions is.

## **2.7 Social Interactionism Coagulation with Ghanaian Traditional Notion of Leadership**

Social Interactionism in Goffman's thought recognises macrostructures and collective orientations circumscribing what actors do in concrete interactional situation. This is to say that what actors do in interactive contexts are structured by a macro universe standing paramount

but unexpressed. Such influence is possible because he believes individuals possess a large inventory of shared understandings and orientations of cultural and macrostructures. Therefore, in an interactional situation individuals use such knowledge in the process (language, speech, gestures, and other interpersonal processes) of calculating and negotiating with others; and as these shared cultural orientations are employed, they are reinforced, especially through the release of rituals (see Turner 1988:91-91).

Human interaction is largely influenced by macrostructures, that is, cultural and social norms, values, ethos among others. Social interactionism coagulate within the Ghanaian notion of leadership which admittedly are not exclusive to Ghana but depict across most part of Africa. It has established so far, that what people carry into interaction is their cultural frames – language, speech, gestures, and other interpersonal processes are directed by cultural categories. Therefore, as we observe and analyse Jesus' ritual making, frame making, stage making, characterisation, processing encounters and role-taking (self-interaction), indirectly the cultural categories and markers which informed them are being observed too. By so doing, those cultural leadership tendencies can be gleaned which in turn shall be considered in the traditional Ghanaian leadership notion of humaneness, Paternalistic leadership style, Spearheading, Community mindedness, Role-modelling, Sacrificing for others, Servant of all, decent language, Treating others like relations, General comportment and mannerism in private and in public. In effect, what social interactionism perspective will do is to help bring out these cultural leadership markers within the social interactions of Jesus.

For instance, when the dramaturgy is applied to Jesus' interaction with the Syrophenician woman, the question is, how do we therefore judge Jesus as a model of interactional leadership? How does he redefine relationship or interaction with the outcast in light cultural social values

of purity, honour and shame? What leadership considerations informed Jesus' interaction approach?

## **2.8 Summary**

The chapter discussed Social Interactionism as the theoretical perspective to re-imagine and observe Jesus as performed in the Gospel Mark. It has been established that human beings act toward things on the basis of the meaning things have for individuals. Meaning of things arises out of the social interactions one has with other individuals. Meanings of things are handled in and modified through an interpretative process used by a person in dealing with things he or she encounters. The meaning obtained through the interpretive process causes the individual to organise himself or herself to foster his or her desired impression on the other interactants. Further in the chapter, Social Interactionism has been recognised as a viable perspective for the analysis of these social interactions of individuals. Social Interactionism, working through Goffman's notion of Stage making, Frame Making, Characterisation, Ritual making, and Mead's Role-taking or Self-Interaction, acts as plausible tools for observing and analysing Jesus in the Gospel of Mark.

In greater details, Interactional order which is the social domain of face-to-face interaction which uses microanalysis as its main method makes it possible to identify Social Ritualization, Processing Encounters and Characterisation in the social interactions for analysis. Moreover, Dramaturgy is also acknowledged as a way of observing and understanding social interaction from a drama perspective. In this thought social life or social interaction is reckoned as something likened to a staged drama. Thus, social interaction takes place on a social stage. Dramaturgy (stage making) creates the legitimate space to observe the individual as a performer and a Character, Information seeker, an Interpretative agent in the interaction process, and an Impression maker. The front and back regions of the social setting as context

to the social interaction, provides information of the individual in the social situation. The individual also functions in a Team, cooperating to stage a single routine to foster impression for a particular body.

It has also been noted that Mead's Role-taking (Self-interaction) concept enables us to understand how an individual organises himself or herself in a social interaction. Self-interaction has been established as the inward interaction or conversation one has with oneself. It is the means by which human beings take issues or reality into account and organizes themselves for action. This involves role-taking which enables the individual to organise appropriate response to the other. The Self, is noted as central to social interaction in the sense that the self is active and not a passive organism that merely responds to stimuli. The Self organised into the Social 'Me' and Spontaneous 'I' allows for creativity and ingenuity. Besides the Self and the Internal Conversation, Symbolic meaning is an aspect of Mead's Self-Interaction which facilitates analysis of social interaction. Symbolic Meaning involves the meaning individuals in an interaction situation assign to objects, events, and behaviours of other. Gestures are significant symbols, and by symbol they mean something that lies outside of the field of conduct. When gestures are internalized by individuals in a society, they are important symbols for interactants as they have the same meaning for all individual members of a given society or social group. Social Interactionism as delineated above possesses great plausibility as a tool in analysing Jesus' social interaction in the Gospel of Mark. Social interactionism would become clear when it is used in chapter four to analyse the interactional activities of Jesus in Mark.

## CHAPTER THREE

### THE MARKAN SETTINGS

#### 3. Introduction

Although this study is devoted to Social Interactionism Perspective, subjectivity must be avoided. In this sense, it becomes imperative to understand Mark from its historical, literary-historical, socio-cultural, and social interactional settings. Thus, this chapter has a fourfold focus: first, to give a review of the historical setting of the Gospel of Mark. Second, to give a general literary-historical setting. Third, to establish the socio-cultural setting of Mark. Four, to establish the social interactional setting.

#### 3.1 Historical Setting of Mark

It is generally accepted that Mark represents the earliest attempt to commit the apostolic tradition into writing (Lane 1974:1). Yet, this gospel has experienced mixed reception: exaltation, and debasement in academic studies till today. Following after its initial spell of exaltation due to Papias' testimony on authorship, the patristic period saw Mark being thoroughly overshadowed by the Gospel of Matthew in the late fifth century (Lane 1974:3). The Gospel of Mark went into oblivion at the dawn of the Gospel tradition.

Augustine postulated that Mark was an abbreviation of Matthew (Telford 1995:18). Six other church fathers: Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Eusebius of Caesarea, Epiphanius, and Jerome (and seven if one counts Papias) in a similar fashion like Augustine, declared Matthew as the earliest gospel to be written (Edwards 2002). This view was to prevail for centuries leading to a consensus of the church fathers, which ascribed the earliest Gospel to Matthew. Mark was so devalued in the patristic period to the extent that quotations from the Gospels were cited from Matthew and John, in that order; from Luke as a distant third; and

barely from Mark (Telford 2002). Even some 20<sup>th</sup> century scholars have also questioned Mark's historicity, literary style and theology. Dehn (1953:18) declared that Mark was "neither a historian nor an author. Bultmann (1963:350), wrote "Mark is not sufficiently a master of his material to be able to venture on a systematic construction himself." Trocmé (1975:72) scoffed at Mark's literary achievement: "The point is settled: the author of Mark was a clumsy writer unworthy of mention in any history of literature". But the cynicism about Mark was to change with the enlightenment period.

The 19<sup>th</sup> century age of Enlightenment ushered in a new dawn for the Gospel of Mark, when the long held perception that "Mark imitated Matthew like a lackey (Lat. *pedisequus*) and was regarded as his abbreviator" was to change (Edward 2002). Modern scholars in their critical studies of the Gospels theorised that Mark was not a slavish follower of Matthew but rather the first of the Gospels, and a primary source for the Gospels of Matthew and Luke (Telford 2002). Scholars of this persuasion included, Lachmann (1835); Weisse and Wilke (1838); Holtzmann, (1863); Weiss (1886); Streeter (1924), and Telford (2002). Edward (2002) hold that "for the past century and a half, Mark has received attention of celebrity proportions, and the resultant crest of scholarship on the Second Gospel is so prolific"

The Gospel of Mark has theology, history, and literature through diverse studies by scholars. Telford (1995:13) maintains that no other text has arguably made as great a contribution to the history of Christianity and to the development of a Christian literary tradition as has the Gospel of Mark. The act of literary communication comprises of an author, a text and a reader (audience), which factors must be considered in the process of interpreting such text (Telford 1999:1). The life setting of Mark the Evangelist and the community for which he wrote, which also raises the question of time and place have been the subject of investigation over the years

(Matera1982:2). Rightly so because literature is most profitably read when the reader understands something of its background.

The knowledge of a gospel's life setting can be helpful for a greater appreciation of its message. Setting is understood as the place, time, or social circumstances in which any character acts (Kingsbury 1989:3). The attempt to understand and interpret Mark, is better served when these historical settings involving author, date and place of composition, the gospel's community or addressees and their social settings are succinctly established.

### ***3.1.1 Authorship***

Author, as applied to the Gospels, has traditionally referred to the historical author though authorship can also imply real or actual author, the narrator, or the ideal or implied author in other disciplines. Establishing the authorship of the Gospel of Mark has been the subject of many research works. However, as Telford (1995:15) has stated, many of the biblical texts either have anonymous or pseudonymous authors coupled with ambiguities of internal evidence and undependable external evidence. These realities have rendered scholars in historical-critical studies rather unsuccessful in pinpointing a particular person or group as the author of Mark. Such attempts have become fruitless. The focus of scholars is now to construct a more general profile of the historical author in terms of his or her cultural background, socio-political situation and religious concerns (Telford 1995:15).

Efforts to establish the historical author of the Gospel of Mark consider both the internal evidence of the text and also the external evidence supplied by church tradition. Healy (2008:18) maintains that "none of the Gospel authors identify themselves by name in their works. But early Christian tradition ascribed each Gospel to an author who was either an apostle or closely linked with the apostles".

### ***3.1.1.1 External Evidence: Traditional View of Authorship***

Mark was earlier on viewed as an unsophisticated and untheological piece of historical reportage, a reliable and relatively unadorned transmission of the reminiscence of the Apostle Peter by the John Mark of the New Testament (Telford 1995:16). Scholarship has it that the earliest mention of the author and circumstance of the Gospel of Mark comes from Papias, Bishop of Hierapolis in Asia Minor. In his *Exegesis of the Lord's Oracles* (c. A.D. 140 CE), and a lost work from which Eusebius made important quotations in his *Historia Ecclesiastica* (Taylor 1966:1; Lane 1974:8; Telford 1995:16; Telford 1991:10; Edward 2002; Healy 2008).

Papias speaks of Mark and quotes the testimony of an Elder:

And the Elder said this also: Mark, having become the interpreter of Peter, wrote down accurately all that he remembered of the things said and done by the Lord, but not however in order. For neither did he hear the Lord, nor did he follow Him, but afterwards, as I said, Peter, who adapted his teachings to the needs (of the hearers), but not as though he were drawing up a connected account of the Lord's oracles. So then Mark made no mistake in thus recording some things just as he remembered them, for he made it his one care to omit nothing that he had heard and to make no false statement therein (Loeb *Classical Library*, p. 297)

This piece of ancient testimony constitutes the foundation of the church tradition which identifies the historical authorship of Mark. The whole debate of the Markan authorship hinges on this church tradition. From that 140 CE to the 5<sup>th</sup> century, literary works and pronouncement by Church fathers that is patristic evidence include:

the reference of Justin Martyr to Peter's 'Memoirs', which may be a reference to Mark's Gospel (Dialogue with Trypho, 106). Statement by Irenaeus that Mark, "the Disciple and Interpreter of Peter" wrote after the death of Peter and Paul (*Adversus Haereses*, 3.1.1). Prologue of the Anti-Marcionite document that Mark was Peter's interpreter, and that he wrote in the regions of Italy after the death of Peter. Statement in the Muratorian Canon, which may be dated A.D. 170-190; "At some things he was present, and so he recorded them." (Published by L. A. Muratori in 1740). Words of Clement of Alexandria in his *Hypotyposes*, which says, Mark a companion of Peter, wrote during Peter's lifetime at the urging of the people of Rome where Peter preached. Then the first half of the 3<sup>rd</sup> century comes the testimony of Origen that the Gospel of Mark was written by Mark as Peter instructed him (Eusebius, *The History of the Church*, vi. 25.6). And finally, the statement of Jerome in his Commentary on Matthew towards the end of the 4<sup>th</sup> century that Mark 'the interpreter of the Apostle Peter' was the first bishop of Alexandria in Egypt (Commentary on Matthew, *Prooemium*, 6).

The patristic evidence which was far-reaching, unsurprisingly resulted in a virtually unanimous claim among the Church fathers that John Mark was the author of the Gospel (Taylor 1966:1; Matera 1987:2; Telford 1995:16; Healy 2008:19).

On Papias' testimony itself, according to Taylor (1966:2), the Elder's statement ends with the first sentence, the rest remain the opinion of Papias himself. The 'Mark' mentioned has been construed as John Mark. Telford argues that the specific identification of Papias' 'Mark' with the 'John Mark' of the New Testament was not actively made until Jerome. John Mark is a known cousin of Barnabas and travel associate of both Paul and Barnabas on their first missionary journey (Acts 12:12, 25; 13:5, 13; 15:37, 39; Col. 4:10; 2 Tim 4:11; Philemon 24).

The reference to Peter and Mark is grounded on 1 Pet. 5:13, "*She who is at Babylon, who is likewise chosen, sends you greetings; and so does my son Mark*". A relationship of discipleship is revealed between Peter and Mark here. A glimpse of St. Mark's work at Rome during St. Peter's residence in the city is discernible (Taylor 1966:2). The Petrine involvement obviously gave the Gospel of Mark credence. No wonder that this Gospel was acknowledged to be the source of at least two of the three later canonical Gospels (Matthew and Luke) though not without contest.

The traditional view or the Patristic tradition is not without challenge. For instance, Niederwimmer (1967) believes that Papias' testimony and the traditional position that the author of the Gospel is John Mark is not trustworthy (cited in Matera, 1987:5). In his view Papias' bid to contend with the Gnostics of Asia Minor led him to develop that pure literary fiction. To Niederwimmer, neither Papias nor his informant knew the real author of the Gospel. He claims Papias only took advantage of 1 Peter 5:13 to give the Gospel the apostolic authority of Peter to deal with the Gnostics. Niederwimmer concludes, the author of the Gospel was not the interpreter of Peter but an unknown Gentile Christian who wrote specifically for Gentiles in the West. (Matera 1987:5).

It is also argued that the 'Mark' referred to is not actually identified, which makes reference to any particular Mark in the New Testament relative. Telford (1995:17) argues that the name

Mark was after all a common one in the Graeco-Roman world. Mark being Peter's interpreter meant he had access to immediate historical reminiscence. However from a critical perspective, Telford argues that the findings of form criticism do not support such assertion. He further argues that one finding of form criticism is that the Gospel material was not, for the most part, arranged, as Papias stated (1995:18). The traditional view is also challenged on the grounds that whereas the vivid details within the Gospel indicate the author's closeness to the oral tradition, the nature and variety of the forms in Mark (apophthegms, prophetic or apocalyptic sayings, legal sayings, wisdom sayings, parables, miracles stories, among others), their stereotypical character, and the loose connections between them, are suggestive of the point that the Gospel is a product of a long process of 'community tradition' and not of direct eye-witness testimony (Telford 1995:17).

Van Eck (2013:20) shares a similar view. He argues, the Papias tradition was oblivious to the results of historical criticism which indicates that the gospels developed in a gradual way, and that the evangelists made use of specific sources. The issues raised by these critiques are legitimate, albeit, they hardly explain away the validity of the traditional view.

Hengel (1985) dismissed the attacks on the Papias' testimony as an invention, secondary, and apologetic vindication of the apostolic origin. He argues, it represents the critical comments of one who estimated the oral tradition as more important than written words. Hengel, concludes, Mark was a Greek-speaking Jewish Christian who also understood Aramaic. A gospel inundated with Aramaic and Hebrew words and formulae (3:17-19; 5:41; 7:11; 8:34; 10:46; 11:9-10; 14:1; 32, 36, 45; 15:22, 34) could not be the work of a Gentile Christian, Hengel asserted. Hengel argues further, the title affix the Gospel is not a creation of the late 2<sup>nd</sup> century but is traceable to the time of the Gospels (69-100 CE). "The Gospel according to Mark" may

have been assigned to the Gospel by the authority who copied the Gospel as early as 69 CE, and if that is so, then the name 'Mark' points to the original author.

### ***3.1.1.2 Internal Evidence***

Not much can be gleaned from the book of Mark itself in identifying the author except for the argument that Peter is a prominent character in the Gospel. The Petrine passages include: 1:16-39; 2:1-14; 3:13-19; 4:35-5:43; 6:7-13, 30-56; 8:15-9:48; 10:32-52; 11:1-33; 13:3-4, 32-37; 14:17-50, 53-54, 66-72. The character Peter plays the role of a spokesman for the Twelve (1:36; 5:37; 8:29; 9:2; 11:21; 13:3; 14:44; 16:7) many times in the Gospel. Based on these, the contention is that Peter could only have been the source for such stories since, in the first place, only he or a few others are mentioned in some instances as having been present, and in the second, the early church itself would not otherwise have kept such a discredited portrait (Telford 1995:19).

The internal evidence is also disputed on the basis that the clue as to the historical author provides little connection with the New Testament traditions about John Mark. John Mark is known to be a cousin of Barnabas, for that matter a Jewish Christian of Palestine and someone who lived in Jerusalem, who is reasonably expected to be familiar with the geography of Palestine. However, the author of our Gospel shows unfamiliarity with the geography of Palestine (cf. e.g. 5:1; 6:45; 7:31; 8:22; 10:1; 11:1), Jewish customs (7:2-4; 10:2; 14:1; 14:64) and even the Jewish leadership groups (3:6; 6:17; 8:15; 12:13) (Telford 1995:19). Even for the Petrine prominence it is established that Mark was not exceptional because Mark mentions Peter 25 times, Matthew 25 times and Luke 30 times (Telford 1995:25). To the extent that ancient texts like the Gospels, are rather the products of a complex interplay between received tradition, literary artifice and religious imagination (15:39) it is difficult to conclude on John

Mark as the author. After all, the Gospel was written in Greek with Gentiles in mind (e.g. the Aramaic translation in 3:17; 5:41; 7:11; 7:34; 14:36; 15:22, 34) (Telford 1995:19).

Considering the difficulties with both the external and internal evidence, Telford concluded, the historical author must therefore remain anonymous, although we shall continue to call him Mark, following convention (1995:20). Before him, Johannes Weiss declined to assert John Mark as the author on the grounds that the identity of Mark and John Mark is not mentioned until the time of Jerome. Again, there are difficulties in believing that the author was a native of Jerusalem.

Taylor (1966:26) believes that “there can be no doubt that the author of the Gospel was Mark, the attendant of Peter. This is the unbroken testimony of the earliest Christian opinion from Papias onwards”. In response to the question: was Mark the John Mark of the Acts and the companion of Paul? Taylor insists, “Today this view is held almost with complete unanimity and it may be accepted as sound”.

### ***3.1.2 Date of Composition***

According to Taylor (1966:31) Mark wrote during the decade 60-70 CE. Attempts to date the Gospel earlier or after are sketchy. For example, based on Mark 13:14 “*the Abomination of Desolation standing where he ought not*”, Torrey, suggests the Gospel was composed in 39-40 CE, claiming that these words might have been written just before the assassination of the Emperor Caligula on 24<sup>th</sup> January 41 CE (Taylor 1966:31). This presupposition is precarious, for what will compel Mark to write his gospel, commiserating with the death of a foreign oppressor?

Another date put forward by Harnack claiming the Gospel was written before or on 60 CE before Paul’s death is also rejected. Such early dates are dismissed since they run counter to the signs of development to be discerned in the traditions taken over by the author as well as

the internal evidence which points to events in the 60s as the backdrop for the final form of the text (Telford 1995:21). Taylor identifies four reasons why the majority of scholars subscribe to the period between 60-70 CE:

- The testimony of Irenaeus – “And after the death of these, Mark, the disciple and interpreter of Peter, also transmitted to us in writing the things preached by Peter” (*Adversus Haereses* iii. I. 2). Irenaeus is believed to be referring to the tradition that these two apostles died in Rome at Nero’s hands c. 62-64 (Telford 1995:21).
- The declaration of the Anti-Marcionite Prologue, to the effect that Mark wrote after the deaths of Peter and Paul. - “... Mark declared, who is called "stump-fingered ", because he had rather small fingers in comparison with the stature of the rest of his body. He was the interpreter of Peter. After the death of Peter himself he wrote down this same gospel in the regions of Italy”.
- The possibility that the Apocalyptic Discourse of Mark 13 mirrors the situation of A.D. 64-66, before the venture of Jerusalem. Many scholars consent that although this discourse is expressed in the conventional language of the Old Testament and Jewish apocalyptic fervour it reflected the Jewish experience during the period.
- The stress Mark puts on suffering and persecution (8:34-38; 10:38; 13:9-13). Mark 13 provides internal evidence for the dating of the Gospel. Telford (1995:21) adds that it points to events, which occurred within the experience of Mark’s community, particularly in the 60s. The decade was characterised by Neronian persecution of churches in Rome in 64 (Tacitus, *Annals* 15.44), serious earthquakes in 60 and 63 (*Annals* 14.27, cf. Mark 13:8), defeat of the Romans by the Parthians in 62 (*Ann.* 15:13-17), civil war throughout the Empire after the defeat of Nero in 68 and a succession of imperial contenders (Galbo, Otto, Vitellius, Vespasian) in 68-69. The list of calamities can never be complete without the disastrous Roman-Jewish War in 66-70 CE which

led to the siege of Jerusalem by Vespasian and his son Titus and eventual destruction of the Temple (Telford 1995:21).

The Jewish historian Josephus recollects the suffering of the Jews as a result of the war, the flight of Jews from their doomed city, the severe famine within (cf. e.g. Josephus, *War* 6.392-408). He further notes the practice of hiring prophets who promised deliverance (*War* 6.285-87; cf. also 2.258-65) during the decade. Christian tradition also acknowledges that the Jerusalem church fled to Pella as a result of an oracle during this period (Eusebius, *Eccl. Hist.* 3.5.5 cited in Telford 1995:22).

- Mark's interest in the question of Gentile freedom (7:17-23, 26 cf.; 8:10).

The acceptance of the period 60-70 CE based on the reasons is expressed in the postulations of various scholars of dates within the period:

Scholars	Proposed Date for Mark
J. Weiss, Zahn, Streeter, and Bartlet	65 CE
Rawlinson and Blunt	65-67CE
Stanton, Plummer, Peake, Burkitt, and McNeile	65-70CE
Swete	67-70CE
Menzies, Gould, and Montefiore	70CE
Wellhausen, Bacon, and Branscomb	After 70CE

The decade subsequent to the Fall of Jerusalem (70 CE) is suggested by Wellhausen, Bacon, and Branscomb. Taylor (1966) argues that this period is unnecessarily late, and against it is the strong objection that 13:14 is not more explicit. Telford (1995:21) argues with Wellhausen and others when he, maintained that on the assumption that Matthew and Luke used Mark as their source, a date no later than 75 CE is normally accepted as the *terminus ad quem* or upper limit

Like the scholars mentioned earlier, Telford argues that scholars who have ventured to be more precise make three main suggestions regarding the date:

- The mid 60s, based on the Nero's persecution of the Church, and hence the Gospel's interest in suffering, persecution and martyrdom (in respect of John the Baptist, Jesus and his disciples) is held to be significant (e.g. 1:14; 6:17-29; 8:31-9:1; 9:11-13, 30-32; 10:30, 32-34, 54; 13:9, 11-13; 14:41).
- The second half of the 60s during the period of unrest and apocalyptic fervour (13:6-8, 17-23, 24-31) occasioned by the Roman – Jewish War and the civil war but before the actual destruction of Jerusalem (scholars of this view include Marxsen).
- Shortly after the fall of Jerusalem and the destruction of the Temple in 70 CE (Brandon subscribes to this view) when end-time expectation had perhaps begun to be tempered by the delay in Jesus' second return or *Parousia* (cf. e.g. 13:10, 32-37).

In conclusion, Taylor (1966:31) states, Mark wrote during the decade 60-70 CE. Telford (1995:23) maintains that when we assess the internal evidence of the text, a general dating of between 65 and 75 CE seems highly probable, and this is now widely agreed. The only contention between Telford and Taylor is the possible date beyond 70 CE. Though Mark 13:14 does explicitly support the date beyond 70 CE it does not also denounce a date before 70 CE.

### **3.1.3 Place of Composition**

Connected to the author and date is the place of composition. Scholars generally agree that Mark was addressing Gentile Christians shortly before or after the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple in 70 CE. Mark 13 is instructive in this regard, as it reveals an atmosphere of Christian apocalypticism (Matera 1987:7). According to Lane (1974:24), the early Church tradition connects the composition of the Gospel to Rome with the sole exception being the

late second half of the 4<sup>th</sup> century witness of John Chrysostom that Mark wrote his Gospel in Egypt at the request of hearers there. It is said, the Anti-Marcionite Prologue noted that after the departure of Peter himself, he Mark wrote down this same Gospel in the regions of Italy and was claimed expressly by Irenaeus and Clement (Telford 1995:23).

Taylor (1966:32) agrees that the Gospel was probably written for the use of the Church in Rome. Telford (1995:23) on his part holds that it is clear on the one hand, that our Gospel was written for Greek-speaking Christians of Gentile origin. Chrysostom's testimony that the Gospel was composed in Egypt, has been found inconsistent with the testimonies of Clement of Alexandria and Origen (Taylor 1966:32). It is believed that Chrysostom's deviation is perhaps due to a misunderstanding of an ambiguous statement of Eusebius: "They say that Mark who was sent to Egypt first preached the Gospel which in fact he committed to writing" (*Hist. Eccl.* II.16). Pointers to the Rome origin have been adduced by many scholars (scholars in this area include: Hengel, Best, Brandon, Standaert, and others), they theorise reasons such as:

- The connection of Mark and Peter with Rome (1 Peter 5:13 where Babylon is an early Christian pseudonym for Rome). It is even suggested that the Rufus mentioned in Mark 15:21 is the same Rufus mention in Paul's letter to the Romans (16:13).
- Mark shows particular preference for Latin technical terms, ranging from the Military (e.g. Legion 5:9; Praetorium 15:16; Centurion 15:39), through the Courts (e.g. Speculator or military executioner 6:27; Flagellare 15:15), then Commerce (e.g. Denarius 12:15; Quadrans 12:42). On two occasions, common Greek expressions in the Gospel are explained by Latin ones. First, "two copper coins (lepta) was explained as a quadrans" (12:42); second, "the palace", that is the praetorium" (15:16). The use of quadrans was particularly enlightening since they were not in circulation in the east.

The presence of Latin terms and of technical terminology lends credence to the tradition that Mark was written in Rome.

- Mark's use of Roman method of reckoning time supports the Rome argument. Mark speaks of four watches of the night, rather than of the three which were traditional in Jewish reckoning (6:48; 13:35). Lane (1974:24) makes the argument that it is even possible that Mark has arranged his Passion narrative in accordance with the four Roman night watches. Since Jesus enters Jerusalem to share the Passover with his disciples in the evening (Ch. 14: 17); the hour of betrayal in the Garden of Gethsemane is very probably midnight (Ch. 14:41); the denial of Peter occurs in connection with cock-crow (Ch. 14:72); and the time when Jesus is brought to Pilate is early morning (15: 1).
- Mark demonstrates a Gospel prepared for Gentile Christians who were familiar with the Old Testament in the Greek and who needed an explanation of Palestinian customs and practices (7:3; 14:12; 15:42). For this reason, the Evangelist consistently translates for his readers the Aramaic words and phrases preserved in the tradition (3:17; 5:41; 7:11, 34; 9:43; 10:46; 14:36; 15:22, 34). It is particularly striking that the Gospel of Mark reaches its climax in the confession of Jesus' deity by a Roman centurion (Ch. 15:39).
- Included in the statements of Jesus unique to Mark is the statement, "Everyone will be salted by fire" (Ch. 9:49). Jesus' enigmatic statement had found fulfilment in the trial and persecution of Roman Christians under Nero (Lane 1974:24).
- Without the support of a much stronger Church like Rome it is not likely that Mark would have had a standing so authoritative that Matthew and Luke could use it as a source (Taylor 1966:32).

The argument against Rome is that the external evidence is relatively late, it may be based on 1 Peter 5:13 and the Papias' testimony. Again, the use of the Latin terms which may even belong to Mark's Tradition, were used throughout the Empire. For instance, Luke and Acts have equally as many Latin words and a Roman provenance is not suggested for the Lukan writings. Moreover, Mark emerging from a major Church centre is challenged by the fact that Mark was later shunned in favour of other Gospels.

Besides Rome and Alexandria, other cities like Antioch, Galilee, and Rural and Small town in South Syria have been suggested as possible places of composition.

### ***3.1.3.1 Galilee***

The Galilee proposal unlike Rome has no external evidence or patristic testimony in favour of it, so the proponents rely solely on internal evidence. Scholars (Lohmeyer, Marxsen, Kelber) who suggest Galilee as the place of origin argue with the following reasons:

- Mark's dependence on Palestinian traditions and his use of Galilean and Judean place names throughout without explanation.
- Mark's special interest in Galilee (1:14, 16, 28, 39; 3:7; 7:31; 14:28; 16:7), the principal sphere of Jesus' preaching, teaching and healing and the place where he is to be seen after the resurrection.
- Galilee as the geographical location appropriately agrees with the chronological context of the Romano-Jewish war and the circumstances of a Palestinian-Christian community suffer calamities that underpin Mark 13.
- The hypothesis of Brandon and Kelber view Mark's Gospel as standing in opposition to the Jewish form of Christianity based in Jerusalem (Matera 1987:16).

The Galilee suggestion is also fraught with challenges, the author's geographical inaccuracies in respect of the region have been cited along with the Galilee interest being construed in symbolic terms, to the effect that Galilee (with its mixed Jewish and pagan population) dominates the Gospel as a paradigm for Gentile mission. Though the use of Aramaic expressions by Mark points to a people of Semitic linguistic background, it is argued that the author's mistakes in the Galilean geography speaks against a Galilean origin.

### ***3.1.3.2 Antioch***

The case for Antioch is made forcefully. In support of this view Bartlet, puts forward these considerations: the fact that Papias cites the testimony of John the Presbyter who lived in the East; the connection of Peter with Antioch; the reference (15:21) to Simon of Cyrene (Acts 11:20, 13:1); the use of Aramaic words in Mark; the place of Antioch as a centre of Roman culture; the early use of Mark by Matthew and Luke; the use of Galilean and Judaeon place-names without explanation; and the want of early testimony to the Roman origin of the Gospel (Taylor 1966:32). Other reasons include, Antioch was an early mission centre for Christian expansion into the wider Gentile world (Acts 11:19-30) (Telford 1995:25).

### ***3.1.3.3 Rural and Small Town in Southern Syria.***

Another hypothesis is the small town in South of Syria (Northern Galilee) argued for by scholars such as Kee 1977, Lührman 1987, Myers 1988, Waetjen 1989, Theissen 1991, Marcus 1992, Van Eck 1995). Pioneering this hypothesis, Kee (1977) using Social anthropological perspective argues that the cultural and linguistic links of the Gospel are with eastern Mediterranean village life, and therefore, suggests rural and small-town of southern Syria (Northern Galilee) as the base for the Markan community (Matera 1987, Telford 1995:26). They argue that the Evangelist wrote shortly before the events of 70 CE. Like others they also

agree that Mark's gospel shows an apocalyptic atmosphere hence basing their analysis on Mark 13.

On such presumption, Kee proceeded using sociological models from other apocalyptic communities to understand the character of the Markan community concluding that, first, the Mark's community is apocalyptic, one pattern after the style of Haisidim and Essene communities which were seen in Judaism around the period of the Maccabean revolt (167-164 B.C). Second, the community had itinerant preachers as its devotees who went from village to village preaching, healing and exorcising demons liken to the Cynics and Stoics. Kee's point of conviction was that the Markan community defined itself in the light of Jesus' itinerant mission to the Gentile regions of Tyre, Sidon, and the Decapolis.

According to Kee, 'the community was an open social, economic, sexual, and ethnic group' (Kee 1977 cited in Matera 1987:14). Kee believes "the evangelist wrote for a covenant people who fervently believed that God would reward their fidelity in the near future" (Kee in 1977 cited in Matera 1987:15). The Markan community, reflecting a typical apocalyptic community, exhibited esoteric tendencies, believing that God had granted it a special revelation in order to understand the mysteries and purposes of God, which was not open to other people (Matera 1987:14). Evincing such is Mark's representation of Jesus as employing parables to prevent outsiders from comprehending the mysteries of God (Mark 4:11-12) and the many private instructions Jesus gives to his disciples (9:28; 10:10; 13:3-37) (Matera 1987:15).

However, to draw such conclusions based on the social and economic situation of Mark's audience against traditions about Jesus and his disciples appear farfetched. Flowing from the above discussions Rome still remains the most likely place of origin of the Gospel, as Taylor

(1966:32) stated, “none of these arguments is conclusive and the case for Rome is much stronger”.

To sum up the arguments, while Rome is the most popular of all these alternatives, the question of provenance is clearly still an open one (Telford 1999:15). Scholars obviously are still divided on who, when and where the Gospel of Mark was composed. However, scholars appear unanimous on the fact that the Gospel was addressed to a Gentile audience, perhaps with some Jews in their midst. There appears no contention also on the situation of the audience in that they were faced with the apocalyptic atmosphere wherein Mark 13 mirrors. Who is the author? Given the fact that the external and internal evidence in favour of the Jewish Christian called Mark are stronger compared to the unknown Gentile Christian if the hypothesis for the Rome origin is sustained, then though Mark was a common name in the Roman Empire, that Mark had contacts with Peter and if he did, the Mark is likely to be John Mark. It is this same contact with Peter, which gave the Gospel importance and prominence.

On place of composition, the external evidence for Rome is strong; although it is challenged, the others: Antioch, Alexandria, Galilee or Syria do not have any external evidence or patristic testimony. All the others depend on deductions from internal evidence, and there is adequate internal evidence which suggests a Rome origin too.

The issue of when the Gospel was composed, appears to depend on one’s interpretation of chapter thirteen. It is difficult to deduce a clue that Jerusalem and the temple have already been destroyed. Scholars agree that the language in the discourse is dependent upon the book of Daniel and other Jewish apocalyptic imagery. There is the likelihood that the author was perhaps writing post Nero persecution, and within the Jewish war (66-70 CE) which may put the date anywhere between 66-70 CE.

After surveying the various hypotheses on the author, date and place of provenance, the position taken in this study therefore, is that the authorship of the Gospel of Mark is still an open one and most likely is unknown. And it is not likely to be an urban Gospel given the Gospel's exceeding interest in rural categories and scenarios. It is difficult to sustain the view that the one person Mark was the sole redactor of the Gospel, but the fact that the oral narratives of Mark give allusion to a rural context and the preservation of particular traditions makes plausible sense that Mark was not written in an urban centre city like Rome or Antioch. Rather the stories were received and circulated among peasants; these stories affirm their tradition.

Therefore the reception of Jesus in these communities is that of a person who, in my view, is a village spiritual leader – Jesus is remembered by these communities as a person who articulates community-shared traditions. He is that kind of a leader received in these communities, who shares their thought forms, their suffering as a true representative character in those communities but certainly not in an urban setting. The way the Markan community receives the memory of Jesus and how he is represented feeds into a culture which seems to dovetail, with plausibly an argument, into a model character within a village setting. There is enough in the Gospel of Mark to suggest that Jesus is a character who was received as a representative of shared cultural values within a peasant subsistence setting.

#### ***3.1.4 The Markan Community***

It has already been noted that the needs of the Markan community provided the major incentive for the preparation of the Gospel (Lane 1974:24). Who constituted this community? There are several hypotheses to locate the Markan community. The Roman hypothesis views a community that is stable but under or about to fall under persecution. The Galilean hypothesis views the community as fervently awaiting the imminent *Parousia*. The Syrian hypothesis

views the community as composed of itinerant preachers who also have a high degree of apocalyptic expectation. Mark writes to quiet excessive apocalyptic expectation. In my view, the setting of Mark's Gospel is a predominantly Gentile community, threatened by persecution, excited by apocalyptic speculation, forgetful of the cross (Matera 1987:16).

The views of majority of scholars are that Mark's gospel was written for people in Rome (Hengel 1984, Senior 1987). If this view is sustained then Mark must be understood as an urban gospel, we must locate his audience among the people of the preindustrial city (Rohrbaugh 2008:143). A good number of scholars also locate Mark's community in the rural areas of South Syria, Transjordan or upper Galilee (Kee 1977, Lührman 1987, Myers 1988, Waetjen 1989, Theissen 1991, Marcus 1992). Rohrbaugh argues, if this location is accepted, the Markan audience must be located among largely nonliterate peasants in a village or small town context (2008:143).

The outlook of the Markan Gospel points to a rural community as the narrative settings in the Gospel are predominantly rural. It is also presumed in this study that Mark was written in a village or small town context. Rohrbaugh (2008:144) argues, given that probably percent of the population in agrarian societies could read, or both read and write, and the majority of these lived in the cities; the Markan audience were very low in literacy. He made this assertion on the back of Hezser's (2001:39-109) conclusion that there is lack of evidence that significant schooling existed at the village level.

Hezser is not alone in this assertion. Earlier on Harris (1989:329) had concluded that "when literacy of the Roman and the Latins first extended beyond the few people who had a specialized need for writing is impossible to judge...women were presumably less literate than men, and once again the combined literacy level in the period before 100 C.E is unlikely to have much exceeded 10%". This position is in sharp contrast with both classics and New

Testament scholars' long-standing tendency to imagine widespread literacy during the Roman period. For example, there is the thinking that schools were common, and that at least elementary education was broadly available (2008:144).

Beavis, (1989:21), for example asserts that "since the evangelist was literate, we can assume that he was educated in a Graeco-Roman school. His reader/audience would thus have brought certain skills and interest to the composition and reading of the text which can be illumined by data on education in the Roman Empire.". She imagines 'competent' first century Markan readers 'trained to make connection between parts of a narrative', and able to catch sophisticated literary allusions the author might have used. Because of the difficulty of catching such things during oral performance, however, Beavis hypothesizes a scholastic Markan community in which Mark's rhetoric might have been studied closely and therefore properly appreciated (Rohrbaugh 2008:144). Rohrbaugh points to Harris' study which concludes that both literacy and the scope of the Hellenistic school system have been sharply overestimated (Harris 1989, 241-244, 329). Per Harris' conclusion, education in the rural communities will be much lower making it difficult to sustain the view that the Markan community was well educated.

If the presumption that locates Mark in a peasant community holds true, and the community reflected the real social profile of a typical peasant village, it may have been difficult for Mark's village readers to appreciate such rhetorical matters as literary allusion, style, and structure in the Gospel of Mark. Mark definitely would have very few people to fulfil such expectation. To this end, Rohrbaugh is right when he concludes that "it is perfectly plausible that a few literate people such Beavis imagines could have been in Mark's audience, and it likely that one such person read this gospel aloud for non-literates". The author of Mark had a message to

communicate. How he came by the content of the Gospel brings to the attention of this study its literary context.

### **3.2 The Literary Context of Mark**

Scholars have identified three stages of the growth of the Gospel, the very words and deeds of the historical Jesus, the period of oral transmission, and the writings of the evangelists. Desire to research the words and deeds of Jesus gave rise to Source Criticism. Similarly, researching the period of oral transmission led to Form Criticism and the research into how the evangelists arranged and modified their materials yielded Redaction Criticism. New Testament scholars also acknowledge various life setting against which the Gospel material can be studied – the life setting of the historical Jesus, the life setting of the early church, and the life setting of the evangelists and their communities (Matera 1987:2).

The research tool in the form of the historical critical methods employed to investigate the settings, the traditions, and the text to answer questions such as ‘how was the gospel of Mark formed’? In what ways can the gospel be described as history? How did the life situation of the people shape and inform the message of the gospel? Even with Source, Form and Redaction Criticism the general view is that the Gospel of Mark was initially orally transmitted among the Christian communities. How was this oral transmission done? It is in place to take as a starting point the orality in the Gospel of Mark.

#### **3.2.1 *Orality of Mark***

The Gospel of Mark is generally believed to emanate from an oral tradition because the four canonical Gospels were written between 70 CE and 100 CE, implying one must have some repertoire of oral tradition to be able to write a history of Jesus. Modern biblical scholarship hold the conviction that the Gospels are not eyewitness accounts. This makes the case for oral

tradition imperative (Henaut 1993:17). Luke 1:2 gives a hint of orality, ‘just as they were delivered to us by those who from the beginning were eyewitnesses and ministers of the word’.

Orality of Mark is strengthened even more by recent New Testament research which recognises that first-century Mediterranean societies were predominantly oral or aural cultures in which probably no more than three to five percent of the people were able to read or write (Rhoads *et. al.* 2012:xii). As Kelber (1983:44) has noted, if speaking came first and set linguistic standards for the synoptic tradition, an introduction of oral features into the Gospel can well be assumed. One cannot be oblivious that without the contribution of orality the Gospel might not even be conceived. The question of orality of Mark has long been affirmed by the works of formed critics<sup>3</sup>. They maintain that the Jesus tradition, hence the eventual gospels, did not spread through written documents but through tradition.

Henaut on his part, points to the particular significance of 1 Corinthians 15:3 “for I delivered to you as of first importance what I also received, that Christ died for our sins in accordance with the scripture”. Paul, in the declaration in this verse points to a tradition that was handed over to him, which tradition must be the oral tradition. The argument for the orality of the Gospels is made through theories put forward by some scholars: Lessing in the 18<sup>th</sup> century theorised that the first Gospel was based on apostolic oral tradition and written in Aramaic (cited in Henaut 1993:17). Farmer agrees with him when he states that our canonical evangelists could all have faithfully reproduced apostolic models. Herder also advanced another theory of an oral Gospel, beginning with Peter's preaching in Acts 1.22. Herder theorized that the earliest tradition was structured into an Aramaic oral gospel between 35 and

---

<sup>3</sup>See Schmidt's book, *Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu* (“The Framework of the Story of Jesus”, Berlin 1919) Dibelius's books, *Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums*, (1919), English translation, *From Tradition to Gospel* (London 1934; reprinted 1971), is based on the much enlarged second German edition (Tübingen 1933) Bultmann's *History of the Synoptic Tradition* (Oxford 1963) is a translation of the third German edition (1958) of *Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition* (originally published Göttingen 1921).

40 CE. Gieseler also postulated a thesis of a complete oral gospel and its translation into Greek in order to explain the agreements among the canonical Gospels.<sup>4</sup>

The method of oral tradition is straightforward: a process involving storytelling through memory, story heard, remembered, and written. The presumption was that an unbroken chain of tradition from the earliest eyewitnesses to the current community guarantees the fidelity of the church's teaching and buttresses the current leadership's authority (Henaut 1993:17). The nature of the orality of Mark involves public discourse in parables in order to keep the crowds in obscurity, with private instruction for the disciples, to whom alone is given the secret of the reign of God. The private instruction granted the disciples is conceived apparently to be the source of Mark's own gospel. The purpose or function of the oral tradition was one apologetic. Henaut (1993:16) argues that such apologetical appeals are implicit in Mark's account of Jesus' habitual teaching practice. Mark states, "with many such parables he spoke the word to them, as they were able to hear it; he did not speak to them except in parables, but he explained everything in private to his disciples" (Mk 4.33-34).

The mode of transmission of the Jesus tradition was from memory. Rhoads and others (2012:xi) have asserted that Mark's gospel was presented from memory, told all at one time, probably in houses, in marketplaces, at meals, at evening gatherings, and at synagogue-like assemblies. They maintain that to the first century Mediterranean people of the time, the gospel was the oral performance<sup>5</sup> and they experienced it (Rhoads et al 2012: xii). In this respect, the written text of the Gospel of Mark functioned as a script for storytelling much as a script functions for a play or sheet music for musical performance. They alluded that the ancient communities

---

<sup>4</sup>See Farmer, W.R., 1964, *The Synoptic Problem: A Critical Analysis*, New York: Macmillan; London: Collier-Macmillan.

Herder, J.G., *Christliche Schriften* (Riga, 1797).

<sup>5</sup> Performance is explained to mean the stories told in lively and meaningful ways not in the sense of actors putting up a drama of the Jesus story.

experienced the gospel embodied in a performer, who used the voice, volume, pace, gestures, facial expression, and bodily movement to express an interpretation of the story to engender a certain effect. In so doing the gospel storyteller stimulates the audience's imagination and bring out the emotion, the humour, and the irony of the story (Rhoads et al 2012: xii).

Orality has too often been assumed to be behind the observable differences among various traditions, whether between Mark and Q, or the synoptic and Thomas (Henaut 1993:14). The oral tradition is not without challenge, the advent of form and redaction criticism what remains is a tradition that still bears the stamp of the post-resurrectional Church and which cannot be traced back through its prior oral transmission. This phase of transmission is murky at best because there is absence of the critical tools to infer more than the most basic facts of relative dating regarding the material (Henaut 1993:14).

From the above discussion, we can see that orality is indispensable to the gospel tradition. The absence of oral tradition poses a challenge today to the effort to analyse the social interactions of Jesus. Kelber has rightly stated, that what used to be spoken words are accessible to us exclusively in the written medium, events have records of events. It means that once-living words have been silenced, their actual speaking context are irretrievably lost on us (Kelber 1983:44).

This study takes the conviction that while speaking circumstances will forever remain outside our grasp, the synoptic tradition reveals a multitude of interactional patterns, needs, functions, thought processes, actions that can prove useful for reconstruction of the oral performance of the Gospel of Mark. It must be said, if our canonical gospel has moved from orality and has come to us as written document, gleaning possible sources of the gospel through pointers from the text becomes a worthwhile endeavour; thus, source criticism which engages our attention in the next section.

### 3.2.2 *Source Criticism*

The scholarly presumption is that the evangelists used certain sources<sup>6</sup> in the composition of the gospels. The task of source criticism has been to investigate and identify these sources. Source criticism operates from the assumption that if an ancient writer has used sources, certain indications in the text will point to this unless the writer has so reworked his source as to destroy all traces of these (Telford: 1995:46). Source criticism focuses mainly on the author's written sources (Marzaferri: 1989:35). In reading the gospel, source critics look out for mainly five literary challenges within the text as pointers to presume the supposed sources used by the evangelists.

The five premonitions for this biblical investigation to presume the use of source or sources include unevenness or even incoherence in the text, signs of interruption of the context where the sources have been inserted, and frequent repetition or duplication in content. Others are independent attestation of parallel material in one or more other texts for which no direct literary relationships can be claimed, and presence of inconsistencies or discrepancies, which can either be historical, literary, ideological or theological. For any of these to qualify as a pointer to a source, the critical indicator is, it should not merely be a kind that is ascribable to the author as an error or genuine literary or psychological factors (Telford 1995:46).

According to Telford (1995:49), to show that a gospel is dependent upon prior written documents or to show literary dependency, source critics look for extensive agreement between the gospel and the said other documentary source. The measures for literary relationship are fourfold and consist of extensive agreement in content, form, order, and wording.

Regarding the Gospel of Mark, as acknowledged by source critics there is a considerable disjunction in the narrative especially when we read it in the original language. Telford

---

<sup>6</sup> By Source, Source critics are referring to written documents.

(1995:5) outlines a number of them as outlined by source critics: obvious insertion is made (7:3-4) in frequent parentheses, a number of which are puzzling (11:13c); lack of logical coherence in certain passages (4:1-34; 8:34-9:1; 9:33-50: esp. 49-50; 11:22-25; 13:3-37); repetition and a number of possible doublet and even triplet (6:30-44 and 8:1-10; two sea miracles 4:35-41 and 6:45-52; and the two reports concerning Jesus of 6:1-16 and 8:28. Others include two stories of receiving children 9:36-37 and 10:13-16, three strands of parable material recognised by many scholars in 4:1-34, three passion predictions of 8:31; 9:31; 10:33-34; and three repeated reference to Judas; 14:10, 20, 43, reference to Mary mother of James/Jesus in 15:40, 20:43, 47 and 16:1); overlaps (some of the individual sayings attributed to Jesus in Mark also overlap with those in Q (Mark 8:35 and Matthew 10:39 = Luke 17:33); material is clustered in common groupings within his Gospel (miracles stories, controversy stories, parables). Inconsistencies and discrepancies abound at every level (Levi called to be a follower of Jesus in 2:14 is not mentioned in the disciples list in 3:13-19, in the parable discourse in chapter 4, it appears Jesus is in a boat continuously (4:1, 35-36), yet 4:10ff implies a change of scene, Jesus directs the boat to Bethsaida (6:45) but it lands mysteriously at Gennesaret (6:53) (Telford 1995:47-48).

The literary and the theology feature of the plot are often likewise baffling (The Pharisees and the Herodians who plot to kill Jesus in 3:6 (12:13) are not mentioned as named groups responsible for his death in the passion narrative (14-16); the parables (4:11-12) which are obscure to outsiders, yet Jesus' opponents perceived the significance of a parable uttered against them (12:12), and Jesus urges that his messianic identity be kept secret (8:30-33), yet he refers to himself as the Son of Man (2:10, 28) and stages a public messianic action (11:1-10) (Telford 1995:48).

What sources account for the above? The question of Mark's sources is an open one if Mark did not depend on any of the Synoptic gospels (Telford 1995:53). Commitment to the extensive *Grundschrift* (literally 'base type or ground script') underlying the Gospel of Mark has lost steam though, W. Shmithals attempts its revival in his commentary. Scholars claim the canonical Mark depended on extra-canonical gospels by doing a comparative analysis of Mark with some extra-canonical gospels like Egerton Papyrus 2 (Mark 1:40-49); Secret Gospel of Mark (referred to by Clement of Alexandria); the Gospel of Peter (a passion narrative only); and the Gospel of Thomas (a collection of sayings, some of which are paralleled in Mark).

The majority view is that rather the dependence operates the other way round and that Apocryphal Gospels do not provide the sources for Mark (Telford 1995:54). Similarly Proto-Mark or Ur-Markus theories do not continue to enjoy great support since the advent of form criticism and redaction criticism (1995:53). Telford notes that the minor agreements and overlap noticeable between Mark and Q has led to the postulation by some scholars of a second edition of canonical Mark (Deutero-Markus) which may have incorporated the Q and other materials (1995:53).

Again, the Christian scrapbook produced by a 'scissors-and-paste' theory was only held in the early years of scholarship. Some scholars have argued for a number of different sources. Cadoux for instance, argues for a combination of three separate Gospels. Some other scholars like W. L. Knox believe that Mark relied on a variety of sources such as short individual tracts, or pamphlets on themes like the Sayings, Conflict, the Parables, the Miracles, the Twelve Disciples, the Apocalypse or the Passion story (Telford 1995:54). This view is however challenged on the grounds that the Gospel of Mark does evince topical and thematic arrangement.

Markan scholars, Telford argues, maintain a more general and open stance in terms of pre-Markan tradition, collections or cycles, and even sources underlying sections of the Gospel as employed by the evangelists without isolating them (1995:54-55). The diversity of the Gospel's content suggests that Mark is the compilation of a multiplicity of sources rather than an edited version of a single one. But were these sources written, oral or both? (Telford 1995:49). The critique against Source critics is that they have never been able to demonstrate convincingly that the alleged sources had enough positive and negative distinguishing features or sufficient unity of thought, language and style to stand out from other sections of the Gospel. Nor have they been able to agree on the precise parameters of such sources (Telford 1995:54)

In Telford's view, concerning the pre-Markan collections, there is still a general agreement in favour of Mark's use of sources for a collection of controversies (in 2:1-3:6 but in 7:1-23 or 11-12), parables (chapter 4), sayings (chapter 10) and a passion narrative. Scholars are more divided in the case of miracles (4:35ff and the apocalypse (chapter 13), but generally agree in the case of 1:1-15 and 1:29-39. W.G. Kummel has shared a similar conclusion that Mark is probably based on no extensive written sources, but that more likely the Evangelist has woven together small collections of individual traditions and detailed bits of tradition into a more or less coherent presentation (cited in Telford 1995:56). The Gospel of Mark is thus increasingly being recognized as a text standing on the borderline between oral and written literature and no significant stages of literary activity preceded its composition (Telford 1995:56).

To sum up the current debate, in Mark there are evidence of the use of sources rather than a single extended *grundschrift*<sup>7</sup>. The study shares Telford's conclusion that Mark stands on the borderline between oral and written literature and no significant stages of literary activity

---

<sup>7</sup> Grundschrift literally mean ground script, is a simplified form of handwriting.

preceded its composition. The role of orality and forms in the Gospel formation is now widely acknowledged, thanks to form criticism and to which we now turn.

### 3.2.3 *Form Criticism*

Form criticism (*Formgeschichte* - its German name meaning form history), as a method, was developed by Jakob and Wilhelm Grimm and applied first to German folklore. It was later taken by H. Gunkel, who applied it to the Old Testament identifying and classifying smaller orally transmitted narratives, didactic and liturgical units lying behind the Old Testament text (Telford 1995:57). Two of the major researches of Gunkel are Genesis (1901) and the Psalms (1926; 1933). When it comes to the New Testament, form criticism was first applied to *The Corpus* by K. L. Schmidt, M. Dibelius and R. Bultmann between 1919 and 1921<sup>8</sup>. In addition to the German scholars, Vincent Taylor, a British author, also adopted form criticism though with some modifications.

To aid the discussion however, it is necessary to explain the two key words: form and criticism. Form is the linguistic sign, outline, structure, or shape of an individual literary unit and criticism is the analysis of the form. According to Gunkel (1862-1932), a text's genre is indicated by its structural form and is bound to a particular social setting and function. In light of these, the application of form criticism to the New Testament had two aims: to classify the various New Testament books according to their literary genre (German *Gattungsgeschichte*), and to analyse the smaller units of traditional material according to the "form" or "shape" they have assumed during the oral, pre-literary period (Travis 1985:153).

---

<sup>8</sup>See Schmidt's book, *Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu* ("The Framework of the Story of Jesus", Berlin 1919) Dibelius's books, *Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums*, (1919), English translation, *From Tradition to Gospel* (London 1934; reprinted 1971), is based on the much enlarged second German edition (Tübingen 1933) Bultmann's *History of the Synoptic Tradition* (Oxford 1963) is a translation of the third German edition (1958) of *Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition* (originally published Göttingen 1921).

When used in a broader sense the method stretches to trace the development of units of the gospel tradition during the oral period and make historical value-judgments on the material. Dibelius explained that form criticism involves reconstruction and analysis, it seeks to explain the origin of the tradition about Jesus, and thus to penetrate into a period, previous to that in which our gospels and their written sources were recorded. But it has a further purpose, it seeks to make clear the intention and real interest of the earliest tradition (Dibelius 1971: v). Form critics also draw attention to various forms which existed within the Gospel traditions (e.g. proverbs, aphorisms, parables, miracles stories, legends, etc.). Highlighting their universal and stereotyped nature, each of the forms had certain standard or conventional features which could be recognized in other forms of the same type, not only in the Synoptic (or triple) tradition but in Jewish, Hellenistic and other folk traditions as well (Telford 1995:59).

Form critics work with some presumptions which include, first, the belief that the time between Jesus' ministry and the composition of the Gospels was a period when the stories about Jesus and his sayings were communicated orally among Christians. This is affirmed by Papias' statement: "I supposed that things out of books did not profit me as much as the utterances of a voice which lives and abides" (Eusebius, H.E. III.39.4 cited Travis 2006). Second, the Synoptic Gospels are "popular" or "folk" writings rather than literary works in the classical sense. This means the evangelists were not historians using modern historical methods of research; they were receivers and transmitters of traditions cherished by Christian communities. To this end, Dibelius (1971:3-6) asserts the authors of the gospels are only, to the smallest extent, authors; they are principally collectors, vehicles of tradition, editors. Third, the oral stories about Jesus circulated as independent units, because acts and sayings of Jesus presumably would be recounted by preachers and teachers as the occasion demanded.

The apostle most probably used particular stories or words of Jesus to drive home some points in the course of their preaching rather than a well written out lecture. The short independent stories (paragraphs known as pericopae) with no gritty connection with the other in Mk. 2:1-3:6 attest to this. Fourth, at the oral transmission phase of the Gospels the story units or units of tradition assumed particular forms in accordance to the function which they performed in the Christian community. Examples of form are: sayings, controversies, parables *et cetera* (etc.). Form critics maintain that the distinctive forms are not accidental happenings but are produced by the setting in which they arose and the purpose for which they were used. This setting they call *Sitz im Leben* (life-situation). That is to say, the stories about Jesus assumed various forms or shapes based on their *Sitz im Leben*.

The unique forms in which the oral tradition of Jesus assumes were dictated by sociological context, life-setting or *Sitz in Leben*. For instance, the framework linking the pericopae were made prior to the written Gospels (e.g. controversy stories, parables or sayings in Mark) may be to make memorization easy. Memory has been identified as a restraining factor in the formation of the Gospel tradition in that what memory can retain and transmit is always capped by nature. And so a particular saying or story may be remembered and transmitted if it served the needs and purpose of an early church, that is, if it is relevant for, kerygmatic (promoting the faith), apologetic (defending the faith), polemic (attacking opponents), regulative (disciplining the community), didactic (teaching church members), catechetical (instructing neophytes) or liturgical (aiding worship) purposes (Telford 1995:58). So deducing the *Sitz im Leben* of a gospel narrative from its form is the claim of the enterprise of form criticism. *Sitz im Leben* to form critics is sociological in essence involving the community's life. The Gospel tradition was seen as having two possible settings, one in the life of the early church and one in the life of historical Jesus (Telford 1995:71). In effect, form critics operate with literary, sociological and historical orientations.

Based on their presumptions, Telford (1995) identifies three operations which form critics perform. One, to recover the traditional units from the editorial work of the evangelist and classification of these units according to their literary form. Two, to establish the sociological function or *Sitz im Leben* of each unit and the determination, therefore, of the particular interest, activity or concern of the community which led to their preservation or even creation. And three, maybe the most delicate operation is the tracing of the history of the tradition itself and the assessment, to ascertain its historical value in throwing light either upon Jesus' teaching and activity or upon those of the early church.

Besides, recovering of the traditional units, classifying the units according to their literary form, establishing the sociological function or *Sitz im Leben* of each unit, tracing of the history of the tradition itself and ascertaining its historical value; form critics undertake comparative analysis (especially of the triple tradition) of oral tradition and familiarity with the theological and other interests of the early Church, and by so doing evaluating the extent of development that a particular unit of tradition has undergone and hence its foundation in history. Pertaining to the third operation – the establishment of historicity of Gospel traditions about Jesus. Form critics operate with these three criteria of authenticity.

It must be said that the criteria is neither definitive in themselves nor fool-proof, and in conjunction with each other are used cautiously. The initial criterion is dissimilarity or distinctiveness, which states that a saying of a story attributed to Jesus has a higher probability of being authentic if it is uncharacteristic of either contemporary Judaism or the early church (Telford 1995:61).

The next criterion is, multiple attestation or the cross-section method, that is a unit of tradition about Jesus is reliable when it is found in two or more literary forms, let say, for example, found in parables, sayings, controversy stories and prophecy and apocalyptic. Another criterion

is, considerations of language and environment; if a tradition reflects Aramaic traits or early Palestinian-Jewish Christian community it is likely to be genuine. By employing these operational strategies and criteria form critics have come to various conclusions.

Regarding form critics' conclusions on the Gospel of Mark, Schmidt, drew attention to the unit-structure or pearls and string pattern of the gospel, pointing out that Mark consisted (with the exception of the passion narrative) of two series of separate and independent units (pericopae) which were joined together by an artificially created chronological and geographical framework (cited in Telford 1995:57). Besides the Passion Narrative, Dibelius identified five main categories which are listed below:

- Paradigms, brief events which terminate, in an authoritative saying of Jesus, or sometimes in a statement about the reaction of onlookers. There are two kinds of paradigms: pure paradigm (Mk. 3:31-35; 2:1-12, 18-22, 23-28; 3:1-5, 20-30; 10:13-16; 12:13-17; 14:3-9) and less pure paradigm (Mk. 1:23-27; 2:13-17; 6:1-6; Lk. 9:51-56; 14:1-6). Paradigms are independent from the literary context, brevity and simplicity, religious rather than artistic colouring – the word of Jesus is made to stand out clearly as the climax of the narrative, and the narrative ends with a thought useful for preaching. The sayings of Jesus may be divided into maxims, metaphors, parabolic narratives, prophetic challenges, short commandments, and extended commandments including some kind of motive clause.
- Tales (Novellen), stories of Jesus' miracles. They include exorcisms (e.g. Mk. 5:1-20; 9:14-29), other healing miracles (e.g. Mk. 1:40-45; 5:21-43) and nature miracles (e.g. Mk. 4:35-41; 6:35-44, 45-52). Novellen involves a description of the disease or situation to be remedied, a statement of the cure or solution achieved by Jesus, and a

statement of the results of the miracle—either the effects on the person healed or the reaction of the onlookers.

- Legends, religious narratives of a saintly man in whose works and fate interest is taken.
- Myths, narratives which depict a many-sided interaction between mythological but not human persons; the supernatural is seen breaking in upon the human scene. (Mk. 1:9-11, Mt. 4:1-11, Mk. 9:2-8).
- Exhortations (Paränesen), the teaching material in the Gospel with their *Sitz im Leben* being catechesis (p.104, 115,119, 271).

Bultmann and those who followed him like R. Pesch, and E. Best do not credit the Evangelist with much a masterful control over his source. They rather see the tradition as exerting a stronger influence in the Gospel. Bultmann, on his part, recognises two broad divisions within the synoptic tradition. First, ‘the tradition of the sayings of Jesus and the tradition of the narrative material’. Bultmann (1963:64) calls the sayings of Jesus apophthegms. In his school of thought, sayings attributed to Jesus are further divided into two subgroups: one which is introduced within a narrative framework with what it says climaxing it, and the other which is without. Sayings within a narrative framework include: Controversy dialogue (Mk. 2:23-28; 7:1-8), closely related scholastic dialogues which present a response to an observation, and request or question and enshrine didactic sayings (cf. e.g. Lk. 13:1-5; 12:13-14; Matt 11:2-6), and general and varied biographical apophthegms (Matt 17:24-27; Mk.10:13-16).

Sayings without narrative framework comprise logia (sayings in the narrower sense), gnomic or wisdom sayings in the form of proverbs or aphorism which embodied conventional secular wisdom or general religious truth (Matt 6:34b; 12:34b; Luke 6:31), prophetic and Apocalyptic sayings – predictions, admonitions, warnings of impending crisis, summons to repentance, and

promises of future reward (Mark 10:29-30; Matt. 8:11-12; Luke 13:28-29; Matt 10:17-23), and legal sayings. Others are christological (separated because of their form – Jesus speaks about the purpose of his coming, his special relationship with God, passion and resurrection (Mat 10:34-36; Luke 12:51-53), and parables (Bultmann 1963:64).

According to Bultman (1963:62) the *Sitz im Leben* of the apophthegms was to be found in preaching, apologetic and polemic. The second main division is ‘the narrative tradition’. Bultmann identified and classified miracles as stories and historical stories and legends, exorcism, healing, raising the dead, nature miracles. For Bultman, these stories were of doubtful historicity (Bultmann 1963:209-218).

In spite of its positive contributions, form criticism is critiqued (for critics of form criticism, see Meagher 1979, Sanders 1979, Kelber 1983) for lack of overall consensus among form critics themselves. It is also argued that the *Sitz im Leben* may after all be as an unreliable guide to historicity as some forms could emerge in certain social life which did not produce them.

In sum, the value of form criticism is in the insight it gives into the process that brought into being the Gospels and their essential traditions. Particularly noteworthy is that it stresses the role played by the practical needs of the community in the formation of these Gospel traditions. Form criticism has also shaped scholarly thought, the common view now is that the Gospels are not biographies but kerygmatic works, religious texts written out of faith, for faith. However, the passive role they assign the Evangelist is challenged by redaction critics.

### **3.2.4 Redaction Criticism**

*Redaktionsgeschichte*, as it is called in German became a discipline of biblical investigation after the Second World War, basically as an extension to form criticism. Redaction is from Latin *redigere* which means “to make something in some form of composition, to bring or

make or turn it into a state or condition” (Floss 2006:609) and ‘*redaktor*’ which means editor in German (Telford, 1995:71). According to Perrin (1969:1), redaction criticism, “is concerned with studying the theological motivation of an author as this is revealed in the collection, arrangement, editing, and modification of traditional material, and in the composition of new material or the creation of new forms within the traditions of early Christianity”. But in the narrower sense, redaction criticism is an investigation of the distinctiveness of the evangelists in relation to their sources (Telford, 1995:72). This means redaction criticism as a discipline is about investigating the unique sources the evangelists used, how they used them and why they were used.

Not until renowned scholars such as M. Kähler, W. Wrede, E. Lohmeyer and R. H. Lightfoot had acknowledged the creative role of the evangelists as theologians in the formulation of the Gospels that redaction criticism was developed into a discipline. Its key proponents are W. Marxsen who applied it to Mark. G. Bornkamm used it in studying Matthew, and H. Conzelmann researched Luke with it. These scholars worked independent of each other seeking to separate pre-Synoptic tradition from the redaction implications upon it.

Redaction criticism refocuses on the role of the evangelists in the Gospel composition, whom the form critics describe as mere compilers of tradition, and of the Gospel framework as artificial construction. Redaction critics see the evangelists as the first exegetes or interpreters or as theologians. Redaction criticism basically aims at investigating the use made of the sources fused into the Gospel by the Evangelist. It is about the way the Evangelist has consciously adapted (redacted) these sources to his own theological end. So in this case, redaction criticism is interested in the distinctiveness of the Evangelist’s contribution to the developing tradition (Telford, 1995:71).

Regarding method, while form criticism focuses on the origin of the Gospel tradition, redaction criticism deals with it at the final stage of the Gospel's composition. More so, while form criticism looks at the oral tradition in all its fragmentation, redaction criticism looks at the process of synthesis conducted by the individual editor upon that tradition. By focusing on the process of synthesis redaction criticism seeks to uncover the theological intent or purpose that governed the process (Telford, 1995:72). It touches on the general literary criticism of the gospel as a literary whole and works to capture the overall literary and theological conception which underlies the nature of its various parts.

The method includes first, separation of traditional material from editorial material or source from redaction. Second, concentration on those aspects of the data, which throws light on the editorial process and gives a cue to the Evangelist's underlying theological motivations. Cues to the redactional intention of the Evangelist is ascertained in three ways: first, figuring out the material or the sources the Evangelist deliberately chose to include. Second, assessing how materials selected have been arranged. Third, analysis of the way the traditional units selected have been linked together to form a connected presentation. This involves looking at the use of seams, summaries, introduction and conclusions (Telford, 1995:73).

Telford (1995) argues that analysing the seams and summaries or other aspects of the editorial framework helps, in turn, to isolate typical features of the gospel language, vocabulary, syntax and style as well as recurrent motifs, themes, ideas or emphases (e.g. use of Christological titles). Taking account of the selection, arrangement, linkage and internal modification of the units, as well as the other factors, a profile of the Evangelist's editorial activities can be constructed and his theological perspective thereby determined. Redaction criticism has made a huge impact on Gospel studies through the work of its proponents.

Marxsen's major contribution is his suggestion that there is a third setting in addition to the two established by form critics which are one, in the life of the early Church and two, in the life of the historical Jesus. The third, according to Marxsen, is in the thought of each evangelist. Marxsen's insight that the writing of the first Gospel (Mark) was a distinct individualistic event in which a diverse, fragmented communal tradition was for the first time brought into a creative synthesis by the skill of the Markan redactor. And his focus on the manipulation of the evangelists on the sources and their respective theologies opened the way for the flood of literature from the 1960s on the Gospels. Marxsen (1969:43) argues that Mark does not make use of his sources by adding formula quotations to them as for instance in the case of Matthew's use of Old Testament quotations; but rather interprets his sources by his arrangement of them. The Evangelist using isolated, self-contained pericopae (small clusters of pericopae) of the oral tradition (both sayings and narratives) arranged and put them together (artificially) and with the passion narrative to form the first connected Gospel. Marxsen maintains that Mark's greatest consolidation appears at the first part of his gospel. Pertaining to the transmission of the individual material to compose the gospel, Mark's attainment goes beyond collecting pieces from his sources and combining them by adding material of his own, to connecting them from a topical view point; implying that a unity emerges despite the diversity of material (Marxsen, 1969:52). There is evidence of topical arrangement created by Mark or the tradition before. Some of the topical arrangement are miracle stories at the first half of the Gospel (1:21-2:12; 4:35-5:43; 6:35-42; 7:24-8:10, 22-26), controversy stories are found in sections (2:1-3:6; 3:20-35; 7:1-23; 11:27-12:40), parables (4:1-34; isolated parable in 12:1-11), teaching on discipleship (8:27-10:45), and apocalypse (13). Evidence of geographical arrangement: Galilee (1-14-5:43), Galilee and its surroundings (6:1-9:50), Journey to Judea and Jerusalem (10:1-52), Jerusalem and its environs (11-16).

Mark's use of connecting devices 'and' and 'and immediately', use of narrative progression words like 'he' or 'they' came or went into, out, up, away; entered/left, withdrew, returned and so on as in 1:14, 16, 21, 29, 35, 40; 2:1, 13; 3:1, 7, 13, 19b, among other evidence of redaction in Mark.

Though its positive contribution to biblical scholarship is not in doubt, redaction criticism is critiqued for its scholars' inability to delineate the precise sources (written or oral) on which to establish their understanding of the Markan redaction which has led to the widening of the criteria for determining his religious outlook. In addition, it is considered a discipline in tension against itself, wanting to remain a historical method but struggling in particular to come to terms with the literary aspects of its source material.

To summarise the discussion, redaction criticism does help to develop an image of the pre-history of the text, the sources employed, and the contribution of the evangelist in the redaction process. In effect, redaction criticism helps illuminate our understanding of the Evangelist's contribution to the development of the gospel tradition. Its holistic treatment of the text positions it as a comprehensive method with multiple concerns – historical, theological, literary and sociological.

The three traditio-historical methods (source, form and redaction criticism) used in Markan research, have been examined in this chapter in terms of their aims, methods, results and limitations. Even before them, the question of orality in the Gospel of Mark was considered. In the process this study agreed with the scholarly consensus that the Gospel of Mark began as oral stories told among the Christian communities. The Gospel can therefore be considered a unique literature with a long history of oral tradition which provide useful historical information when subjected to working of these traditio-historical methods.

Source, Form and Redaction criticisms as discussed, in their individual means, help modern readers to form at least a mental picture of the pre-history of the text in terms of the sources employed, the forms assumed by the pre-Markan tradition and the editorial action that took place. It has been established in the study the pioneering role these methods played in enabling insight and a journey to the past behind and beyond the text to the historical Jesus. Through the various emphases of these methods they have aided the appreciation of the contribution of both the evangelist and the early Church to the development of the Jesus tradition.

The inquiry in the subject also introduced us to a point of divergence among the three tradition-historical criticisms. The major difference among them pertains to positions taken regarding the question of creativity. The extent to which Mark is believed to have been a master of his material, and the particular model that is imagined for the composition of the Gospel. Though these three literary-historical critical methods talk about *Sitz im Leben* of the gospel tradition not much attention is given to the social context of the Gospels for hermeneutical purposes.

Meaning, it is said, resides in the social context, therefore effort to understand the gospel better would require a discussion of the social setting of the gospel and the corresponding social scientific method applied to its study.

### **3.2.5 Social Scientific Criticism**

Further effort to advance the understanding of the New Testament, particularly the Gospels, beyond the work of the historical critical methods led to the emergence of the Social Scientific Criticism (Acronym 'SSC'). Social Scientific Criticism takes as its conviction that the biblical texts have more of the historical context, more importantly, a social dimension, or context which produces the text. There is the need for a critical awareness of the social and cultural context of the text just as the *Sitz im Leben* in emphasised in form criticism.

Elliott, the man credited with the name of this methodology (Elliott 1982, 1993, 2011; Van Aarde & Joubert 2009:423; Malina 2008:5), has observed that the last third of the 20<sup>th</sup> century saw growth in the need for more refined analysis and articulation of the social context of the biblical text. Such growth was expressed in the 1970s, by many exegetes employing the social scientific criticism in their work. Such works included: Wayne Meeks on the sectarian perspective of the Gospel of John (1972) and Pauline mission as an urban phenomenon (1983), Gerd Theissen on the social dynamics concerning the Jesus movement in Palestine and beyond (1978, 1982), Fernando Belo on the debt system underlying the Gospel of Mark (1974) and John Gager's exposition of the Revelation of John (1975). Others were John Elliott's work on First Peter as a product of a sectarian group within Israel with its focus on societal estrangement and group solidarity (Elliott 1981, 1990); and Bruce Malina's delineation of characteristic ancient Mediterranean perceptions, values and social strategies (Malina 1981, 1986; Elliott 2011:2).

According to Elliott (1993:7), social scientific criticism is

that phase of the exegetical task which analyses the social and cultural dimensions of the text and of its environmental context through the utilization of the perspectives, theory, models, and research of the social sciences. As a component of the historical-critical method of exegesis, Social Scientific Criticism investigates biblical texts as meaningful configurations of language intended to communicate between composers and audiences. In this process it studies not only (1) the social aspects of the form and content of texts but also the conditioning factors and intended consequences of the communication process, (2) the correlation of the text's linguistic, literary, theological (ideological), and social dimensions and (3) the manner in which this textual communication was both a reflection of and response to a specific social and cultural context, that is, how it was designed to serve as an effective vehicle of social interaction and an instrument of social as well as literary and theological consequence.

From the definition SSC is a sub-discipline of exegesis in association with other exegetical methods like textual, literary, narrative, historical, tradition, form, redaction, rhetorical and theological criticisms. Whilst other exegetical methods undertake critical analysis of specific features of the biblical text, social scientific criticism focuses on the text as well as ancient social and cultural systems in general as investigated by sociologist, anthropologists, and archaeologists (Elliott 1993:8). Elliott (1993:8) explains further that with social scientific

criticism the text is studied as both a reflection of and a response to the social and cultural settings in which the text was produced.

The aim of social scientific criticism is to determine the meaning or meanings explicit and implicit in the text, meaning made possible and shaped by the social and cultural systems occupied by both authors and intended audiences. Its operational method involves analysis of the texts in conjunction with the study of the social and cultural system in which these texts were produced and which provided their framework of meaning (Elliott 1993:8). Social Scientific Criticism employs models from the social system of the ancient Mediterranean biblical world to analyse its data. Some of the models are Patronage, and Honour and Shame. By using perspectives, theories, models, and research of the social sciences it expands the frontiers of biblical understanding and interpretation. In this sense social scientific method has a heuristic function in biblical interpretation.

Malina (2008:5) maintains that biblical interpreters who practise social scientific criticism look for dimensions of the social system that might disclose the meaning of a given social interaction as presented in the written description of social scenarios found in the New Testament writings. Texts, whether literary or oral, also were designed to serve as vehicles of social interaction, hence the primary focus of social scientific criticism is the biblical text (Elliott 1993:8). Social scientific approach can adopt both synchronic and diachronic point of view in its analysis (Elliott 1993:15).

In making a case for the relevance of social scientific methodology, Neyrey states that words take their meaning from a social system, not from lexicon. Social scientific reading alerts us to the fact that proper reading requires that we learn the ancient cultural system that filled those words with distinctive meaning (Neyrey 2008, cited in Neyrey and Stewart 2008: xxi).

Elliott (1993:17) adds that the lives, ministry, and the message, action and impact of Jesus and his followers are all rooted in a matrix of social and cultural forces. Elliott (2011:17) shares a similar view, that every writing of the Gospel of Mark describes events that are social in nature: social relations, social structures, social institutions, roles performed and statuses held in the social arena, as well as scripts to be enacted in the social dramas of everyday life. More so, the biblical books themselves are social and rhetorical products with literary, theological or social aims. They are intended for social communication and social interaction and to prompt social action on the part of its targeted audience. The sociality of the biblical text requires the social scientific approach.

To sum up, social scientific criticism like the historical critical methods leads us into the social world behind the text, which enhances hermeneutics. It uses both synchronic and diachronic point of view. In that case it is able to analyse the collection of social phenomena and their interrelationships at a given time and place or focus on social movement and change over the course of time.

As a diachronic approach, social scientific criticism can ensure an interaction of scenarios and parallels between first century ancient Mediterranean world and the world of the 21<sup>st</sup> century biblical exegete. And as a synchronic approach, it can analyse in details the Mediterranean cultural, social, economic and political scenarios in their context. In talking about scenarios, one may wonder, what were the scenarios that occupied the first century Mediterranean world of the Gospel of Mark?

### **3.3 Social Setting and Socio-Cultural Context of Mark**

The world the biblical characters lived in was dramatically different from the one in which today's people live. A lot of information in the Bible rely on the Mediterranean cultures which

were noted for their honour and shame social arrangement. People thought of themselves as belonging to households and their resources were limited (Mahlangu 2001:86). Regarding the society and the social system within which Jesus spoke, Clarke writes “Graeco-Roman society was highly stratified, and at all levels of community life, people recognized and elevated the status quo whereby those of comparatively greater rank and social standing received due deference and honour” (Clarke 2000:146-147).

As has been noted earlier in this chapter settings are critical to the interpretation of historical writings like the Gospel of Mark. Efforts are thus made to grasp the perceptions and social contexts of the original author and his intended audience by understanding the interactional behaviour of the characters in the Gospel. The necessity of this lies in the general belief that meaning invariably resides in the social system shared by persons involved in the interaction with each other (Malina 1996: xi).

Even more importantly, as social systems yield the meaning various human societies derive and maintain their distinctive social systems which must be understood first. This explains why persons enculturated and socialized in a particular social system readily understand each other (Malina 1996: xii). How can a 21<sup>st</sup> century African reader interpret a first century Gospel of Mark? Malina (1996) suggests, against the backdrop that what one brings to one’s reading is far more significant than what one presumably reads out of some document.

Malina (1996: xiii) maintains that to be a considerate reader of the Gospel of Mark, one must bring to one’s reading a range of scenarios rooted in the social system of the author and audience. By social systems he means social institutions, values clustered around value objects and types of typical persons. Value objects include the self, others, nature, time, place and God(s). The system of the Markan audience, a part of the first century Mediterranean region,

has been found to include collectivist selves whose focal social institution was the family and to “kinify” relations, especially in that dimension called patron–client (Malina 1996: xiv).

### ***3.3.1 Interactional Persons and Groups in Mark***

Jews in Palestine during the Hellenistic and Roman periods lived in an agrarian society within a large agrarian, bureaucratic and partly commercialized aristocratic empire (Lenski 1966:214; Kautsky 1982:24; Saldarini 1988:35; Van Eck 1995:211). The society was highly stratified, with steep hierarchy and great inequalities with the elite few in control of wealth. This kind of society with many identifiable groups and persons was arranged in what social science scholars would call classes. It is these identified groups and persons who also constituted and are imagined in this study as the the interactional base for Jesus in Mark.

Obviously one’s social standing informed the kind of interactions social system allowed and even who one can interact with. The Gospel of Mark consists of many social groups and individuals who provided the interaction forum. Rohrbaugh (2008) identified five broad groups of people within which are different clusters of people. The groups comprised urban elites who were made of rulers (King, Procurator, and Tetrarch), highest ranking military officers, ranking priestly families, the Herodians and other aristocratic families. The next group was retainers also consisting of lower military officers, officials and bureaucrats such as clerks, bailiffs, personal retainers, household servants, scholars, legal experts, and low-level lay aristocracy. Another group was urban non-elite, this comprised merchants, artisans, day labourers, and service workers of various kinds. There was the degraded, unclean, and expendables group which involved beggars, prostitutes, the poorest day labourers, tanners, peddlers, bandits, sailors, gamblers, ass drivers, usurers, dung collectors, and even some merchants. And last

group was the rural peasants and other villagers, this group included freeholding peasants, tenant farmers, day labourers, slaves, and various landless groups.

### ***3.3.1.1 The Urban Elite***

The Urban Elites were estimated to be about 2% of the agrarian society of first century Palestine. They were mostly the educated, and lived in fortified central areas of the cities, usually enclosed in separate walls, hence they were physically and socially isolated from the rest of the society (Rohrbaugh 2008, cited in Neyrey and Stewards 2008:145).

These were rulers, high ranking military officers, high ranking priestly families, the Herodians and other aristocratic families along with their retainers. They had control of writing, coinage, taxation, the military and the judiciary. They had very little in common socially, culturally, and politically with the lower classes (Rohrbaugh 2008:146). This interactional group maintained their own mannerism, vocabulary, speech patterns, and dress to the effect that they could easily be spotted on sight (Rohrbaugh 2008:142). This group was the wealthiest. Their wealth is believed to be amassed from land ownership and taxation, which drained the resources of the rural areas and impoverished the rural dwellers.

Fiensy (1991:93-94) estimates the average peasant plot at six acres or less, in contrast with the tens of thousands of acres of arable land owned by the Herodian family in lower Galilee (Rohrbaugh 2008:147). This dovetails into the general assertion that in the agrarian societies one to three percent of the population owned the majority of the arable land. Rohrbaugh (2008) provides the list of urban elites identified in Mark as follows: caesar (12:14, 17), Pontius Pilate (15:2, 8, 15), rulers of the gentiles (10:42), herod (6:14: 8:15), Herodias (6:17), Herodia's daughter (6:22), Philip (6:17), governors (13:9, 15, 16), high priest (2:26, 14:47, 53, 54, 60, 61,

63, 66), chief priest (8:31, 10:33; 11:18, 27; 14:1, 10, 43, 53, 55; 15:1, 3, 10, 11, 31), Scribes (1:22; 2:6, 16; 3:22; 7:1, 5; 8:31; 9:11, 14; 10:33; 11:18, 27; 12:28, 35, 38; 14:1, 43, 53; 15:1, 31), strong man (3:27), those who have (4:25), elders (8:31; 11:27; 14:43, 53; 15:1), rich man (10:22), wealthy (10:23, 25), vineyard owner and son (12:1, 6), Sadducees (12:18), family of seven brothers (12:20), rich people (12:41), kings (13:9), man going on a journey (13:34), owner of upper room (14:14), Joseph of Arimathea (15:43), and Jairus and his family (5:22, 23, 40).

Rohrbaugh notes the prominence of social conflict in Mark's narrative and finds no surprise that all of Jesus' opponents come from this group or its retainers. All conflicts come from a single social strata who acts in genuine solidarity with each other. This suggests that conflict is social as well as theological. Social level of Scribes could vary; it has been identified that urban Scribes were more than mere typists. They functioned as respected sages of consideration and influence and they were distinct from village Scribes. Urban Scribes should be understood as retainers of the urban aristocracy for their rural appointment (Hunt & Edgar 1934: ix, 339, 393 cited in Rohrbaugh 2008:148)

In summary, Jesus had a number of interactional encounters with members of this urban elite group but majority of such encounters were characterised by conflict. Jesus' interaction with this group was one of conflict as almost all his opponents were members of this group. The Scribes and Pharisees are clearly the members of the Jewish aristocracy and their struggle with Jesus is primarily one for political influence over the non-elite (11:18) (Rohrbaugh 2008:148). However, three exceptions are made: the Scribe who is not far from the kingdom (12:34), Joseph of Arimathea (15:43) and Jairus (5:21-43). For example, Jairus though not particularly

urbanite was certainly a village leader. These three according to Malbon (1989:275-276) prevent excluding members of the elite from Jesus' community and may indicate that some of such were in the community of Mark as well.

### ***3.1.1.2 Retainers***

Retainers as they are called are persons in the service of others, usually the powerful elite. At the time of Jesus, they included low-level military officers, officials and bureaucrats such as clerks and bailiffs, personal retainers, household servants, scholars, legal experts, and low level lay aristocracy. They are basically in the service of the elite and serve to mediate both governmental and religious tasks to the lower classes and to village areas. These include: pharisees (2:16, 18, 24; 3:6; 7:1; 3, 5; 8:11, 15; 10:2; 12:13), people from Jairus's house (5:35), men arresting John the baptizer (6:17), soldier of the guard (6:27), levi (2:14), those selling in the temple (11:15), servant-girl of the high priest (14:66), crowd sent from chief priest; Scribes and elders (14:43), physicians (2:17; 5:26), Galilee priest (1:44), courtiers, officers (6:21), Judas Iscariot (14:11), tax collectors (2:15, 16), moneychangers (11:15), doorkeepers (13:34), soldiers (15:16), Centurion (15:39) and slave/servant (1:20; 9:35; 10:43, 44; 12:2, 4; 13:34; 14:47).

Deserving of special mention here are the Pharisees, key actors in this category and sworn opponents of Jesus. The Pharisees are so prominent in the Gospel of Mark because they were opponents of Jesus not on account that they were the most powerful leaders of Judaism. They were not members of the governing class; in any case, Jesus himself was a minor religious figure in his lifetime and would hardly have been noticed by the Jerusalem authorities, or even when eventually got noticed, would not have been the focus of the authorities or their attention.

The day-to-day opponents of Jesus would have been of a lower level – local leaders would have confronted Jesus in a competition for influence among the people (Saldarini 1988:71). Pharisees were perhaps part of the local leadership in Galilee. They were mentioned in five situations and in all of them they were in conflict with Jesus. Two times they were mentioned along with the Scribes as a joint team in conflict with Jesus (2:16; 7:1, 5). And two times they were mentioned with the Herodians (3:6; 12:13) scheming to destroy Jesus.

In the view of Saldarini (1988:71) the Pharisees of Mark's day were a group of retainers competing with the Jesus groups for influence among the non-elite. They might have depended on the priests, and the temple, the wealthy leaders of society, or Herod Antipas for livelihood. Saldarini (1988:71), rightly observes, the Pharisees “could not develop their own interpretation of Judaism and propagate it among the people who were full-time lower-peasants.”

To sum up, according to Rohrbaugh, more people in this category than in the elite group were followers of Jesus. For example, the people from Jairus' house, Levi, tax collectors, and the centurion. The interactional activity of Jesus with members of this group is high, reasonably so. As Saldarini has observed Jesus himself was a low level religious leader. His engagement with the tax collectors, Scribes and the Pharisees is particularly noteworthy.

### ***3.3.1.3 Urban Non-elite***

Eight percent of the people in agrarian societies are considered to be of this group (Rohrbaugh 2008:150). They have varied economic status, ranging from extreme poverty among day labourers with some artisanal groups creating considerable wealth and placed among successful merchants. Rohrbaugh (2008:50) notes that even the rich among them bore little social or cultural influence. The urban non-elites (the urban poor) lived in segregated areas at the outer

edge of the cities which had internal and external gates with guards, and the gates were locked in the night. It is noted that among the urban non-elites poor health and nutrition were often worse than in the villages, and life expectancies were shorter.

Identifiable urban non-elite in Mark are: those buying in the temple (likely includes peasants) (11:15), widow (12:42), and the crowd/people (1:5, 33; 6:34, 39; 11:18, 32; 12:12, 37, 41; 14:2, 43; 15:8, 11, 15).

Not much of this group is seen in Mark's story, the most probable reason being the fact that aside from the Passion Narrative, very little of Mark's story takes place in an urban environment (Rohrbaugh 2008:150). In short, direct interaction between members of this strata and Jesus is very limited. Except in a few for cases with the crowd or people (1:33; 6:34, 39; 12:12, 37) Jesus did not have direct interaction with any of the group members.

#### ***3.3.1.4 Degraded, Unclean, and Expendables***

Rohrbaugh (2008:150) maintains that every preindustrial city had outside its walls the degraded, unclean, and the expendables consisting of: beggars, prostitutes, the poorest day labourers, tanners (forced outside the cities because of their odour), peddlers, bandits, sailors, gamblers, ass drivers, usurers, dung collectors, and even some merchants. They were present in both villages and cities. Members of this strata are forced out of the city but allowed into the city in the day time for their daily subsistence. Their living conditions and life-expectancy were appalling; but they were not a large portion of the population.

Incidence of Expendables in Mark include: the man with an unclean spirit (1:23), the sick and demon possessed (1:32-34, 39; 6:9, 13, 55; 9:38), leper (1:40), paralytic (2:3), man with

withered hand (3:1), those who had nothing (4:25), demoniac (5:2), haemorrhaging woman (5:25), syro-phoenician woman and daughter (7:25-26), deaf man with speech impediment (7:32), blind man (8:22), blind bartimaeus (10:46), simon the leper (14:3), swineherds (5:14), and the man carrying a jar (14:13).

The striking thing about this group is the sheer number of them in Mark's story and the frequency with which Mark gives summaries of Jesus' interaction with them (1:28, 32-34, 45; 3:7-10; 6:31-34, 54-56; 7:36-37) (Rohrbaugh 2008:151). Mark wants us to know early on in his book that Jesus' healing activity among this group of people is the major reason for the reputation that he developed (1:28). He explains that the swineherd and porter were among the most degraded employments. The next case in point is the Syro-Phoenician woman. Theissen (1984) and Cooley (1994) explain that she could have been a higher status woman but with her daughter afflicted by an unclean spirit, probably she and her daughter might have been considered by the villagers as marginalized or ostracized persons. In a nutshell, there are a lot of interactional activities between Jesus and members of this group. Unsurprising as it were, Jesus himself a peasant, was at the margins with his own.

### ***3.1.1.5 The Rural Peasants and Other Villagers.***

This group constituted ninety percent of agrarian societies like that of the New Testament era. They lived in the village doing what social scientists call primary industry – farming and extracting raw materials. Rohrbaugh identifies several sub-groups who are found in Mark's Gospel. They include: freeholding peasants, tenant farmers, day labourers, slaves, and various landless groups that include fishermen, artisans, and other craftsmen. Peasants identified in Mark are: those from the Judean countryside (1:5), Peter, Andrew (1:16), James, John, Zebedee (1:19-20), Simon's mother in-law (1:30), Jesus (6:3), Mary (6:3), James, Joses, Judas, Simon,

and Jesus' sisters (6:3), Seed scatterer (4:26), Mary Magdalene, Mary the mother of James, Joses, Salome (15:40), Little ones (9:42), Children (10:13), Bystanders in Bethphage (11:5), Those buying in the temple (likely included urban poor as well) (11:15), Tenants (12:1), Sower (4:3), Simon of Cyrene (15:21) and the crowd (2:4, 13; 3:9, 20, 32; 4:1, 36; 5:21, 24, 27, 30, 31; 6:14, 17, 34, 39, 45; 7:14, 17, 33; 8:1, 2, 6, 34; 9:14, 15, 17, 25; 10:1, 46)

### **a. Freeholding Peasants**

Majority of scholars agree that the percentage of land held by Galilean freeholders in the first century was very small (Fiensy 1991:60 cited in Rohrbaugh 2008:151). The reason was land lost to the wealthy due to debt emanating from poor and unstable yield (Oakman 1986:26; Horsley 1989:88-90; Fiensy 1991:93; Goodman 1982).

### **b. Tenants, Day Labourers and Slaves**

Evidence for aristocratic control of major portions of the arable is most abundant for the period following after the revolt of 66 CE. There we get a clear picture of large estates employing tenant farmers, landless labourers, and slaves in producing crops for absentee landowners. In ever increasing numbers during the first century CE, landless peasants worked the lands of the wealthy, to whom they paid significant portions of the produce for the opportunity (Fiensy 1991:75-85).

### **c. Other Rural Groups**

In addition to peasant farmers, most village and rural areas contained at least several other groups. Low-level retainers and lay aristocrats often provided village leadership, and mostly villages of any size had a council to govern local affairs. Artisans, craftsmen, fishermen, and herders were common as well, though few artisans or craftsmen could make a living in only the smaller villages and thereby had to work in several locations (Rohrbaugh 2008:153).

### 3.3.2 *Peasant Health*

Mark's Gospel allows for many healing and exorcism activities raising a question about the health situation at the time. Infectious disease was a severe threat to life and undoubtedly accounted for much of the high mortality rate among children (Rohrbaugh 2008:154). Most lower-class people have been found in atrocious health even in adulthood, majority suffering from internal parasites, rotten teeth, and bad eyesight.

Majority suffered from protein deficiency since childhood and carried parasites transferred to them from animals such as sheep, goat and dogs. Zias (1991) asserts that 'fifty percent of the hair combs from Qumran, Masada, and Murabbat were infected with lice and lice eggs' (Rohrbaugh 2008:154). Health of the peasants was also plagued by malnutrition. Fiensy (1991:98) maintains that infant mortality rate was very high estimated around forty percent. It is argued, "the age structure of the population, and pathological evidence from skeletal remains can be taken as indicators, malnutrition was a constant threat as well" (Fiensy 1991:98). Rohrbaugh (2008) also notes fraud, robbery, forced imprisonment, forced labour, beating, inheritance disputes, and forcible removal of rents as another feature of village life in the Markan story (Rohrbaugh 2008:154).

Commenting on these group Rohrbaugh (2008) maintains that minimal survival levels were common. Given the above, obviously, interactional engagement between Jesus and these groups' members is high. Perhaps it is so because of where Jesus sited his ministry and those he made his focus in ministry. Deserving of special mention are children (10:13), Jesus not only showed acceptance of them but set them as a pattern for life in the new kingdom which had come to these peasants.

### 3.3.3 *Interactional Models of the Markan Social World.*

Culture provides the morality of social interaction in market, civil society, and state (Marmefelt cited in Heatherton & Walcott 2009:22). Such morality is expressed in ways of institutional and interactional arrangements. Social science researchers have sought to understand such interactional arrangements of the ancient Mediterranean biblical world by gleaning models for interpretation. This section delineates three of them: Honour and Shame, Patronage, and Personality.

#### 3.3.3.1 *Honour and Shame*

Honour and shame are cardinal values for interaction in the first century Mediterranean world (Malina 1993:28). Their weight and pervasiveness according to Rohrbaugh (2010:109-110) reflect in the space they enjoy in the works of ancient authors like Xenophon, Aristotle, Alus Gellius, Plutarch, Philo, Josephus, and even Augustine. *τιμή* translated honour, esteem, recognition (John 4:44; Romans 2:7,10; 9:21, 12:10; 13:7; 1 Peter 1:7; 2:7, 17; 1 Cor. 12:23-24), its opposite *αἰσχρὸς* translated shame (Luke 9:21; 1 Cor. 1:26; 11:4-6; Romans 1:16; 5:5; 6:21; 9:33; 10:11) as well as *ἀτιμία* translated dishonour (Mark 12:4; John 8:49; 1 Cor. 4:10; 11:14; 12:23; Romans 1:24, 26; 9:24) are common in the New Testament Bible.

Malina (1993:31-33, 50; Rohrbaugh 2010) explains the model in the following way:

Honour, understood as one's reputation in the eyes of the public, was the core value of the ancient Mediterranean world. It was the goal, the passion, the hope of all who aspired to excel. In other words, honour is the value of a person in his or her own eyes (that is, one's claim to worth) plus that person's value in the eyes of his or her social group. To this extent, honour is a claim to worth along with the social acknowledgement of worth. Honour then might be described as socially proper attitudes and behaviour in the area where the three lines of power, gender status, and religion intersect. Honour in this sense applies to both genders. It is the basis of one's reputation, of one's social standing, regardless of gender.

Rohrbaugh (2010:111) explains honour further as the status one claims in the community, together with the all-important public recognition of that claim. This honour claimed, but

without public recognition, was considered the boast of fools. For this reason, honour acknowledged by one's peers was of value beyond measure and meant access to power and privilege. To obtain such recognition, Malina (1993:31) notes power, gender status and religion as the defining features of honour, which factors intersect to validate this claim to worth leading to its concomitant social or public acknowledgement.

Power here refers to the ability to exercise control over the behaviour of others. Gender status refers to the sets of duties and right of the different genders, and religion means the attitude one must have and the behaviour one is expected to follow are relative to those who control one's existence (Malina 1993:31). Take for instance, a father in a family (gender role, status on the ladder of society) commands his children to do something, and they obey (power), as God (the gods) intended: they treat him honourably. Other people seeing this would acknowledge that he is an honourable father (Malina 1993:32). The end result is legitimate honour, which is the honour that is publicly recognized, which determines one's life prospects by bringing goodies such as access to power, opened doors to patrons, conferred the right to exercise authority and, above all, accorded one an audience and the right to speak in public (Rohrbaugh 2010:111).

It is most noteworthy that honour is a limited good in the public space just like scarce resources of land, crops, livestock, political clout, and female sexuality (Rohrbaugh 2010:112). The implication is that honour gained was always honour taken from or a loss to another person. It goes without saying that the consequence is seen in the intense competition and envy that characterized such agonistic societies for honour. In such societies, individuals are concerned with honour, there is a constant dialectic, a thinking back and forth, between the norms of society and how the person is to reproduce those norms in specific behaviour. The major

preoccupation is what one ought to do about what is ideally acknowledged in the society as meaningful and valuable, and then examines one's actions in the light of those societal norms (Malina 1993:32). When a person is honoured it means one's actions are judged to be in conformity with social thoughts. So the first century person was interested in his or her honour rating.

Explaining shame on the other hand, Rohrbaugh (2010:112) notes two kinds of shame – having shame which is a positive veil and being shamed is a social catastrophe, especially since shame for one member of a family meant shame for all. When one is shamed, it means a loss of “face”, a public loss of honour; and is a negative shame. Rohrbaugh has examined several views on shame. In his consideration of Philo's treatment of the shame, he argues that, “shame is a sign that one feels his conduct to be disgraceful, for only disgraceful actions are followed by shame” (Rohrbaugh 2010:112, see Philo, *De specialibus legibus* IV.6). Rohrbaugh maintains that when the Bible says, being “thrown into outer darkness, where there will be weeping and gnashing of teeth” (Matt 8:12; 13:42, 50; 22:12; 24:51; 25:30; Luke 13:28; see Acts 7:54), it was describing the reaction of persons who have been publicly shamed or dishonoured. This notwithstanding, having shame is positive (Rohrbaugh 2010:112).

Malina (1993:50) holds that those who are shamed are shameless persons who do not recognise the rules of human interaction, and who do not recognize social boundaries. Such individuals or group have dishonourable reputation beyond all social doubt. They are outside the boundaries of acceptable moral life, and do legitimately suffer denial of the normal social courtesies. Actions of shaming are also taken, for example, spitting in a person's face was a common informal social shaming sanction, which defiled and degraded people and rendered them unclean and socially unacceptable (Bechtel 1991:59; see Numbers 12:14; Lev. 15:8; Mark

15:19; Matt. 27:30). Showing courtesy to a shameless person makes one a fool, because it is foolish to show respect for boundaries when a person acknowledges no boundaries (Malina 1993:51).

As noted above, having shame is positive, it means to have a proper concern for one's honour and to know what can bring about its gain or loss. Aristotle speaks of the "fear of dishonour" and likens it to fear of death—both make one go pale (Rohrbaugh 2010:12). "Positive shame means sensitivity about one's own reputation, sensitivity to the opinion of others. To have shame in this sense is an eminently positive value" (Malina 1993:50). This is to say, a person worthy of the title "human," any human group worthy of belonging to humankind, ought to have shame, be sensitive to its honour rating, and be sensitive to the opinion of others (Malina 1993:51). What positive shame does is to help people in the acceptance of and respect for the rules of human interaction, make them dignified, and human.

Another equally important component of the discussion on honour is how honour is attained. Honour can either be ascribed or acquired. While ascribed honour like ascribed wealth, is honour that you get simply for being you, not because of anything you do to acquire it. Acquired honour on the other hand, is the socially recognized claim to worth that a person acquires by excelling over others in the social interaction that we shall call challenge and response (Malina 1993:33).

For more clarity, ascribed honour is the socially recognized claim to worth that befalls a person, that happens passively, for example, derives from the fact of birth. If one is born into an honourable family one is honourable (Malina 1993:33). One can understand the genealogies in the Bible in light of a person's honour lines and thus socially situate the person on the ladder

of statuses (Malina 1993:33). Besides, honour can be attained when ascribed to a person by notable persons of power such as God, the king, aristocrats, in sum, by persons who can claim honour for others and can execute its acknowledgement.

Acquired honour, unlike the ascribed, its attainment involves challenge and response that is persons hassle each other according to socially defined rules in order to gain the honour of another (Malina 1993:34). The challenge is a claim to enter the social space of another. Challenge and response is a sort of constant social tug of war – a person (source, challenger) sends a message (word, gift, invitation, some action or event) by means of certain culturally recognised channels to the receiving individual who responds (even non-action is interpreted as a response). Challenge – response within the honour – attainment system is a sort of social interaction involving three phases:

- The challenge on the part of the challenger
- The perception of the message by both the individual to whom it is directed and the public at large.
- The reaction of the receiving individual and the evaluation of the reaction on the part of the public (Malina 1993:35).

The claim will be to gain some share in that space or to gain a cooperative mutually beneficial foothold or to dislodge another from that person's social space, either temporarily or permanently (Malina 1993:35). Malina maintains that in the first century Mediterranean world every social interaction that takes place outside one's family or outside one's circle of friends is perceived as a challenge to honour (Malina 1993:37). The model of shame and honour suggests the basic way in which Mediterranean people express their self-esteem or their esteem for others (Moxnes 1996:20). In effect, patronage, slavery, economic practices, purity rules,

meal practices, and even a sense of identity which are derived from a group membership should be understood in terms of honour and shame (Moxnes 1996:20).

In sum, honour and shame were pervasive realities in the New Testament period with major ramifications for leadership. Honour and shame underpinned how public office particularly public leadership played out in a society. The system of city honours in exchange for benefaction is well known from ancient sources. There was pressure on citizens to contribute to the city expenses in exchange for honour of various kinds (Public offices); thus, a motivation for the patronage system.

The system became a source of competition for power and influence among the city elites. Honour thus, was a reward for the upkeep of public life and the financing of common goods through benefactions toward the city (Moxnes 1996:34). The old Eastern traditional Mediterranean practice of giving divine honours to the ruler caused leading citizens to use benefactions to compete for priestly and public positions (Moxnes 1996:3).

The struggles for honour is unending as people always sought to redefine their status in society. In Mark Jesus' dealings with the people of the margins of society (Mark 1:21-29, 40-45; 2:1-12, 15-17, 18-20, 23-28; 3:1-6; 5:1-20, 25-34; 6:35-44, 7:24-29; 8:1-10) led the Pharisees and the Scribes to conclude that he was a fool. In fact by showing courtesy to the shameless in John 8:1-11 Jesus became a fool. By showing courtesy to the crowd full of shameless people made him a fool in the eyes of the Pharisees, Scribes and the priesthood. It will be reasonable to suggest that Jesus, conscious of honour and shame typology in his society redefined honour and shame. By touching the untouchables he became even more popular and honoured. Jesus' riposte ability was phenomenal; he would not lose any argument with the Scribes or the Pharisees.

### ***3.3.3.2 Patronage and Clientism***

Mark makes extensive use of the Graeco-Roman benefaction system as both social background and as hermeneutical key to understanding the person and role of Jesus and the nature of his community. The benefaction system operated through a patron-client arrangement which was a distinctive relationship between a patron and a client called patronage. Malina (1993:133) explains the patron-client relationship as “a social, institutional arrangement by means of which economic, political, or religious institutional relationships are outfitted with an overarching quality of kinship or family feeling”.

Patron–client relations was known to be pervasive in the whole of ancient Mediterranean society. The patron–client relationship existed on a system of reciprocity. Malina (1993:100) maintains that it was a form of social interaction with a sort of implicit, non-legal contractual obligation, unenforceable by any authority apart from one's sense of honour and shame. Within this system there is a debt of obligation: a person is bound to another in terms of on-going generalized reciprocity, the idea that beneficiaries owe a debt of gratitude to their benefactor (Malina 1993:86).

This dyadic relationship obliges no wider than the individuals who went into such a patron–client relationship (Malina 1981:82). Saller (1982:1) notes three defining elements of patronage: First, it involved the reciprocal exchange of goods and services. Secondly, to distinguish it from a commercial transaction in the marketplace, the relationship should be a personal one of some duration. Thirdly, it should be asymmetrical, in the sense that the two parties are of unequal status and offer different kinds of goods and services in the exchange – a quality which sets patronage off from friendship between equals.

The patron–client relationship is a hierarchical relationship but with mutual obligations. Under the system, the patron usually was of a higher social rank or class, possessed greater wealth and greater power which enabled him to protect, sponsor, and be a benefactor of the client. The client on the other hand is of lower social rank who was required to offer services to his patron as needed. Moxnes (1991) thus expressed that the patron-client relations are social relationships between individuals based on a strong element of inequality and difference in power.

The basic structure of the relationship is an exchange of different and very unequal resources. A patron has social, economic, and political resources that are needed by a client (cited in Van Eck 1995:169) and the client offers service in return. A patronage relationship also existed between a conqueror and a dependent foreign community. The demand to uphold one's obligations were primarily moral, based on ancestral custom and trust on the part of the patron and the client is to reciprocate with dutiful devotion to the patron. In Roman politics, an important man demonstrated his prestige by the number of clients he had.

One of the features of patron–client relationship as noted by Malina is favouritism. Favouritism is the main quality of such relationships. Clients enter the relationship with such an expectation; in fact, they seek out patrons, earthly and heavenly, essentially for the purpose of obtaining favours. What the inferior client lacks is assurance of aid in various emergencies and a guarantee of permanent access to resources (Malina 1993:135).

God as Patron (father), as he is referred to, covers the whole of the New Testament. The patron is like a father, while the clients are like loving and grateful children, no matter what their age may be (Malina 1993:34). It has been explained that in the Bible, anytime anyone is called a "father" who is not a biological father, the title refers to the role and status of a patron (Malina 1993). Jesus called God 'father', making God a patron with him behaving not as a patron but as a broker, in that he put prospective clients in touch with the heavenly patron, God. As the

Bible puts it, God, the Father, is nothing less than God the Patron. The kingdom of heaven as proclaimed by Jesus was God's patronage and the clientele bound up in it (Matt 4:17, 23; 10:7; Mark 1:15) (Malina 1993:134).

While being in Galilee, and on his way to Jerusalem, Jesus however redefined patron–client relationships in terms of the new household of God by crumbling the steep hierarchical and inequality structure. He ate with sinners and tax-collectors without looking for reciprocity (Mark 2:13-17), healed many without asking them to follow him (Mark 8:22-26) and sometimes even tried to get away from the crowds (Mark 6:31). When Jesus was on his way to Jerusalem, and the disciples argued the question of which of them was the greatest, he taught them: whoever wants to be first must be last of all and servant of all (Mark 9:35) (Van Eck 1995:175).

### ***3.3.4 Social Values that Governed Social Interactions in the Markan Social Context***

Culture colours the way its members recognize and understand reality. Cultural interpretations of the same reality do differ. For instance, what was important to first century Greco-Roman Palestine may be unimportant to the 21<sup>st</sup> century African. Interactions do take place in a socio-cultural context, the values of which direct and inform the nature of social interaction which take place. The value system that existed in the Markan social context are discussed.

Pilch and Malina (1993: xiii) in the *Handbook on Biblical Social Values* define value as “some general quality and direction of life that human beings are expected to embody in their behaviour. A value is a general, normative orientation of action in a social system. It is an emotionally anchored commitment to pursue and support certain directions or types of actions”. Social system itself refers to ‘the set of ways in which human beings seek to realize a meaningful human social existence’ (Malina 2008:5). In this study, ‘value’ is understood as

what a society deems to be the right and best way of going about life within a period of time which members are to internalize and exhibit. Pilch and Malina (1993: xxii) give general overview of value preferences common in the New Testament world. They asserts that Mediterranean culture or the culture reflected in the Bible, favours:

‘Being’ over doing, Collateral relations over individualism, Present or past time orientation over future, Subordination to nature over mastery of it, A view of human nature as a mixture of good and bad elements over a view of human nature as exclusively good or bad (Pilch and Malina 1993:xxii).

They are also qualities that inhere in value objects which include: self, others, nature, time, space, and wealth (God) (Pilch & Malina 1993: xv). Values are categorised into three broad groups. First, core values – they are expected values in all human interactions. Scholars maintain that honour and shame are core values in the first century Greco-Roman world. Second, means value. Means values are values that enable the realization of core and secondary values, for example, power, generosity, and eloquence. They are ‘means’ values because they help the accomplishment of honour, which is the Mediterranean goal or end cultural value. Third, peripheral value; such values are specific to given interactions. Compassion is an example of a peripheral value because it is expected only in situations guided and governed by kinship considerations in the first century New Testament world (Pilch & Malina 1993: xv). Nine social values of the New Testament world with ramifications for this study’s purpose are discussed below:

#### ***3.3.4.1 Family Centeredness***

McVann (1993:70) writing on family-centeredness or kinship, stated, “it is part of honour, the core value of Mediterranean culture. Honour and shame implies social standing or worth in the

community, and is of incalculable value in cultural contexts where the well-being of the collective is of paramount importance". This makes unflinching loyalty to the family and obedience to family authorities paramount and are constant features of the culture reflected in the Bible. He maintains that the value of family-centeredness grows from three distinct but closely related components of the ancient society: honour and shame, tradition, and land (McVann 1993:70). The family-centeredness is actually literal in meaning: the family is the centre as opposed to the modern individualism.

Family-centeredness value was a complex and pervasive cultural phenomenon which received expression at all levels and in all times of society as reflected in the Bible. It offered the foundation for the society itself as a core cultural value of Mediterranean biblical society (McVann 1993:72). That is to say, family centeredness, did not only inform the social interactions of family members, but also the system of meaning from which cultures arose. In relation to family life, this essential value operated this way: The patriarch and matriarch of the extended family (clan or tribe patriarch and matriarch), or the husband and wife of the nuclear family had the duty to procure honour and maintain the family's social standing. They were also to receive uncompromised respect and obedience as reflected in the Bible (e.g. Exod. 20:12; Deut. 5:16; 21:18-21; Prov. 30:17). However, the male authority is clearly dominant in this strongly patriarchal society (Num. 1:2-3, 17-19; 27:8; Eph. 5:22; Col 3:18). Any stain on family honour are serious matters and likely to result in acts of vengeance (e.g. Gen 34; Deut. 22:13-23:1) or strong condemnation (Gen 9:20-27; 2 Sam 12:1-12) (McVann 1993:71).

The honour children gave to the father conveyed the tradition to them. In this regard, tradition was that which was handed down to the children, the established and time-tested communal wisdom, a wisdom which simultaneously grounds and encompasses identification with the

culture (e.g. Exod. 10:2; 12:26; 13:8; Deut. 4:9; 6:7, 20-25; 32:7,46) (McVann 1993:71). Tradition thus, grounded and informed family structure, and family structure perpetuated tradition. This interface created respect for authority and exclusiveness as reflected in the Bible. Moreover, the value of family centeredness revolved around the land on which the people of the tradition dwelt in families (e.g. Lev 25:18; Deut. 30:15-20). The land was a gift from God and as such sacred (e.g. Deut. 5:28-33; Prov. 2:20-22). Control and maintenance of the land (family property and national borders) was a real matter of honour and tradition (e.g. Deut. 19:14; Isa 5:8). To loose land means shame and the destruction of tradition and the families (e.g. Ps 137).

McVann (1993) notes how Christianity was met with hostility because it challenged foundational values of Judaic tradition discussed above and virtually sought to reverse them. For instance, authority in the Christian community was to be secured on the basis of service rather than rank (e.g. Matt. 10:37; Mk 10:42-45). Being disciples took precedence over family or ethnic membership (e.g. Mk 3:31-35). Dietary traditions of society were challenged (e.g. Mk. 7:19). The value of land and property was redefined (e.g. Mk. 10:28-30; Acts 2:45), exclusiveness is repudiated (e.g. Gal. 2:1-10; Col 3:11). Obedience to the authority of tradition was relativized to meet the requirements of the Gospel (e.g. Matt 5:10-12; Mk. 13:9-13; Gal 3:10-14). What struck the opponents of Christianity as chaos and anarchy, however, quickly developed its own culture.

The close identification with the family and the associated unquestioning obedience to family authorities, and tradition were of paramount value to the ancient Mediterranean biblical world.

#### ***3.3.4.2 Dyadism***

Dyadism is a means value which suggests that individuals are honoured through association with the other person, institution or something. Neyrey (1993) notes that individual people of

the biblical world are not known or valued because of their uniqueness, but in terms of their dyad, that is, some other person or thing (Neyrey 1993:51). Dyadism, becomes that means value by which a person's honour can be continually checked, affirmed, or challenged (Neyrey 1993:51). Dyadism, or an other-directed orientation, is a value which functions as a means of learning about and pursuing one's honour (1993:52). Neyrey (1993) points to some examples of dyads in the relation to:

- Place: Simon was the man from Cyrene (Mk 15:21; Luke 4:27; Matt 15:22; Acts 22:3; 18:24)
- Family: members of a family were known in terms of their family relations. Simon was son of Jonah (Matt 16:17; Mark 1:19; Lk 8:3; Mk 6:3; Acts 12:2; Gal 1:19). Jesus, more significantly, he was the Son of God (Mk 1:11; 9:7; 15:39), (Neyrey 1993:50).

Neyrey explains further that “personal identity and knowledge of this sort belong in a cultural world which was highly ordered and carefully classified, so that there was a place for everyone and everyone in his place” (1993:51). Almost invariably such people of this social context taught of themselves and others in stereotypes which told of their role and status, for example as fishermen and carpenters, as Scribes and lawyers, as governors and kings (1993:51). Dyadism is clearly expressed in the way people sought patrons; a person could advance one's cause by seeking the patronage, protection, authorization and favour of another. For example, students sought teachers; farmers sought landlords; the pious seek God (Neyrey 1993:52). In sum, since honour is a public claim to worth and a public acknowledgment of that claim by others, the opinions of others hold central importance in this culture of the ancient Mediterranean biblical world.

### **3.3.4.3 Communicativeness**

Communication in the ancient Mediterranean culture of the New Testament era is generally echoed in the concrete images of mouth and ears (Pilch & Malina 1993: 25). It was about the purity of the mouth and ear. By two means the value of communication is established. First, expurgate that which comes in (food), and that which goes out (speech). To this end there were food regulations in place to outline ritual purity, Judaic ethnicity and Christian anti-ethnicity (e.g. Lev 11:1-43; Mark 7:3; Acts 10:13-14 cf. Mark 7:18-19; Acts 10:15-16). Both regulations are equally understood as having been divinely ordained (e.g. Lev 11:44-45; Acts 11:1-18). Second, speech that issues from the mouth should, just like what enters it, be clean, that is, should indicate both acceptance of and compliance with purity (Pilch & Malina 1993: 26). Both the Jewish and Christian traditions single out clean speech in two commandments in the Decalogue (Exodus 20:7, 16; Deut. 5:11, 20), and in the Sermon on the Mount (Matt 5:33-37). The understanding was that what goes out of the mouth, like what comes in, should be determined by God's will as expressed in his law and institutionalized in the culture of his people (McVann 1993:26). McVann concludes that communicativeness, therefore, serves as a means value in the Mediterranean world and key strategy for establishing, maintaining and defending honour or even to shame others.

Ears were similar to mouth in that what one permits to enter should also be in agreement with the established cosmology that is pure and undefiled (e.g., Prov 2:1-2; 5:1; 18:15; Acts 7:57). This implies that appeals to God to incline his ear (e.g. Isa 37:17; Pss 5:1; 88:2) were based on the purity and righteousness of the supplicant's mouth (speech) and hands (actions) (e.g. Ps 24:3-6; Zeph.3:9), recognition of the need for purity (e.g. Ps 51), or faith in Jesus as Lord (e.g. Acts 2:21; John 14:13) (McVann 1993:26). The culture thus, reflected in the Bible, which determined the standards of acceptable communicativeness proceeded from their

understanding of God. It is in this sense that blasphemy was considered ultimate crime with death penalty as punishment (Lev 24:14-16 Mark 14:60-65; 15:29-32). Insults and taunts were properly directed at those whose behaviour indicated rejection of established wisdom and tradition (e.g. Pss 22:8; 109:17-19; cf. Prov. 18:6-7).

McVann maintains that in the New Testament world, communicativeness was effective, valued, and prized if it endorsed and explicated the worldview and ethos held by the culture in general, that is if it upheld and defended the tradition. In contrast, it was inadequate, untrustworthy, or contemptible if it challenged, denied, or repudiated the culture's core values (McVann 1993:27).

#### ***3.3.4.4 Power***

Power is another 'means' value. It was understood as the ability to exercise control over the behaviour of others (Pilch 1993:139). This value was exercised to win honour in that when subordinates accept and respect the power of superiors, the superior was considered to be honourable. In the social system of the New Testament power was exercised through two formal institutions - kinship and politics. First, kinship, the family circle exercises control over the individual child with the father, mother, aunts, uncles, siblings, cousins, and other members of the extended family (Pilch 1993:140). Kinsfolk and acquaintances were expected to keep track of the children. Family members continued to exercise power over other family members even in adulthood (Mark 3:21). From the Jewish tradition, one brother is to redeem another brother who might need it (Lev 25:48) or retaliate his death if that becomes necessary (Num 35:16-21).

Second is politics, for “politics by definition is the institution by means of which members of a group achieve and use power to implement public goals” (Pilch 1993:141). In the ancient Mediterranean biblical world, power in right sense was to be used to maintain order in society as it should be. Any obstruction of that stood in the way of the order that properly belonged in society. In the Gospel of Mark, except for his power for exorcisms, Jesus generally has no power at all. Given that Jesus' ministry of exorcism helped to bring order to society, it could be understood as political actions performed for the purpose of restoring correct order to society (Pilch 1993:141). This was because in Jesus' Mediterranean world, human beings possessed by a spirit were in a devalued state. The process of healing involved diagnosing the problem, prognosing the outcome, and applying the suitable therapy (Pilch 1993:141).

A further instance in the political institution wherein some people exercised power was the mediation of disputes. It was a challenging but highly honourable task best accomplished by a kinsperson; the mediator most often was sought to settle blood feuds. Jesus at some point was invited to mediate between two brothers but he refused to (Luke 12:13). His recognition of the general political value of mediation was amply expressed in the beatitudes: "Blessed are the peacemakers [i.e., mediators], they shall be called sons of God" (Matt 5:9). Pilch (1993:142) holds that the beatitudes, are culturally valuable lines of conduct quite obvious to anyone familiar with the workings of the culture. Peacemaker, he explained, was another name for mediator. The agonistic Mediterranean culture reproduced in the Bible, using power for mediation certainly was an important means value.

#### ***3.3.4.5 Service***

Service, another means value, according to Malina (1993:160) refers to tasks performed by lesser persons for those who control their existence in the context of the ancient Mediterranean Biblical world. Service normally refers to something to be done by a slave that is a servile

work. The link of slave to servile work, he noted, was because slave and non-slave were considered to belong to two different species, just as the way humans differ from God.

Service was either toward God or man. In relation to God, service pertains to Temple worship and its rituals (e.g. Exod. 31:10; 35:19; 1 Esdr. 6:18; Luke 1:23), while in relation to men it pertained to forms of bondage (e.g. Gen 30:26; Exod. 1:14). Service was also understood as a response and an initiative. Service "is a duty not only to repay a service done but also to take the initiative oneself in doing a service" (Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics* 1133a.4-5 cited in Malina 1993:160). Paul taught Christians to demonstrate the slave service owed God in Temple worship in their Christian's service to neighbour, which was service to Christ (Rom 12:1-2; 14:17-18; Gal 5:13; see also 1 Cor. 9:19; 2 Cor. 4:5) (Malina 1993:160).

#### ***3.3.4.6 Hospitality***

Hospitality is a value which serves as a means for attaining and preserving honour, the core cultural value (Malina 1993:104). It is the process of receiving outsiders and changing them from strangers to guests (Malina 1993). Hospitality was never about receiving or entertaining family and friends, it was always about receiving strangers in the biblical world. In simplicity, to show hospitality to strangers is to receive them (Malina 1993:104).

Malina (1993:104) identifies three levels of reception of strangers: First, strangers have to be tested. The test involved checking for how they might fit in and as to whether they would accept the community's norms (Mark 5:17). When the ritual of foot washing was administered to strangers it was indicative of the movement from stranger to guest (Gen 18:4; 19:2; 24:32; cf. Luke 7:36-50).

Second, the stranger took on the role of guest. Transient strangers need patrons, persons who were established community members because of their apparent lack of customary or legal standing within the visited community wherein strangers were incorporated as guest or client (protégé). In this sense, to offend the guest was to offend the host who was a protector and patron of the guest (Gen 19:1-10) (Malina 1993:105). Hospitality involved some rules which required observance from both the patron and the protégé. The guest or the client was expected to desist from insulting the host and from any show of hostility or rivalry; a guest must honour the host (Matt 9:10; Luke 5:29). Moreover, the guest was to avoid usurping the role of the host. (Mark 1:30-31); taking precedence (Luke 14:8); giving orders to the dependents of the host (Luke 10:40-42); making claims or demands on the host or demanding or taking what is not offered (Luke 7:36-50 cf Mark 6:10). In addition, guest was expected to refrain from refusing what was offered. The guest is above all bound to accept food (see Luke 10:8; Mark 6:8 1 Cor. 9:4) (Malina 1993:105).

Similarly on the part of the host or the patron he was expected to abstain from insulting one's guests or from any show of hostility or rivalry. Further more, the host was to protect one's guests and their honour. The host was also expected to pay attention to one's guests, to grant them the necessary precedence, to show concern for their needs and wishes or in general to earn the good will which guests should show (Luke 7:36-50, 40-42; John 2:10) (Malina 1993:105).

Hospitality between individuals was rarely reciprocal (Matt 25:38, 43) among the traditional Judaic works of mercy. It could however, be viewed as a reciprocal relationship between communities. Such hospitality to travelling Christians was both urged (see Rom 12:13; 1 Pet 4:9) and much practiced (e.g. Acts 17:7; 21:17; 28:7; Rom 16:23) (Malina 1993:106).

Third, the guest was not supposed to leave the host with the same status as upon arrival, for the stranger – guest would leave the host as either friend or enemy. Should the guest leave as a friend he would spread the praises of the host (1 Thess. 1:9; Phil 4:15), notably to those who sent the stranger to the host (Mark 9:37). But if as an enemy, the one aggrieved would have to get satisfaction (3 John) (Malina 1993:106).

#### ***3.3.4.7 Domination***

Pilch (1993:46) explains domination to mean a value that imposes sanctions of power in order to gain honour with the sanctions of power including physical force, pain, violent expulsion, and death. Domination sanctioned by God is the theme of the book of Joshua, a sort of reward for the Egyptian domination of the Israelites. In that social context people sought dominion over others in order to be lord, in other words, to lord it over others.

Lord was understood as “a person with the right to control other persons totally and at will, with the right of life and death over another, with full rights to the property and being of another” (Pilch 1993:46). Lording it over others and being subject to others in the ancient Mediterranean biblical world were means by which honour was gained and shame imposed. This value is realized by subjecting others and the common context in which this value appears are passages which exhort a person to "be subject to" (Pilch 1993:46).

Lord was a title of respect (Matt 21:3, John 13:13), it symbolised great deference. In the view of Pilch, in the hymn cited by Paul (Phil 2:5ff.), lordship described the highest conceivable role in terms of legitimate power and precedence. Perhaps opposite Lord was slave, a slave, of course, was the other social extreme: a person that was another's property with no rights at all, not even human rights (Pilch 1993:46). It was recounted that the domination sanctioned by God

was the theme of the book of Joshua, a sort of reward to the Israelites for suffering the Egyptian domination (Pilch 1993:46).

#### **3.3.4.8 Purity**

Purity is a means value which directs each member of a society to respect and observe the system of space and time lines that human groups develop to have everything in its place and a place for everything (Pilch 1993:151). Pilch further explains, in the ancient Mediterranean biblical society, a person characterised as pure was the one who knew how to be clean rather than unclean, pure rather than polluted; in other words, how to maintain honour and avoid shame (Pilch 1993:151).

Pollution or defilement of person could either be from outside, inside, at the margins, and inconsistencies or internal contradictions: From outside, when an otherwise pure person contacted or lived with what was considered impure he became polluted. For example, in Ezra chapter 9 and 10, the Israelites were considered to have defiled themselves because they took foreign women as wives. To get God's people to be pure again, Ezra had to send all the foreign wives and their children away.

From inside, in the social system of the biblical world there were lines that created distinct places and roles for everyone; crossing these lines rendered a person impure and unclean (Pilch 1993:151). For example, gender-linked roles were part of this purity concern. By this, males were to behave like males and females were to behave like females. This finds expression in Leviticus 20:13 decrees that " if a man lies with a male as with a woman, both of them have committed an abomination; they shall be put to death, their blood is upon them" (RSV). Members of society who disregarded internal lines were impure and unclean (Pilch 1993:151).

At the margins or boundaries, purity was threatened at the margins when boundaries became porous and permeable (Pilch 1993:151). For while Leviticus deals with pollution from the margins or boundaries, (chapter 11 – clean and unclean foods, chapter 12 – childbirth, chapters 13-14 – repulsive scaly condition, chapter 15 – male and female bodily effluvia) particularly discharges from the body openings at the very margins of the human body. Jesus challenged the rules, for him, purity threats were not located at the margins but taught rather that they were within (Pilch 1993:152).

From inconsistencies or internal contradictions, this has to do with putting a system at apparent war with itself and was perhaps the most common threats to purity. Jesus pointed to one such inconsistency when the Pharisees who would agree with the commandment to honour father and mother and also allowed a male to declare his goods *korban*, that is, dedicated to God, and therefore unavailable to his parents, should they need it (Mark 7). Maintaining purity helps one to keep his or her honour.

#### ***3.3.4.9 Humility***

Humility is a very important mean value which directs persons to stay within their inherited social status. The means for being humble include refusing to presume on others and avoiding even the appearance of lording it over another (Malina 1993:107). With this understanding, a humble person did not portend or challenge another's rights, nor did he claim more for himself than has been duly allotted him in life. Humility could exact from the humble one, to even stay a step below or behind their rightful status (Mk. 1:7). Malina (1993:107) stated that humility was a socially acknowledged claim to neutrality in the competition of life. The understanding of the New Testament is that God exalts the humble (2 Sam 22:28; Ps 18:27; Luke 1:52; 14:7-11). Therefore, humility has precedence over honour (Prov 15:33; 18:12).

In contrast, the one who attempted to better himself or herself at the expense of others, to acquire more than others, to strive for honours others now enjoy, were all instances of proud and arrogant behaviour, such persons God humbles (Matt. 23:12; Luke 18:14; see Deut 8:2, 16; Ps 55:19). To humble or humiliate oneself, Malina (1993) explains, meant to declare oneself powerless to defend one's status (e.g. 2 Chron. 33:23; 36:12; Phil 2:8), and then to act accordingly either factually (becoming powerless, like the lowborn; "humble in spirit" in Isa 57:15; 66:2; or "the humble of the land" in Zeph. 3:12), or ritually (by a rite in which the use of power is set aside, symbolized by behaviour typical of the low-born: fasting, rending garments, weeping, lamenting, confessing – e.g. Lev 26:41; 1 Kgs 21:29; 2 Kgs 22:8-20; Ps 69:10). While self-humiliation before God was commendable and won God's favour (Prov 3:34; Jas 4:10; 1 Pet 5:5-6; also 2 Cor 12:21), to humble or humiliate others was to shame them (e.g. Dinah in Gen 34:2; "women" in Ezek. 22:10; Isa 2:9, 11, 17).

With regards to Jesus, tradition insists that he was no arrogant teacher, but "meek and humble of heart" (Matt. 11:29, 21:5). The use of a colt by Jesus, which was just for travelling, instead of a horse, which was a symbol of power and status, was a mark of humility. Jesus admonished his followers to humble themselves (Matt. 23:12; Luke 14:11; 18:14), as though one was as powerless to do so as a child (Matt 18:4). Malina concludes that humility is a course of action or behaviour which facilitates the realization of honour, the core value of Mediterranean culture (Malina 1993:108).

### **3.4 Summary**

So far it has been established that the Gospel of Mark comes from a setting, which have been identified and examine from three dimensions: historical, literary and social. Beginning with historical setting, the question of authorship, date, place of composition and the Markan

community has been answered. While Rome is the most popular of all these alternatives (Telford 1999:15) and Mark or John Mark continues to enjoy considerable acceptance as the author, the question of authorship and provenance is clearly still an open one. Scholars obviously are still divided on who, when and where the Gospel of Mark was composed.

However, scholars appear unanimous on the fact that the Gospel was addressed to a Gentile audience, perhaps with some Jews in their midst. There appears no contention also on the life situation (*Sitz im Leben*) of the audience that they were experiencing apocalyptic atmosphere wherein Mark 13 mirrors. This study therefore, took the view that the authorship of the Gospel of Mark is still an open one and most likely is unknown. And it is not likely to be an urban Gospel given the Gospel's exceeding interest in rural categories and scenarios. It is difficult to sustain the view that the one person Mark was the sole redactor of the Gospel. Therefore the reception of Jesus in these communities is that of a person who, in my view, was a village spiritual leader: Jesus is remembered by these communities as a person who articulated community-shared traditions.

Turning to the literary setting, we noted three traditio-historical methods and social scientific criticism used to study Mark's Gospel. The traditio-historical methods which were examined in this chapter are the Source, Form and Redaction criticisms. They were looked at in terms of their aims, methods, results and limitations. Even before them, the question of orality in the Gospel of Mark was considered. In the process this study agreed with the scholarly consensus that Mark began as oral stories told among the Christian communities.

The Gospel can no longer be considered the product of direct and reliable eyewitness account but does provide useful historical information when subjected to the working of these tradition-

historical methods. Source, Form and Redaction criticisms, as discussed, in their individual means help modern readers to form at least a mental picture of the pre-history of the text in terms of the sources employed, the forms assumed by the pre-Markan tradition and the editorial action that took place. We also noted the pioneering role of these methods in enabling us to make a journey to the past behind and beyond the text to the historical Jesus.

The inquiry into the subject also introduced us to point of divergence among the three traditional historical criticisms. The major difference among them pertains to positions taken regarding the question of creativity, the extent to which Mark is believed to have been a master of his material, and the particular model that is imagined for the composition of the Gospel. Though these three literary-historical critical methods talk about *Sitz im Leben*, of the gospel tradition not much attention is given to the social context of the gospels for hermeneutical purposes.

The social setting and corresponding social scientific method examines the text and its social context from which meaning is generated. The social setting led the study to establish the social world of the New Testament paying particular attention to interactional groups, interactional models and interactional value system which occupied the first century ancient Mediterranean biblical world.

Though none of the methods discussed is used for analysis of this study, they serve as relevant background and insight to the discussion in chapter four. The use of social interactionism as a perspective which is within the methodological orientation of social science criticism denotes distinction from other scholars who have done exegesis on Mark's gospel, either in parts or as a whole.

## CHAPTER 4

### JESUS' SOCIAL INTERACTIONS IN MARK

#### 4. Introduction

How Jesus is presented by the evangelist in the Markan Gospel as a leader in his social interaction engages the attention of this chapter. Therefore, the chapter does involve observing and analysing Jesus' social interaction as performed in Mark 6:30-44; 7:1-23; 7:24-30; and 10:35-45. Though these passages have been purposively selected and they are meant to reflect Jesus' interactions with a crowd, Pharisee and Scribes (conflict), gentiles, and the disciples (discipleship). Incidentally these groups are also major interactional groups in the Gospel of Mark.

Actions and words of individuals follow a certain routine which is sustained by a collective knowledge of their implications by persons involved. So an effort to observe Jesus' social interaction is an attempt to dig into those underlying assumptions and comprehend what is going on beneath the words written on the pages of the Bible. The necessity to glean leadership principles out of Jesus' social interaction in the Gospel of Mark has been dealt with in chapter one. Two research gaps which emerged from the discussion in chapter one are restated here for emphasis. It was first noted that no serious studies exist regarding observing Jesus in his character traits and interactions with people in Mark to determine if there are demonstrable qualities and principles that are beyond time and may be applicable and relevant for leadership that can be appropriated for the setting of Africa. Second, it was established that a gap exists in the knowledge of filtering Jesus' social interaction through the Akan cultural lens for relevant leadership principles for the African context.

These gaps are adequately dealt with in the discussions in this chapter. To begin with, the literary structure and all social interactions of Jesus in Mark will be outlined within the overall structure of the Gospel of Mark. The immediate context and the broader literary properties of the selected passages will be examined. In observing and discovering the Markan Jesus as an interactional leader, it will be situated within leadership in the households and the Ghanaian cultural understanding of leadership as reiterated earlier in Chapter one. Then each selected passage will be under the lens of the tenets of Social Interactionism Perspective (Ritual making, Frame making, Characterisation, Encounter processing, Stage making and Role-taking) in the light of Ghanaian traditional notion of leadership.

The point must be made that every person lives in a world of social encounters, involving himself or herself either in face-to-face or mediated contact with other participants. This obviously includes Jesus and his own generation of people. In each of these contacts, the individual tends to act out what is sometimes called a line; that is, a pattern of verbal and nonverbal acts by which he expresses his or her view of the situation and through this, his or her evaluation of the participants as well as himself or herself (Goffman 1967:5). In the Gospel of Mark Jesus is seen in many face-to-face encounters wherein he demonstrates verbal and nonverbal acts of which, interpretation by the interactional participants informed their subsequent actions.

As established earlier (see Chapter 1.6.1; 1.7; 1.8) leadership happens at the point of interactions whether through verbal or through increasing behaviours. Unlike the Christology and narrative oriented studies on the Markan Jesus, what this study sees Jesus doing is not rushing to the cross, but rather it sees him model leadership in particular ways of interactions, which this study calls “Social Interactions Leadership Model”. This “Social Interactions

Leadership Model” when juxtaposed with how the Pharisees and Gentiles (e.g. Herod) led is human centred. It is based on how one treats the other. All these are carefully encapsulated within the narrative and the literary, and the social interactional structure of Mark, which need to be understood first.

#### **4.1 Social Interactions of Jesus within the Overall Structure of the Gospel of Mark**

The Gospel of Mark presents Jesus as a man of interactions, who lived his mission and leadership through interactions. Ninety interactions emerge out of a thorough examination of the Gospel of Mark involving Jesus and other persons or entities from which the choice of the four passages stated above was made for his social interactional analysis. The selected passages are considered to be adequate representation of his dominant interactional groups. To discover him, they offer glimpse of him at the micro level of social interaction. The purpose of this section is to present a tabular summary of all his interactions in Mark. They are arranged under three headings - i. Reference in Mark ii. The persons or group involved with Jesus in the interaction and the setting iii. Who initiated it and the nature of the interaction? These are tabulated below:

<b>NO.</b>	<b>Scriptural Reference</b>	<b>Persons/group/place involved</b>	<b>Who Initiated Nature of interaction</b>
<b>1</b>	Mark 1:12-13	Satan (spirit) Wilderness	Satan initiated, tempted Jesus
<b>2</b>	Mark 1:12-13	Wild beasts (animals) Wilderness	Jesus initiated, he was with wild beasts.
<b>3</b>	Mark 1:12-13	Angels Wilderness	Angels initiated, they ministered unto him.
<b>4</b>	Mark 1:16-18	Simon and Andrew (Fishermen) Galilee Sea Shore	Jesus initiated, command, promise and response by Peter and Andrew in following him
<b>5</b>	Mark 1:19-20	James and John (Fishermen) Galilee Sea Shore	Jesus initiated, invitation and response by following him

<b>6</b>	Mark 1:21-28	Synagogue attendees Mixed Group of people Capernaum Synagogue	Jesus initiated, teaching, exorcism, response praise (aretology) to him.
<b>7</b>	Mark 1:29-31	Peter's mother-in-law, Andrew, James and John Peter's home- Capernaum	Peter initiated, touch, healing Service
<b>8</b>	Mark 1:32-34	The sick and demon-possessed and their attendants Capernaum	The people initiated, healing, exorcism and denial of demons from speaking
<b>9</b>	Mark 1:35-38	Simon and those who were with him. Capernaum	Peter initiated, report and request
<b>10</b>	Mark 1:1:39	Synagogue Attendees Galilee	Jesus initiated, preaching and exorcism
<b>11</b>	Mark 1:40-45	Leper Galilee	The leper initiated, show of pity, touch, cleansing, charge not to tell anyone.
<b>12</b>	Mark 2:1-5, 10-12	The many who were gathered together (crowd) the paralytic and his four Attendants Jesus' home- Capernaum	The people initiated, preaching, forgiveness, healing, praise of Jesus (aretology)
<b>13</b>	Mark 2:6-10	Scribe Capernaum	Jesus initiated, self-interaction, confrontation
<b>14</b>	Mark 2:13	Crowd Sea Shore –Capernaum	Jesus initiated, teaching
<b>15</b>	Mark 2:14	Levi Capernaum	Jesus initiated, command, response by following
<b>16</b>	Mark 2:15-17	Tax Collectors, Sinne Pharisees Capernaum	Scribes and Pharisees initiated, Disciples, Scribes and Confrontation and Response
<b>17</b>	Mark 2:18-22	People (crowd) Capernaum	People initiated, question Jesus, responds with a new paradigm
<b>18</b>	Mark 2:22-28	Pharisees Capernaum	Pharisees initiated, confrontation over ritual, Jesus responds with a new paradigm
<b>19</b>	Mark 3:1-6	A man with withered hand And Pharisee Capernaum	Jesus initiated, healed the withered hand on a Sabbath, Showed anger and grief, took on the Pharisees

<b>20</b>	Mark 3:7-12	Crowd from Galilee, Judea, Jerusalem, Idumea, Beyond Jordan, Tyre and Sidon Capernaum	The crowd initiated, Jesus healed many.
<b>21</b>	Mark 3:13-19	Those whom he desired Capernaum	Jesus initiated, appointed 12 disciples.
<b>22</b>	Mark 3:22-30	Crowd, Family and Scribes Home, Capernaum	Scribes initiated, accused Jesus of being Beelzebul, Family (came to seize him), Jesus taught Parable 1
<b>23</b>	Mark 3:31-35	Mother, brothers and The Crowd Capernaum	Mother, brothers and Crowd initiated, Jesus redefined family
<b>24</b>	Mark 4:1-9	Crowd Seashore, Capernaum	Jesus initiated, taught parable 2 -the Sower
<b>25</b>	Mark 4:10-34	Disciples, others Capernaum	Disciples initiated, Jesus explains Parable 2 to them. Taught parable 3- (26-29) – Scattering of Seeds Parable 4- (30-32) –Grain of Mustard seed Parable 4- (33-34) other parables
<b>26</b>	Mark 4:35-41	Disciples On the sea, Capernaum	Disciples initiated, Jesus stills the storm, Disciples filled with awe
<b>27</b>	Mark 5:1-20	A man with unclean Spirits called Legion Seashore, Gerasenes	The man with unclean spirits initiated, Jesus cast out the spirits
<b>28</b>	Mark 5:21-24	Jairus, ruler of the Synagogue Capernaum	Jairus initiated, invited Jesus. Jesus went him to heal his sick daughter
<b>29</b>	Mark 5:25-34	Crowd, woman with Issue of blood Capernaum	The woman with the issue of blood initiated, healing took place without Jesus saying a Word (first individual healing Without a word), Jesus commended her faith.
<b>30</b>	Mark 5:35-43	Messenger from the Synagogue ruler's house, The Synagogue ruler, the Crowd Capernaum	The Messenger initiated, Jesus ignored the bad news of death, encouraged the Synagogue ruler- 'Do not fear, only believe' Jesus went with only 3 disciples, raised the dead girl.

<b>31</b>	Mark 6: 1-6	Crowd Synagogue, Nazareth	Jesus initiated, Jesus taught, the people were astonished at his teaching and he was amazed at their unbelief.
<b>32</b>	Mark 6:7-13	Disciples Village, Nazareth	Jesus initiated, instructional, charge, responds by going to preach.
<b>33</b>	Mark 6:30-32	Disciples Nazareth	Disciples initiated, Jesus asked to take a rest, they followed
<b>34</b>	Mark 6:33-44	Disciples and Crowd Ashore, Nazareth	Jesus initiated, had compassion, taught them, and miraculously fed them.
<b>35</b>	Mark 6:45-52	Disciple On the sea	Jesus initiated, the disciples face danger on the sea.
<b>36</b>	Mark 6:53-56	Crowd Gennesaret	Crowd initiated, Jesus healed the sick who touched him.
<b>37</b>	Mark 7:1-13	Pharisees, Scribes Disciples Gennesaret	Pharisees and Scribes initiated, they queried Jesus on why his disciples did not observe the tradition of the elders. Jesus put in a riposte.
<b>38</b>	Mark 7:14-23	Crowd Gennesaret	Jesus initiated, taught on new line for purity.
<b>39</b>	Mark 7:24-30	Syrophoenician woman And daughter Tyre and Sidon Region	Syrophoenician woman initiated, Jesus used dog for her, which was an insult (dogs were scavengers), the woman responded like a client seeking favour from a patron.
<b>40</b>	Mark 7:31-37	The sick, deaf and dumb Sidon region, Decapolis	The people initiated, Jesus healed the deaf and dumb, the people were surprised and praised him
<b>41</b>	Mark 8:1-10	Crowd Sea of Galilee	Jesus initiated, fed miraculously 4000 people
<b>42</b>	Mark 8:11-13	Pharisees District of Dalmanu'tha.	Pharisees initiated, argued with Jesus, Jesus responded with a New agenda
<b>43</b>	Mark 8:14-21	Disciples By the sea of Galilee	Jesus initiated, warned them of the leaven of the Pharisees, and chided them for lack of faith, and their fixation on lack of bread

<b>44</b>	Mark 8:22-26	Blind man and his team Village, Bethsaida	The blind man's team initiated, Jesus healed him
<b>45</b>	Mark 8:27-33	Disciples Villages of Caesarea Philippi	Jesus initiated, he inquired: who do people and you say I am? Disciples answered variously. He predicts his suffering and Death (1)
<b>46</b>	Mark 8: 34-9:1	Multitude and Disciples Caesarea Philippi	Jesus initiated, taught them the cost of following him
<b>47</b>	47. Mark 9:2-13	Peter, James and John Mountain, Caesarea Philippi	Jesus initiated, he was transfigured Predicts his resurrection (1)
<b>48</b>	Mark 9:14-29	Crowd and Disciples Caesarea Philippi	Jesus initiated, chided the people and the disciples for their lack of faith, Jesus heals the child of epilepsy
<b>49</b>	Mark 9:30-32	Disciples Galilee	Jesus initiated, he predicted his death and resurrection (2). Disciples were afraid.
<b>50</b>	Mark 9:33-37	Disciples Capernaum	Jesus initiated, taught the Disciples about true greatness (1). Taught the importance children to God.

<b>No.</b>	<b>Scriptural Reference</b>	<b>Persons/group/place involved</b>	<b>Who Initiated Nature of interaction</b>
<b>51</b>	Mark 9:38-50	Disciples Capernaum	John initiated, Jesus explained the universality of his name to them. Jesus taught 5 different things.
<b>52</b>	Mark 10:1	Crowd Region of Judea beyond Jordan	Jesus initiated, he taught them
<b>53</b>	Mark 10:2-9	Pharisees Region of Judea Beyond Jordan	Pharisee initiated, Jesus explained why divorce was granted, and insisted marriage should not be broken.
<b>54</b>	Mark 10:10-11	Disciples Region of Judea beyond Jordan	Disciples initiated explained burden of divorce on divorcees
<b>55</b>	Mark 10:13-16	Disciples Region of Judea beyond Jordan	Jesus initiated, chided the disciples for blocking children from coming to him
<b>56</b>	Mark 10:17-22	A man Region of Judea beyond Jordan	The man initiated, Jesus explained to him, what to do inherit eternal life
<b>57</b>	Mark 10:23-31	Disciples Region of Judea beyond Jordan	Jesus initiated, explained to them how difficult it was for a rich man to inherit the kingdom of God. He assured The disciples of rewards in following him
<b>58</b>	Mark 10:32-34	Disciples Road to Jerusalem	Jesus initiated, once more predicted his death and Resurrection (3)
<b>59</b>	Mark 10:35-40	James and John Road to Jerusalem	James and John initiated, Jesus explained to them the cost of sitting at his left or right, and that the ultimate decider is God. He teaches them on leadership.
<b>60</b>	Mark 10:41-45	Disciples Road to Jerusalem	Jesus initiated, Jesus taught them that to be great you do what servants do.
<b>61</b>	Mark 10:46-52	Bartimaeus Jericho	Bartimaeus initiated, Jesus healed him of blindness.
<b>62</b>	Mark 11:1-10	Disciples and Crowd Bethphage and Bethany	Jesus initiated, sent two for a colt. The crowd received him like a Messiah, and praised David's kingdom to come again
<b>63</b>	Mark 11:12-14	Fig tree Bethany to Jerusalem	Jesus initiated, he was hungry, he cursed the fig tree.

<b>64</b>	Mark 11:15-19	Synagogue attendees Jerusalem	Jesus initiated, he cleansed the temple. The Scribe sought ways to destroy him.
<b>65</b>	Mark 11:20-25	Peter and the Disciples Bethany to Jerusalem	Peter initiated, Jesus taught them the importance of faith in prayer
<b>66</b>	Mark 11:27-33	Chief priests, Scribes And elders Jerusalem	Chief priest, Scribes and elders, they questioned him of his authority. Jesus put in a riposte question.
<b>67</b>	Mark 12:1-12	Chief priests, Scribes and Elders Jerusalem	Jesus initiated, told them the parable of the vineyard tenants
<b>68</b>	Mark 12:13-17	Pharisees and Herodians Jerusalem	Pharisees and Herodians initiated, they came to entrap him, so they questioned him about tax
<b>69</b>	Mark 12:18-27	Sadducees Jerusalem	Sadducees initiated, they questioned him about the Resurrection and marriage after Death. Jesus explained to them the fact of resurrection after death, and no marriage after death.
<b>70</b>	Mark 12:28-34	Scribe Jerusalem	Scribe initiated, he questioned Jesus on the greatest commandment. Jesus answered loving God and Neighbour. Jesus told him you are not far from the kingdom of God.
<b>71</b>	Mark 12: 35-39	Temple attendees Jerusalem	Jesus initiated, taught on the Lordship of Christ (1). Warned the congregation about the Scribes.
<b>72</b>	Mark 12:41-44	Disciples Temple, Jerusalem	Jesus initiated, he taught on the value of people's offering in the Temple.
<b>73</b>	Mark 13:1-37	Disciples Temple, Jerusalem	One disciple initiated, Jesus taught them on end time (apocalypse), and asked them to Watch.
<b>74</b>	Mark 14:3-9	Simon the leper, the Woman with the Pure nard, and the People in Simon's home Bethany	The woman with the alabaster box of oil initiated, Jesus made a hard statement on the poor, and commended the woman for anointing him. He once more predicts his Death (4).

<b>75</b>	Mark 14:12-16	Disciples Bethany	Disciples initiated, Jesus guided them on the preparation for the Passover.
<b>76</b>	Mark 14:17-25	Disciples Jerusalem	Jesus initiated, at the Passover meal, he told about who will betray him, and he instituted the Last Supper
<b>77</b>	Mark 14:26-31	Disciples Mt Olives, Jerusalem	Jesus initiated, he told the disciples of their impending desertion. Peter insisted he wouldn't.
<b>78</b>	Mark 14:32-42	Disciples Gethsemane	Jesus initiated, he went to pray three times for the cup to be removed from. He asked the disciples to watch and pray.
<b>79</b>	Mark 14:43-50	Judas Iscariot, and Club-wielding crowd Jerusalem	Judas Iscariot initiated, they seized Jesus. Jesus, inquired as to why they had come to arrest him like a robber
<b>80</b>	Mark 14:53-65	Crowd, High Priest, Chief priests, Elders The high priest's Court, Jerusalem	Chief priests and the whole council initiated, (trial 1) false testimony was brought against him, Jesus affirmed that he is the Christ (2). They all condemned him as deserving of death.
<b>81</b>	Mark 15:1-15	Chief priests, elders Scribes, Pilate Pilate's palace Jerusalem	Chief priests, elders, Scribes and Pilate initiated, (trial 2), the instigated crowd also condemned him and said, 'crucify him'. They chose Barabbas over him.
<b>82</b>	Mark 15:16-20	Soldiers, battalion Praetorium (palace) Jerusalem	Soldiers initiated, mocked him as the king of the Jews, spat on him, and led him to crucify him.
<b>83</b>	Mark 15:21-32	Soldiers, Simon of Cyrene, passers-by, Those with him at Golgotha, Jerusalem	Soldiers initiated, crucified him, mocked, reviled him, let the Christ...come down from the cross. (He was crucified at the third hour)
<b>84</b>	Mark 15:33-39	Bystanders, Centurion Golgotha, Jerusalem	Jesus initiated, sixth hour darkness, ninth hour he cried out, bystander gave sponge filled with vinegar. Centurion affirmed that 'He is the son of God'

85	Mark 15:40-41, 47	Mary Magdelene, Mary, and Salome Golgotha, and tomb Jerusalem	Mary, Magdelene, Mary and Salome initiated, they looked, followed to the tomb.
86	Mark 15:42	Joseph of Arimathea Golgotha, Tomb Jerusalem	Joseph of Arimathea initiated took Jesus' body and buried in a hewn cave.
87	Mark 16:9-11	Mary Magdelene Jerusalem	Jesus initiated, appeared to Mary Magdalene
88	Mark 16:12-13	Two men Walking into the Country	Jesus initiated, appeared to them
89	Mark 16:14-18	The eleven disciples Jerusalem (or Galilee)	Jesus initiated, appeared to the eleven, upbraided them for their unbelief, commission to preach the good news with signs following.
90	Mark 16:19-20	Disciples Everywhere	Disciple initiated, Jesus spiritually confirmed their Message with signs and wonders.

#### 4.1.1 Analysis of the Interactional Table

Jesus was involved in a total of 90 social interactions in the Gospel of Mark. He initiated 42 of them and other interactants initiated the remaining 48. His most preferred place of interaction was Capernaum where he was in interaction 24 times, followed by Jerusalem where he had 21 interactions. The disciples were his most dominant interactional group appearing in interaction alone with him 22 times. Also, for 12 times the disciples were with others in interaction with him. The crowd comes in as the next dominant group which had interactions with Jesus; 10 times the crowd was alone in interaction with him and together with others were in interaction with him nine (9) times.

## 4.2 Literary Structure of Mark

Mark as a literary document has a formal structure which is its planned framework. Beginning with its title, “The beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ the Son of God” (Ἀρχὴ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ [υἱοῦ θεοῦ]), scholars find in the title, Mark’s indicative agenda of the narrative as he moved from the oral form of preaching the Jesus tradition to a written account of Jesus. It is all about a new genre called “Gospel” concerning Jesus Christ, who is the Son of God.

Lane (1974:25) submits in this regard that Mark’s task in the narrative was to project Christian faith in a climate of uncertainty where martyrdom had been a reality. This agenda informed his selection and arrangement of the tradition to present the Christ who continues to show his presence and his authority among his people. To further unpack the Gospel genre, and borrowing from Wrede’s work “The Messianic Secret in the Gospels”, the Gospel genre is deemed to possess a confessional shape to depict Jesus as the Son of God, making it distinct from the common Greco-Roman biographies (see ed. Keck 1995:519).<sup>9</sup> The confessional shape idea did not bring finality to clarity of the gospel genre as some scholars argue that Mark chooses to narrate history in an apocalyptic mode. Others opine that Mark’s Gospel is a foundation story for an early Christian Community that had no interest in history or biography (ed. Keck 1995:519). In this sense, Mark’s gospel genre comes to the reader as a theology-induced biography of Jesus to an audience who required encouragement in the face of great tribulation.

Delving into the literary content of the gospel, Mark is found to be characterised by simplicity and straightforwardness. The language and style are less elaborate and more popular than that

---

<sup>9</sup>The pattern of Ancient biographies considers first, the uncommon birth, the childhood feat that foreshadow the hero’s later life, and the extraordinary nature of the characters. The hero’s life should round up in glory translating in triumph and honour. Biographies of Moses by Jewish writers like Philo and Josephus follow all the conventions of their time. (See *The New Interpreter’s Bible* 1995:519)

adopted by Matthew or Luke. Mark's sentences are simply constructed and commonly are threaded together by the conjunction "and" (καί). And his use of "immediately" (εὐθύς) to precede the introduction of new episode, these creates excitement and warms the reader into the episode (Lane 1974:26).

On the interactional trajectory, Mark's literary style captures not only the shocked reaction of the people after Jesus has acted (e.g. 1:27ff; 2:12) or the fear and astonishment of the disciples (e.g. 9:5ff; 10:24, 32), but also Jesus' own indignation, stern anger, godly sorrow or frustration experienced (e.g. 1:41, 43; 3:5; 7:34). The capturing of such emotions do not only make interactional analysis possible but demonstrates possibility of the entire Gospel being performed before an audience.

Lane (1974:26) observes that Mark's literary style succeeds in putting his listeners on the scene where they may visualize and feel what the Evangelist has described. In Mark's literary genre the Evangelist creatively invites the audience including today's reader to stand where Jesus stood, and where he stands.

Form and Redaction critics generally agree that the Gospel of Mark consists of events and narratives that can be classified as miracle stories, sayings, controversy stories, parables, discipleship, apocalyptic discourse, and passion narratives laced with messianic agenda.

There is less disputation among scholars on literary organisation pattern of the Gospel along the line of geography. It is generally accepted that

- The Prologue contains John the Baptist as witness to Jesus as the "Coming One" in the desert (1:1-8)
- The initial aspect of Jesus' ministry placed him in and around Galilee (1:9-8:21)

- Jesus commences his journey toward Jerusalem while he instructs the disciples about the cross (8:22-10:52)
- His passion and death and other events take place in and around Jerusalem (11:1-15:41).
- Final events including the resurrection take place at the tomb, (15:42-16:8; see Telford 1995:101; The New Interpreter' Bible 1995:520).

Also noteworthy of Mark's structure are the mini patterns involving the presence of doublets...; Passion Saying - Disciples err - theme of Discipleship, and the placing of one narrative inside another (Stein 1971:193). The placing of one narrative inside another pattern means that the structure of Markan literary narrative does not denote stories standing distinctively from each other. There are a number of back and forth switch situations where the Evangelist initiates an episode, interrupts it to recount another event, and then returns to the first episode (see Mark 3:20-21, 31-35; 5:21-24a, 35-43; 11:12-14, 20-25, 14:1-2, 11-10).

Scholars believe that the interlocking individual stories and the frequent intercalations, perhaps, were the Markan strategy to help the audience interpret one story in the light of the other. This approach has been found to typify oral storytelling and indicative of Mark's oral tradition. Following from the above insight, the four selected narratives shall be subjected to analysis. For emphasis (see Ch. 1.5), the observation or analysis involves a foundational analysis consisting of the literary context and scholarly views on the narrative, and social interactional observational or analysis through application of its selected five tenets as a heuristic tool laced with the Akan Traditional notion of Leadership.

### 4.3 Social Interactional Analysis of Mark 6:30-44

#### The narrative

- <sup>30</sup>The apostles returned to Jesus, and told him all that they had done and taught.
- <sup>31</sup>And he said to them, "Come away by yourselves to a lonely place, and rest a while." For many were coming and going, and they had no leisure even to eat.
- <sup>32</sup>And they went away in the boat to a lonely place by themselves.
- <sup>33</sup>Now many saw them going, and knew them, and they ran there on foot from all the towns, and got there ahead of them.
- <sup>34</sup>As he went ashore he saw a great throng, and he had compassion on them, because they were like sheep without a shepherd; and he began to teach them many things.
- <sup>35</sup>And when it grew late, his disciples came to him and said, "This is a lonely place, and the hour is now late;
- <sup>36</sup>send them away, to go into the country and villages round about and buy themselves something to eat."
- <sup>37</sup>But he answered them, "You give them something to eat." And they said to him, "Shall we go and buy two hundred denarii worth of bread, and give it to them to eat?"
- <sup>38</sup>And he said to them, "How many loaves have you? Go and see." And when they had found out, they said, "Five, and two fish."
- <sup>39</sup>Then he commanded them all to sit down by companies upon the green grass.
- <sup>40</sup>So they sat down in groups, by hundreds and by fifties.
- <sup>41</sup>And taking the five loaves and the two fish he looked up to heaven, and blessed, and broke the loaves, and gave them to the disciples to set before the people; and he divided the two fish among them all.
- <sup>42</sup>And they all ate and were satisfied.
- <sup>43</sup>And they took up twelve baskets full of broken pieces and of the fish.
- <sup>44</sup>And those who ate the loaves were five thousand men.

#### 4.3.1 The Literary Context

Mark 6:30-44 (cf. Matthew 14:13-21; Luke 9:10-17) falls within Jesus' Galilean ministry narrative and classified under the miracle episodes. As it fits the continuation of verse seven to thirteen, it begins three episodes of miracles (6:33-44; 45-52; 53-56), which precede the purity conflict with the local Pharisees and the Scribes from Jerusalem in chapter seven. From form critics' point of view, Mark 6:30-44 involves accounts of missions report and a miracle story so neatly knit together. Accordingly, interpreters have variously divided the narrative into missions report or preliminary dialogue and feeding miracle. Geulich (1989:336) has noted how generally the demarcation is put between either 6:31 and 6:32 (cf. Schweizer 1967:135-36; Pesch 1976:345) or 6:32 and 6:33 (Kertelge 1970:130) or 6:33 and 6:34 (Bultman 1963:231; Schenke 1974:217-221) or 6:34 and 6:35 (cf. Taylor 1966:317; Egger 1976:121-131). He distinguishes three strands within this narrative – 6:30 conveying the mission summary report, with 6:31-32 being a transition or introduction to the feeding story and 6:33-

44 accounting for the feeding miracle. Geulich's three strands are ideal. However, putting the second line after 6:32 leaves 6:33 hanging. Chapter 6:33 properly, belongs to the transition part therefore, the second demarcation should be between 6:33 and 6:34. The resultant strands will be missions report (6:30), transition or introduction to the feeding story (6:31-33), and the feeding miracle (6:34-44). This notwithstanding, for the purpose of this study, the narrative Mark 6:30-44 is taken as unitary. Jesus' interactions begin with the disciples through to the crowd ending in the feeding miracle.

This feeding miracle mirrors a number of Old Testament feeding stories such as the miraculous feeding of the people in the wilderness (Ex 16; Psalm 78:18-30; 105:40) and the feeding miracles of Elijah and Elisha. Elisha's servant actually complained about giving the twenty barley loaves to the 100 people (1 Kin 17:8-16; 2 King 4:1-7, 42-44; Geulich 1989:336; ed. Keck 1995:601). Even in the Apocryphal books of 4 Ezra and Baruch, links can be made with this feeding miracle and the future Messianic reign. The anticipation is that the banquet in the Messianic age will relive the wilderness miracle (4 Ezra 6:52; 2 Baruch 29:4).

Pertaining to the sources, the presence of the doublet feeding narratives in Mark – the story of the feeding of the 5,000 and the events which followed (Mk 6:30-44) compared to the feeding of the 4,000 which is like its sequel (Mk 8:1-9) pointing to Mark's use of different sources. Due to the doublet some scholars consider the whole of Mark 6:30-44-7:37 and 8:1-26 as coming from pre-Markan Tradition (Taylor 1966: 628-632). Mark 6:30-31 is attributed to Mark's redaction (Taylor 1966:318; Geulich 1995:337; Best 1981:192-193; Cranfield 1963:213). Most Source Critics place Mark 6:34-44 within the collection of miracle stories (Keck 1965; Telford 1995:55). In terms of placement, this feeding story commences another major section (Lohmeyer 121-122; Pesch 1976:345, 349-350). The incidence of a demanding

crowd appear to be a regular occurrence in Jesus' Galilean ministry and he appears to have grown used to it (1:37, 45; 2:2, 13, 3:7-12, 20; 4:2; 5:21, 24, 31; France 2002:260).

#### **4.3.2 Social Interactional Observation and Analysis**

The observation is done using the tools of social interactionism perspective informed by Ghanaian traditional notion of leadership as the heuristic lens. In verse 30, the disciples are seen as initiating the interaction with Jesus. The use of *ἀπόστολοι* (apostles) in verse 30 as a title for the disciples by Mark is seen only here in verse 30. Though, it is also used in 3:14 that is disputed (see Geulich 1988:339; Donahue & Harrington 2002:204; Danker, Bauer, & Arndt 2000:121). Reference to the disciples as *ἀπόστολοι* connect to 6:7 where the present infinitive active (*ἀποστέλλειν*) of the verb is used to indicate the continuous or repeated nature of their being sent out by Jesus (*ἀποστέλλειν* – send them away - 3:14; Lk 9:2; Jn 4:38; 17:18). Generally, the term “apostle” was a technical one for the early Christian missionaries denoting that they are official emissaries of Jesus who proclaimed the gospel (see ed. Keck 1995:600).

Turning to social interactional observation of verse 30, from the Social Interactional point of view the title ‘apostle’ is used for framing purposes (see Ch. 2.2.1.4). Goffman’s ideas of frame-making and characterisation come in here to explain the title ‘apostles’. Frame-making is giving a social interaction marked boundaries of what can and cannot occur in that given social situation. And characterisation (see Ch. 2.2.1.3) is placing the individual before one’s immediate presence in a certain social category based on one’s assumption of him or her. Therefore, the use of ‘apostles’ here plays a crucial interactional function. Unlike the title ‘disciple’ (*μαθητής* – learner, apprentice), ‘apostle’ as applied to them is to indicate their functionality as emissaries within this interactive framework. Within this apostolic frame, the disciples were expected not to go and ask for further clarity on parables or sayings by Jesus but

to deliver a message of the Kingdom, which has been entrusted to them, and report afterwards to the one who sent them. It creates the impression that the disciples are people sent out with a mission.

Moreover, the RSV's rendering of *συνάγονται οἱ ἀπόστολοι πρὸς τὸν Ἰησοῦν* as 'the apostles returned to Jesus' (Mk 6:30a) does not emphasise the idea of 'gathered together' (*συνάγονται*) toward Jesus which is crucial to the apostles' interactional strategy. Disciples deliberately decide to come to Jesus as one group. This action of theirs, is explained by Goffman's team notion (see Ch.2.2.1.5) and stage making (see Ch. 2.2.1.5) in dramaturgy. A team has been explained in chapter two, to the extent that social interaction (performance), like theatrical performance, can involve individuals coming together to form a team to foster a single desired impression. They foster the impression on a stage. Goffman sees staging as a means of signalling in interaction.

Social interaction is like a stage, with actors entering and exiting front and backstage regions forming impression (impressions are how subjects present themselves in the interaction) and making impression, which indicates to others what to expect from an individual and what is expected in return for a specific performance (Turner 1988:93). Though Jesus sent them out two by two (6:7) their returning to him 'all together' is not accidental but an intentional interactional approach. In their stage making, they are presenting a front (see Ch. 2.2.1.5) one front on the social stage to Jesus thereby creating an impression of a team with a singleness of purpose (front is those things that we most intimately identify with the performer himself or herself and that we naturally expect will follow the performer wherever he or she goes).

As a team, they fostered an impression of great success to Jesus in their first missions exploits. This interactional approach of the apostles reflects the Ghanaian traditional leadership notion of communality where leadership at the village level is understood as teamwork. Usually, clan leaders will come together to meet the chief to present a single voice on issues, after which together with the chief they may address the Community members.

Receiving the disciples together (team) rather than two by two as they went reflects Jesus' interaction ritual (see Ch. 2.2.1.1). In Ch. 2.2.1.1 interaction ritual was explained as those things done routinely, with brief expressions occurring incidental to everyday action. Meeting with groups or crowd (Mk 2:2; 3:20, 32-35; 4:1; 5:21; 6:30; 7:1) is perfunctory to Jesus making it possible for the apostles to use that approach of a team. His routine of associating with crowd more than individuals cast Jesus in the light of the people's leader and places his leadership at the level of the masses (ὄχλος). The apostles returning to report (ἀπήγγειλαν) to Jesus, according to Keck (ed. 1995), shows that 'the apostolic teaching is based on the teachings of Jesus. To Geulich (1989:339) this shows the apostles' dependent relationship; that is to say, the mission was an extension of Jesus' mission.

From the social interactional perspective, in their return to Jesus and reporting, the apostles interactionally were signalling a meek manner (see Ch. 2.2.2.1.5. Manner is those stimuli which function at the time to indicate to us the interactional role the performer will expect to play in the on-coming interaction), and by this gesture foster an impression of acknowledgment of Jesus' authority over them as their leader and their willingness to submit to him. In the traditional Ghanaian leadership notion refusal to report back to the leader who assigned any task is gross disrespect and an undermining of his or her authority.

Jesus' response to them in verse 31, 'Come away by yourselves to a lonely place, and rest a while' (δεῦτε ὑμεῖς αὐτοὶ κατ' ἰδίαν εἰς ἔρημον τόπον καὶ ἀναπαύσασθε ὀλίγον) is contrary to the general expectation of a comment on their report as either a commendation or further instruction. Turning to the choice of ἔρημον τόπον, the lonely place is within Jesus' strategy. It is a choice of a setting (see Ch. 2.2.1.5) which best communicates Jesus' interactional motif of inclusive-exclusivism approach to both the disciples and the crowd. Where everyone is welcome particularly those excluded by the prevailing cultural and social structure yet must make a journey to be distant from the polluted socio-cultural and religious system. So to embrace the tenets of his new kingdom which promises to restore true purity and human dignity.

Solitary place (ἔρημον τόπον) recalls Jesus' love for uninhabited places 1:12-13; 1:35, 45 (Donahue & Harrington 2002:204; see Taylor 1966:319), and it represents a place of privacy, peace and tranquillity. What informed Jesus' decision to come out with this imperative clause in 6:31? The significance of solitary place in Jesus' interactional approach can be seen in the place of setting in social interactions in Goffman's dramaturgy. Setting is a physical layout, and other background items which supply the scenery and stage props for human action played out before, within, or upon it. Setting tends to stay put, geographically speaking, so that performers have to bring themselves to the appropriate place of choice to be their setting for interaction. The kind of impression a performer wants or makes influences the choice of a setting. So by the choice of a solitary place Jesus sought to create an impression of care, privacy, distinctiveness, rest and unwind after the hustles and bustles of daily work.

Though the apostles had not complained of fatigue or hunger Jesus' social interaction techniques most probably led him to discover them in their true state of exhaustion. Perhaps,

Jesus was employing Mead's self-interaction and role-taking (see Ch. 2.2.2). Mead explains as the self (individual) responds to a gesture from another that carries a symbolic meaning, which meaning is discerned through taking on the role or attitude of the other which in turn helps the individual to organise and reorganise his or her action by way of response. Through self-interaction, Jesus gleaned and interpreted the gestures, facial expressions, and bodily movement of the disciples.

One can plausibly imagine Jesus observing and analysing even the unintended impression of the bodily gestures of the disciples following the missions work and the crowd calling on them frequently. Jesus then comes to the conclusion within himself that the apostles need rest and food. All these were possible because Jesus maintained a self-conception of care (Mk 3:1-6; Matt. 11:28; Jn. 7:37). He rightly fostered the impression of one who cares and pays attention to the other. To the Akan traditional notion of leadership, this action of Jesus affirms the cultural assumption of being each other's keeper. Jesus' request for the disciples to go and take rest will be a mark of a good leader within the thought of Akan traditional notion of leadership.

The apostles going along with Jesus into the boat, affirms, Jesus' right interpretation of their gestures and routines. Drawing on the social interactional arrangements which existed in the first century ancient Mediterranean biblical world as discussed in chapter three (3.3.3.2), it is reasonable to argue here that Jesus played the role as mediator-patron by showing concern about the condition of the disciples and identified their needs – hunger and fatigue. Typical of patrons of his time, Jesus as a patron leader proceeded to provide a solution to the need (come eat and rest) – an act of mercy and favour expected of patrons. In Ghanaian conception, the true sense of a leader is what Jesus demonstrated in his interaction with the disciples, showing care and concern when they least expected.

ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ (into the boat) in verse 32 recalls several departures ‘by boat’ by Jesus and his disciples before the performance of several miracles (4:36; 5:2, 18, 21; 6:45). Juxtaposed with ἰδίαν (by themselves, 4:34; 7:33; 9:2, 28; 13:3), a situation which usually afforded the disciples opportunity to seek clarity on issues, ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ... κατ’ ἰδίαν (into the boat ...by themselves alone) will be a back region in Goffman’s dramaturgy (see ch. 2.2.1.5; back region is where impression is planned as evidence of the staged character of everyday social life) for Jesus and his disciples.

The boat now served as a back region, where their team impression was nurtured and challenged as a matter of course. It is possible their performances were straightened up in back regions like the boat and the disciples could run through their performance, checking for offending expressions. Here weak members of the team, who are expressively inept, can be schooled or dropped from the performance. Here they could relax and step out of character (see Ch. 2.2.1.5; the Character is the figure, usually fine one, whose spirit, strength, and other sterling qualities the performance is designed to suggest.). To use contemporary word, inside the boat becomes a place for recharge and rehearsal. With Jesus and the disciples in the boat together an unintended impression of a team was fostered to the crowd who received them as such. From the Ghanaian traditional leadership standpoint, Jesus being in the same boat with his disciples is a challenge to Ghanaian and African traditional and even some political leaders who live in secluded areas where only those who are initiated can get access to. Jesus is at the level of his followers, he created no artificial barriers for an aura of importance or exclusiveness around himself. This act of Jesus calls into questions the African leadership and its proclivity for special treatment for persons in authority.

The destination of the boat is only described by Mark but not named; the locale remains unidentified in Mark. However, parallel stories in Luke 9:10 and John 6:23 place it near Bethsaida and near Tiberias respectively. Taylor (1966:319) has examined the views of some commentators' (see Weiss 1903:205, Wellhausen 1909:47, Klostermann 1950:71) on the position of the solitary place in Mark, and he argued that it is associated with the north-east side of the lake.

The Markan combination of εἶδον (saw, perceive; 6:20, 34, 38, 48, 49, 50) and ἐπέγνωσαν (recognise, perceive, I come to know; 2:8; 5:30; 6:54) in verse 33 has attracted the attention of many commentators. The syntactical arrangement *many* (πόλλοι) placed after verbs *saw* (εἶδον) and *recognise* (ἐπέγνωσαν) creates the possibility of an indefinite number of 'they' who saw the disciples and Jesus leave. Definitely a number from the crowd who saw them, created an awareness among the crowd and the subsequent spread of the news of their departure. ἐπέγνωσαν which also means to ascertain or gain information about something explains why the 'all' the towns around got there first.

My concern at this point, is not how they got to the destination ahead of Jesus and the disciples but why they got there. The crowd will only run ahead of Jesus voluntarily based on their interactions with Jesus. Having been in the immediate presence of Jesus on a number of times, had made them glean Jesus' interaction rituals which were teachings and sayings, concern for them, care, and favourable disposition toward the untouchables of the society. They also included his supernatural intervention of miracles among them, and his continuous victory over the Pharisees, Scribes and Herodians who exploited them. The crowd has stuck with Jesus because of the kind of impression he had fostered on them through his social interactions with them. Thus, Jesus' interactions with the crowd has translated into great unwitting influence

over them. πεζῆ (on foot) ... προῆλθον αὐτούς (ahead of them) suggest how they longed to be in interaction with Jesus and how they cherished the impression or the effect of his interactions on them. Ghanaian community folks, like the crowd, are more interested in the interaction rituals of their leaders – how he or she speaks to them, what they can associate the leader with and so on.

The crux of this narrative is the verse 34 where Jesus' interactional approach determined all that followed. 'ἐξελθὼν εἶδεν πολὺν ὄχλον' (having gone out he saw a great crowd) refers to Jesus seeing a multitude from all the cities who had run ahead of them and gathered. Jesus' response to what he saw is one of positive emotion, "compassion" for they were "like sheep without a shepherd" rather than negative emotion of anger or agitation for being robbed of time of solitude.

Interpreters have identified this verse as reminiscence of Moses praying that people will have a leader so that they may not find themselves "like sheep without a shepherd" (Num 27:17). Others see it as a response to the prophets who condemned kings for failing to act as shepherds (1 Kings 22:17). Still others see fulfilment of Ezekiel 34:5-6's prophecy that in a new age in which God will shepherd the people (Taylor 1966: 320, see Geulich 1989:340, ed. Keck 1995:601; Donahue & Harrington 2002:205).

Jesus uses characterisation (see Ch. 2.2.1.3) in his interaction with the multitude. He applies categoric characterisation interactional tool (see Ch. 2.2.1.3; Categoric characterisation, is a kind of characterisation involving placing the other in one or more social categories) to them, and concludes they are ' πρόβατα μὴ ἔχοντα ποιμένα' (sheep without shepherd), based on the information he garnered through his interpretation of the impression of the multitude he

characterised (them ‘sheep’). The characterisation is metaphoric wherein Jesus applies the properties of sheep to the multitude. Shepherd is also in the metaphorical sense implying a leader, ruler, or commander (Brown 1975:564). Characterising the multitude as sheep means Jesus saw them as vulnerable, weak, without direction, requiring care, preyed on, and limited. The sheep characterisation then informs the actions of Jesus in the subsequent interaction in the narrative. ‘ἤρξατο διδάσκειν αὐτοὺς πολλά’ (he began teaching them many things; 41; 62; 8:31), implies Jesus acting to provide what was gleaned as lacking for the multitude. He begins to interact with them as a teacher; instructing and going ahead of them (leader).

The characterisation ‘sheep’ exudes Ghanaian traditional leadership notion, the leader is appointed to help his people not to exploit because ‘sheep’ to the Ghanaian is the gullible, weak, idiotic yet adorable animal, which requires a lot of assistance. Proverbially the Ghanaian will say, “Only a fool’s sheep breaks twice”, to emphasize the kind of attention the sheep requires from its leader.

In verses 35 and 36, the disciples (μαθηταὶ) began another interaction with Jesus the shepherd (ποιμήν) on behalf of the sheep (the crowd). Worthy of note is the interactional framing word used for the associates of Jesus ‘μαθηταὶ’ (disciples) indicating that they are in this interaction as learners. The disciples, perhaps, based on much self-interaction and role-taking regarding the crowd or their interpretation of the gestures or the routine of the crowd, or both given that they may have internalised knowledge of crowd behaviour came to Jesus, προσελθόντες αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ἔλεγον (the disciples came to him and said...). This is the second time the disciples are talking to Jesus on behalf of the crowd in Mark. The first in 5:31 (καὶ ἔλεγον αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ) was to explain away Jesus’ search for the one who touched him. The disciples this time, following in the stead of their master, come to Jesus out of concern for the crowd. They had concluded that it was late and they were hungry.

Some commentators put the time at the fourth watch of the night, that is, anything within 3:00 a.m and 6:00 a.m (see Donahue & Harrington 2003:205). Robertson (1930:231) puts the time after 3:00pm. This study agrees with Robertson, for the context of the expression ‘and the hour is now late’ (Καὶ ἤδη ὥρα πολλῆς γενομένης) points to an earlier time than 3:00 a.m. ὥρα used here for day-time reference the first evening, thus putting the time after 3:00 p.m. The approach of the disciples fostered an impression of concern and care to Jesus. Once more they function as a team to create a common impression. Team impression can now be said to be an interaction ritual of the disciples. On the concern showed by the disciples, the Ghanaian will say, ‘a crab does not give birth to a bird’, meaning a living being will only produce after its kind. In other words, it is within legitimate reason for the disciples to reflect the nature of Jesus the Shepherd who shows concern.

The disciples’ statement that here is, ὅτι ἐρημὸς ἐστὶν ὁ τόπος (this place is desolate) is explained by Malina and Rohrbaugh (1992:217) that ‘areas outside towns and villages were considered places of chaos, meals did not normally take place there. Proper care could not be taken in the preparation of food or the other necessities of ritual purity’. Social interactionally, the disciples keeping Jesus’ characterisation of the setting as desolate and repeating it to him sought to create the impression of the place as place of lack, impossibility and desperation.

By the use of the Greek imperative ἀπόλυσον αὐτούς (you send away), (though even with cases of plea and exhortation imperative can be used) the disciples were direct and instructional in their words to Jesus, their master. Staying within their social interactional frame of care about the crowd, they requested their master to send them away for food. Though they had created the impression of care to Jesus, per this request they put before him, their care did not include

appealing to their ingenuity and their creativity to find food for the crowd. The impression they now foster here is, ‘providing food for them is not part of our considerations, it is above our ability or beyond our means’. In such a highly stratified socio-cultural context, for Jesus not to have rebuffed those words or rebuked them for it suggested the kind of humble and tolerant leader he was. Probably, the disciples knew humility (see ch. 3.3.4.9) was Jesus’ interactional ritual.

Their idea that the crowd should ‘buy themselves something to eat’ (ἀγοράσωσιν ἑαυτοῖς τί φάγωσιν) is considered by Malina and Rohrbaugh (1992) as indicating that the multitude was distant from family, thus, affirming verse 33. From the interactional perspective it seems the disciples, by this idea, had forgotten Jesus’ characterisation of the crowd as ‘sheep’ and subsequently put himself up as the shepherd. Other than that they would not have assigned the responsibility of finding food for the sheep to the sheep, when they had Jesus Christ with them. The impression created here is that the sheep are responsible for finding their own food, and that the shepherd has little to do with that.

**In verse thirty-seven while Jesus is consistent with his interactional frame of the role of shepherd,** the disciples still have not understood the full demands of that role. Some interpreters say Jesus’ response, ‘You give them something to eat’ (δοτε αὐτοῖς ὑμεῖς φαγεῖν), confused the disciples. Others say it is strange, impractical, and some say it is somewhat anomalous as they were prohibited from carrying money or provisions during their mission trips (cf 6:8; see Johnson 1960:37; Geulich 1989: 341; The New Interpreter’s Bible 1995:601; Donahue & Harrington 2002:205).

Jesus' response recalls the Elisha episode in 2 King 4:42 where his servant was as confused as the disciples when he asked him to set the twenty loaves of bread before hundred people. These notwithstanding, from the social interactional perspective, Jesus' response does not amount to confusion but rather a wise interactional framing, which Goffman describes as directing another in an interaction (see Ch. 2.2.1.5). The response takes the disciples from going haywire in their thinking and returns them to the framework of the functionality of a shepherd. Importantly, it brings them back to follow the leading of Jesus their master. Within this framing Jesus wanted them to think and act like shepherd who had unflinching commitment to the good of the sheep. The shepherd goes ahead of the sheep to find food, he does not ask the sheep to go and find food. By this response, Jesus sought to foster an impression of possibility as against their impression of impossibility.

The disciples' use of ἀγοράσωμεν (shall we buy) is deliberative yet spells out their shock and confusion about what Jesus' instruction brings to them. Their use of speech to express their state of mind is best understood from the significance of speech in Goffman's ritual making (see Ch. 2.2.1.1; according to Goffman speech, plays a special role in interaction, allowing matters sited outside the social situation to be brought into the collaborative process, and allowing plans to be negotiated regarding matters to be dealt with beyond the current situation). They used the interactional tool of speech to foster the impression of confusion and complete loss to Jesus by their suggestion of two hundred denarii of bread.<sup>10</sup> A denarii was a normal daily wage for a labourer (Matthew 20:2), so two denarii worth of bread affirms the size of the crowd in verse 34. The disciples' response to Jesus does not suggest absence of means but they did not feel obliged to feed the crowd. By their response, they still create the impression that

---

<sup>10</sup> See Malina, B. J. & Rohrbaugh, R. L. 1992. *Social science commentary on the Synoptic Gospels*, for detailed treatment of bread and denarii.

this is beyond us, this is not our task. Unlike Jesus, perhaps, they had not defined themselves yet as shepherds (cf Acts 2:42, 45-46; 6:1-3). Jesus' interactional approach clearly was to model being a shepherd to the disciples.

Williamson (1983:228) shares in this view that Jesus' instructions to the disciples, which stunned and mystified them, are expected to get them to understand. The disciples' lack of understanding within the interaction provides the basis for the denunciation in 6:52, that the disciples did not appreciate what Jesus sought to teach them because their hearts were hardened.

Jesus continues in his interactional frame of modelling being a shepherd and directing their actions in verse thirty-eight. 'How many loaves of bread have you? Go and see' (πόσους ἄρτους ἔχετε; ὑπάγετε ἴδετε). Donahue and Harrington (2002) see a sub motif with bread in the whole section between 6:8 - 8:19 as the word 'bread' mentioned 17 times and accentuated by the disciples' two major misunderstandings of the bread agenda of Jesus (6:52; 8:17-21). This is actually to communicate the shepherd's role in feeding the flock (the followers).

In the question, πόσους ἄρτους ἔχετε; ὑπάγετε ἴδετε (how many loaves of bread have you? Go and see) Jesus employs significant gestures in the interaction – 'movement and searching' and a front (see Ch. 2.2.1.5) – 'knowing what they have' in the interaction to advance his agenda. The gestures of movement and finding out on the part of the disciples create the impression of the effort a shepherd makes in feeding the flock.

Jesus also fosters another significant impression on the disciples that a shepherd counts and assesses what he or she has and acts with it rather than bemoaning what he does not have to

discourage himself or herself. These gestures reflect the Ghanaian notion of the leader going ahead of his community to find their basic needs of life. The gravamen of this burden is revealed by the blame traditional Ghanaian leaders receive even for lack of rain at a time when it is supposed to be raining. To the Akans of Ghana, Jesus' interactional performance beginning with his care for the tired disciples through to the feeding of hungry and exhausted crowd positions him as 'nyimpa' (see ch. 1.8).

Since in stage-making actors perform with their front, the disciples knowing their front – five loaves and two fishes is significant to their performance as shepherds. By this front, the disciples were to understand that meeting the needs of the flock is based on resources available to you as a shepherd, which resources include God's influence or intervention.

Jesus commanding the people to sit in groups of 100s and 50s in verses 39 and 40 relives Old Testament metaphors. In Exodus 18:25 and Numbers 31:14 Moses arranged the people in groups of 1,000, 500, and 10 under specific leadership in order that God, through them, will provide their counselling needs.

Some interpreters connect Jesus' command to Qumrans Community's adoption of Moses' grouping for eschatological reasons to enhance their own identity of sectarian life as true Israel (1QS 2:21-22; CD 13: 1QM 4:1-5:17; 1QSa 1:14-15, 28-29) and specially for the messianic banquet (1QSa 2:11-22 see Guelich 1989:341; Donahue and Harrington (2003:206). It means that the feeding has both retrospective and prospective implications. The use of 'σμπόσια' 'σμπόσια' (symposia, group) carries the distributive sense that is group by group combined with ἀνακλῖναι (recline), educe for Mark's Greco-Roman audience the memory of a formal party (Geulich 1989:341; see Donahue & Harrington 2002:207).

Symposia denotes a drinking party properly understood as a banquet, which usually will include a lecture or conversation. It was a highly valued event (see Danker, Bauer & Arndt 2000:959). The formal party is not the only allusion that is made. Other commentators like Iersel (1964:188), and Heising (1964:91) find the τῷ ἁλῶρῳ χόρτῳ (the green grass) as evoking the ‘green pastures’ in Psalm 23 hence the role of the shepherd in feeding the sheep. Now Jesus turns attention to the crowd, in this interaction, Jesus employs the gesture of reclining (ἀνακλῖναι) and the framing of sitting in groups (συμπόσια). When the people sat down in groups Jesus assumed the position of a host (a shepherd) offering a banquet to his guests (offering food to the sheep). While the reclining frame created an impression to the crowd of submission, relaxation and calming effect, and relief, it most importantly created an impression of expectation in the crowd – hence faith.

The palpable hope and anticipation for what Jesus will do next can be associated with the reclining especially when the crowd know Jesus for exceeding expectations and imparting people with divine power. The interactional frame of groups of 100 and 50 conveys an impression of interconnectedness, being at the same level, facilitation of assistance, fellowship – a new kind of communion and community. The diversity of groups also creates the impression of unity in diversity.

Still remaining regarding the impression Jesus sought to foster with the ritual and frame of reclining is the building first of all, the framework for the implementation of the vision of the shepherd. It was the groups which became the means by which the bread was shared. Creating fellowship and bonding, commonness and equity as Jesus sought to do with his interactional strategy is exactly what leadership in the traditional Ghanaian perspective cherishes about those the community deems as good leaders. They are seen in their interactions treating all as one

common family and the leader is to be seen enforcing communion among the community folks as one people.

Jesus brings a new perspective to his interaction in verse 41. When he took the five loaves and the two fishes (λαβὼν τοὺς πέντε ἄρτους καὶ τοὺς δύο ἰχθύας), he used the gesture of looking up to heaven (ἀναβλέψας εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν) and demonstrated knowledge of the Jewish culture by blessing God (εὐλόγησεν) for the loaves and the fishes, and breaking (κατέκλασεν) them, and setting before them (παρατιθῶσιν αὐτοῖς; the crowd as guest) like a host.

Mead's generalised other explains this interactional approach of Jesus, generalised other is the organized attitudes of the whole community which attitude has been assimilated through socialisation (see Ch. 2.2.2). Jesus used a gesture known to all and signals a connection with God. This fosters an impression of a relationship with God, who is the ultimate provider, and that God is part of the resources he could appeal to in the discharge of his duties as a Shepherd.

A similar gesture, ἀναβλέψας εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν (looked up to heaven; Matt. 14:19; Lk 9:16), is employed in 7:34 and John 11:41 prior to another miracle. Many interpreters consider looking up into heaven as a gesture of prayer. However, some find his gesture of prayer contrary to normal Jewish gesture of looking down when praying (Taylor 1952:324; Geulich 1989:341; Donahue & Harrington 2002:206; Cranfield 1963:219; Pesch 1976:352-353). εὐλόγησεν (he blessed; 8:6); the blessing here is presumed the standard Jewish blessing of bread, which Taylor (1966) quotes as follows "Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, King of the world, who bringest forth bread from the earth". In the blessing of the bread in Jewish religion, both Donahue and Harrington (200:207), and Geulich (1989:342) bring an important clarity that it is, it is God

who is blessed and not the bread. κατέκλασεν (he broke) κατέκλασεν...ἔδίδου (gave) the change from aorist to imperfect connotes the idea of continuous distribution.

The breaking of the bread depicts Jesus in the role of the father in the Jewish household at table. παρατιθῶσιν (8:6, 7; Lk 9:16; might set before, serve) used here in tandem with its regular use carries the notion of offering food as a sign of entertainment or welcome or hospitality (Gen 18:8; 24:33; 2 Sam 12:20; Luke 11:6; Acts 16:34; see Donahue & Harrington 2002:207). To some commentators, the gesture of Jesus blessing God for the bread before giving it to the disciples to distribute points to the Eucharistic blessing (Mk 14:22 see ed. Keck 1995:601; Johnson 1960:125). Taylor (1959:324) deduces that the meal in the wilderness belongs to the same cycle as the Last Supper and even points forward to the Messianic Feast on high (cf. 14:25).

With the interactional gesture of looking up to heaven (ἀναβλέψας εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν) Jesus creates the impression of communion or interaction with God (the divine), the only patron whose mediator he was in the new kingdom he proclaims. This impression was to communicate to the disciples and even the crowd that God is the key interlocutor when it comes to meeting the needs of the sheep in the kingdom. Again, it fosters the impression to the disciples that God is part of their shepherding role; and to the crowd, it fosters the impression of involving God in daily activities as ordinary as eating.

The results of this interaction is to be seen in verse 42 where five loaves of bread and two fishes were able to satisfy 5,000 men and still have some leftovers. Using the ritual or the gesture of breaking (κατακλάω) the bread has been noted as typifying the tradition of Jewish fathers at table, and obviously was to foster the impression of a father (leader) who provides.

Significantly, this gesture signals an impression to the disciples, and to the crowd in particular, the paramountcy of sharing in the new kingdom. Following the interactional strategy of giving the bread and the fishes to the disciples (καὶ ἐδίδου τοῖς μαθηταῖς) to set before the crowd (παρατιθῶσιν αὐτοῖς) is instructional. Jesus by this gesture fosters an impression of team effort (Mk. 3:25-26), delegation and division of labour in the provision of the needs of the sheep to the crowd and today's audience of the Gospel of Mark.

Interactional impression of team effort is a key theme in this narrative, in the sense that the disciples are the ones who instigated the miracle, who found out and brought the loaves and fishes, who distributed the meal and who gathered the fragments. Their interactional actions fitted into Jesus' asking them to find out what they had, ordering the crowd to recline in their groups, blessing God for the bread, breaking the bread, and through his hands the miracle unfolds as the disciples distribute the bread.

Another impression from this gesture to the disciples that cannot be missed is one of service, Jesus practicalises or lays the foundation for what he will be teaching them in Mark 10:43. The disciples serving a crowd is critical for their role as shepherds given that a crowd by demography will reflect different genders and different age groups meaning that their service is to all. Service which is a universally valued mark of leadership, which Jesus impressed upon the disciples, is mostly cherished in the Ghanaian traditional notion of leadership. To the extent that in a traditional Ghanaian community a leader's applause is in his service at the level of the people not at how grandiose he is in apparel or titles. In fact he or she is expected to be a symbol of service at the base.

Verse 42 declares "and they all ate and were satisfied" (καὶ ἔφαγον πάντες καὶ ἐχορτάσθησαν). Here, Jesus continues on the interactional frame of modelling being a shepherd, the crowd

employ the gesture of eating and a characterisation of ‘all...satisfied’ used by the author. This pithy description of the crowd affirms the miracle. Interpreters conclude that ἐχορτάσθησαν (were satisfied) indicates far more than a token meal, and it provides the confirmation of the miracle. That is, the need of the crowd for a meal has been met. The fact is the loaves and fish were miraculously increased in contrast to the dearth of funds and the insufficiency of bread at hand. Taylor’s words “old commentators generally agreed in seeing in the incident a miracle of creation”; and some interpreters explain “the action as one of benevolence (Taylor 1952:325; Williamson 1983:230; Geulich 1989:343; Donahue & Harrington 2002: 207; France 2002:268). If taken literally, ἐχορτάσθησαν (were satisfied), since none of the members of the crowd is heard speaking, to come to such a conclusion could only be possible through observation. Interactionally, by observing their bodily movements, gestures and expressions and their interaction ritual perhaps led to the conclusion that they were all satisfied. From social interaction analysis it can be argued that satisfaction is wholistic not just a matter of food. Food is a channel to a complete social interaction.

The use of πάντες (all) is a critical word in the interaction, and germane to Jesus’ interactional agenda. Jesus functioning as the shepherd host shows hospitality to all. As in patron-client relationship, all clients receive their patron’s favour. The sheep (crowd) have their needs met by their shepherd. Even more important is that πάντες (all) creates the impression of absence of discrimination which was scarce in the socio-cultural system of the first century ancient Mediterranean biblical world. It may be observed further that καὶ ἔφαγον πάντες καὶ ἐχορτάσθησαν (and they all ate and were satisfied) was possible because the host, the mediator of the new kingdom, and the shepherd of the sheep, gave equal access to all. This creates the impression of one who welcomes all and is prepared to help all irrespective of the background.

The crowd being satisfied was their positive response to the shepherd. The sheep's (crowd) ritual or gesture of eating (ἔφαγον) what was offered them in the interaction made the miracle possible. It creates an impression of agreement, being on the same page, humility and obedience on their part. Thus, the sheep going along with the shepherd is critical to meeting the needs of the sheep. Not discriminating is one value of the traditional Ghanaian leadership notion which is hardly met. Strong family ties have created a seemingly incurable tradition of favouritism within communities.

In verse 43, the disciples employ another ritual in their interaction. "And they took up twelve baskets full of broken pieces and of the fish" (καὶ ἤραν κλάσματα δώδεκα κοφίνων πληρώματα καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν ἰχθύων). Interpreters consider the act of picking up the fragment as replicating the traditional honour for bread as the gift of God and it was a regulation that crumbs which fall on the ground during meals were to be picked. Wicker baskets (κοφίνων; Mk. 8:19, Mt. 14:20, 16:9, Lk. 9:17, Jn. 6:13) was a unique Jewish basket. The Jews were so fond of them that Juvenal, the Roman satirist (3.14) made fun of them as a symbol of a poorer class of Jews in Rome. They were small and used in carrying food in contrast to a large basket (στυρίδας) used by Mark 8:8 and Act 9:25, which can even carry a human being.

Moreover, κλάσματα (broken pieces; Mk. 8:8, 19, 20; Mt. 14:20; 15:37; Lk. 9:17; Jn 6:12) is also used in the Didache 9:3ff in reference to the broken bread of the Agape and the Eucharist, thereby establishing a loose coupling between this feeding miracle and the Eucharist. Twelve basketfuls (πληρώματα) is taken symbolically, reminiscing the twelve in the Jewish territory in contrast to seven in 8:8 in the Gentile territory with interpretive function of either the Twelve Apostles in contrast to the Seven Hellenist deacons of Acts 6:1-6 or the twelve tribes of Israel

in contrast to the seven or seventy nations (Gentiles) (see Taylor 1966:325; Williamson 1983:231; Geulich 1989:343; Donahue & Harrington 2002:207; France 2002:268).

In this interaction, the disciples make use of a typical cultural ritual of picking up pieces after meal, so by this interactional approach they continue in the impression of service. An impression of avoidance of waste of resources and preservation is also created. One may even stretch the impression to purity and cleanliness, not leaving the place defiled after meals. In other words, the disciples sought to create an impression of responsibility to their master on the one hand, and service to the crowd on the other.

In agreement with the literary interpreters, the twelve baskets full can be taken symbolically, which holds symbolic meaning (see Ch. 2.9; Symbolic Meaning involves the meaning individuals in an interaction situation assign to objects, events, and behaviours of others) to the disciples. In relation to their abilities, the basket full in each one's hand holds a plausible meaning of unlimited abilities in this new kingdom (John 14:12). By looking at the basketful symbolically, they see the role of the shepherd as being inbetween the scarcity and the abundance for the sheep. It could also suggest that to them is entrusted the food (resources) meant for the sheep, thus creating a sense of responsibility in them toward the sheep (crowd).

The interactional impressions created by the picking up of the twelve basketful of broken bread, I will argue, are major challenges to traditional Ghanaian leadership. Though avoidance of waste of resources and preservation, purity and cleanliness have a great place in traditional Ghanaian notion of leadership. However, they are yet to occupy their rightful place in practice. There is so much wastage of the scarce economic resources, lack of supervision and lack of the sense of personal responsibility to avoid wastage.

In the concluding verse, which is verse 44, the Evangelist brings in some statistics; “and those who ate the loaves were five thousand men” (καὶ ἦσαν οἱ φαγόντες [τοὺς ἄρτους] πεντακισχίλιοι ἄνδρες). While some interpreters consider the arrangement of the crowd on the grass in groups as offering a quick estimation of the number present; others like Malina and Rohrbaugh (1992:217) find a crowd of five thousand as a hyperbole in the tradition because they are convinced that it should be bigger than the population of all but a handful of the largest urban settlement. Conversely, Williamson does not doubt the historicity of the figure five thousand men but rather sees it as an immense gathering since large neighbouring towns like Capernaum and Bethsaida could boast of only 2000-3000 dwellers each (1983:232), perhaps underscoring the popularity of Jesus. Mark’s πεντακισχίλιοι ἄνδρες (five thousand men) appears to be less compared to Matthew’s about five thousand men, besides women and children (8:21).

The statistics here used in the interaction offers symbolic meaning, and projects Jesus in a superior light. In comparison with the Elisha miracle (2 Kings 4:42-42), Jesus has a ratio of one bread to thousand people whilst Elisha has a ratio of one bread to five people. Understood this way Jesus is a greater shepherd. Again, the social interactions use of statistics in this narrative from five loaves and two fishes, groups of hundreds and fifties to five thousand men fosters an impression of records keeping which is critical to leadership. It projects Jesus as a shepherd with great ability and inexhaustible resources to meet the needs of the sheep (crowd). The ultimate rationale of this feeding miracle in the Gospel is to create the impression that the people (crowd) now have a true shepherd (leader) in Jesus Christ.

## 4.4 Social Interactional Analysis of Mark 7:1-23

### The Narrative

<sup>1</sup>Now when the Pharisees gathered together to him, with some of the Scribes, who had come from Jerusalem,

<sup>2</sup>they saw that some of his disciples ate with hands defiled, that is, unwashed.

<sup>3</sup>(For the Pharisees, and all the Jews, do not eat unless they wash their hands, observing the tradition of the elders;

<sup>4</sup>and when they come from the market place, they do not eat unless they purify themselves; and there are many other traditions which they observe, the washing of cups and pots and vessels of bronze.)

<sup>5</sup>And the Pharisees and the Scribes asked him, "Why do your disciples not live according to the tradition of the elders, but eat with hands defiled?"

<sup>6</sup>And he said to them, "Well did Isaiah prophesy of you hypocrites, as it is written,

This people honours me with their lips, but their heart is far from me;

<sup>7</sup>in vain do they worship me, teaching as doctrines the precepts of men.'

<sup>8</sup>You leave the commandment of God, and hold fast the tradition of men."

<sup>9</sup>And he said to them, "You have a fine way of rejecting the commandment of God, in order to keep your tradition!

<sup>10</sup>For Moses said, 'Honour your father and your mother'; and, 'He who speaks evil of father or mother, let him surely die';

<sup>11</sup>but you say, 'If a man tells his father or his mother, what you would have gained from me is Korban' (that is, given to God) -

<sup>12</sup>then you no longer permit him to do anything for his father or mother,

<sup>13</sup>thus making void the word of God through your tradition which you hand on. And many such things you do."

<sup>14</sup>And he called the people to him again, and said to them, "Hear me, all of you, and understand:

<sup>15</sup>there is nothing outside a man which by going into him can defile him; but the things which come out of a man are what defile him."

<sup>17</sup>And when he had entered the house, and left the people, his disciples asked him about the parable.

<sup>18</sup>And he said to them, "Then are you also without understanding? Do you not see that whatever goes into a man from outside cannot defile him,

<sup>19</sup>since it enters, not his heart but his stomach, and so passes on?" (Thus he declared all foods clean.)

<sup>20</sup>And he said, "What comes out of a man is what defiles a man.

<sup>21</sup>For from within, out of the heart of man, come evil thoughts, fornication, theft, murder, adultery,

<sup>22</sup>coveting, wickedness, deceit, licentiousness, envy, slander, pride, foolishness.

<sup>23</sup>All these evil things come from within, and they defile a man."

#### **4.4.1 The Literary Context**

Mark 7:1-23, literary is at the centre of the section that extends from Chs. 6:7 to 8:26. It prefaces three successive miracle narratives containing Jesus' ministry to Gentiles (Mk 7:24-30, 31-37; 8:1-10). It does not have any convincing association with the preceding narratives and the specific location or time of incident is indeterminable except to say that Jesus was moving around the area of Gennesaret (Taylor 1966:334). Bultmann's view that the story originates from discussions within the Christian community, because no real answer is given to the question posed by the Pharisees and the Scribes even though he accedes to the narrative emanating from the Palestinian community is discounted by Taylor. He argues that Jesus prefacing his citation of Isaiah with "well did Isaiah prophesy of you hypocrites", in addition to "you have a fine way of rejecting the commandment of God" was an answer while leaving out the disciples (see Taylor 1966:334).

In terms of form the material of this narrative is similar to the accounts of controversy grouped in Mark 2:1-3:6, and 3:22-26 of which this unit could easily have been part (Williamson 1983:244). Form critics have varied conclusions on the text itself and the traditional units from its earlier settings. While Cranfield (1963:231) and Lambrecht (1977:25,-27) take it as a single unit, Taylor (1966) conceives three different classifications: 7:1-8 (pronouncement story), 7:9-13 (saying), and 7:14-23 (saying, 334, 339, 342). Geulich agrees with Kümmel (1973:29); Pesch (1976:367-377), and Gnllka (1978:277-278) and that the narrative has two separate forms based on analysis of its history of tradition. The first division is 7:1-13 (the controversy narrative) and the second is 7:14-23 (teaching narrative).

Scholars consider that the constituent elements points to different stages in the development of the tradition which depicts the varying concern of the early Church. Geulich (1989) notes

that the original core tradition underpins 7:1-2, 5b, 15, consisting of the situation (Jesus, the Pharisees and the Scribes and the disciples), charge (eating with defiled hands), and response (adversarial form, 361). The core serving as the foundation, issues of tradition of elders, Korban in Jewish Christian community, and defiled hands are addressed. Then the parenthetical details in vv. 3-4 meant illuminate v. 2 and definitely assist the Gentile Christians. The setting, brings to the fore the issue of social boundaries, confronting Jewish purity laws before ministry in the Decapolis. The final part of the development in the tradition is seen in the change of scene in verses 14-18a.

The narrative unit naturally transitions at verses 8 and 13 creating logical divisions. The divisions are 'the charge of the Scribes and Pharisees and Jesus' initial response' (v 1-8), 'Jesus' counter-charge that the scribal tradition is in conflict with the Law' (v 9-13), and 'finally the exposition of true defilement' (v 14-23). The three phases are suggestive of a unified argument which focuses on essential differences between Jesus and the Pharisees and the Scribes regarding purity. The maintenance of the concern with defilement, ritual and truth, throughout the narrative gives the inkling that Mark purposed 7:1-23 to be received as a single unit (Johnson 1960:130; see Williamson 1983:244). From social interactional perspective the narrative is a single unit with three episodes: 7:1-13 (Pharisees and the Scribes question Jesus and his response); 7:14-16 (Jesus engages the people in parable); and 7:17-23 (Jesus explains the parable to his disciples in private).

Regarding source, similar to stories of its kind, the contention is that this narrative possibly circulated as a discrete unit of tradition not tied to any specific time or circumstance. Thus, the historical value of the story is considered high. Two main attributions are made, first, the scholars who take 7:1-23 as a collection of traditions put together by Mark (Lambrecht, ETL

53, 24-73; Quesnell, *Mind*, 90-91). Second, scholars who based on the development in the tradition, suggest that Mark utilised an already combined mixture of traditions rooted in Jesus' ministry (7:6-7; 9-13, 15) and other church elaborations (7:18b-19, 20-23; Geulich 1989:362).

The narrative is a Pronouncement story outlining the attitude of Jesus to the scribal rules regarding ritual purity. The literary genre borders on teaching, of discourse, first in the form of a long controversy (7:1-13), then of a public teaching to the crowds (7:14-15), and a lesson given in private to the disciples (7:17-23; Taylor 1966:334; Focant 2012:278).

For motif, Mark uses this controversy section as the highlight of Jesus' Galilean ministry. Jesus is at present pushing beyond the boundaries of the closed religious system advocated by the Scribes and the Pharisees ((Johnson 1960:130; Moloney 2002:137). Mark's 'bread' motif comes up again when reference is made to the eating of bread as the trigger of the controversy. This connects the scene to 6:41, 44 and 8:14-21. All these point to the disciples understanding the bread agenda in 6:51; 7:15 and 8:14:21 pertaining to the shepherd feeding the sheep.

#### **4.4.2 Social Interactional Observation and Analysis**

Interaction in this narrative is initiated by the Pharisees and Scribes from Jerusalem in verses 1 to 5. The Pharisees (*Φαρισαῖοι*) are noted earlier in controversy with Jesus at 2:16, 24 and 3:6 and they keep to confrontation with Jesus after this episode in 8:11, 15; 10:2; 12:13. Some Scribes from Jerusalem (*τινες τῶν γραμματέων ἐλθόντες*), in the gospel the Scribes are stronger opponents of Jesus than the Pharisees appearing in conflict with Jesus (2:6, 16; 3:22) and sustaining the conflicts hereafter (7:5; 8:31; 9:11, 14, 16; 10:33; 11:18, 27; 12:28, 32, 35, 38; 14:1, 43, 53; 15:1, 31) and are noted in conflict situation with Jesus throughout the Gospel of Mark.

Some Scribes from Jerusalem presuppose the event took place in Galilee. The participle ἐλθόντες (having come) could be in reference to both the Pharisees and the Scribes. Perhaps given Mark's use of similar expression in 3:22 coupled with the καί (and) before the τινες (some) tilt the verbal adjective in favour of the Scribes. The implication is that the Pharisees are local and the Scribes have purposefully come. Interpreters like France (2002) believe that the use of ἐλθόντες (having come) from Jerusalem could mean they had come purposefully to dispute or investigate Jesus (see Taylor 1966:334; Geulich 1989:363; Donahue & Harrington 2002:219; France 2002:280).

Williamson (1983:242) notes rightly, that the words ἰδόντες (having seen); ... τοὺς ἄρτους (the loaves) in verse 2 are dependent upon the main verb ἐπερωτῶσιν ("they questioned") which was not introduced until verse 5 because of the explanatory parenthesis in verses 3-4. The use of 'the bread' (τοὺς ἄρτους) rather than 'bread' (ἄρτον) without the article 'the' to connote 'food' suggests 'the loaves' are actually intended thus making allusion to 'the loaves' in 6:41, 44 and even 8:1-9 of which the disciples lacked understanding. κοιναῖς χερσίν (with defiled hands) is with the sense of 'ritually unclean' hands. The Greek word for "defiled" is simply 'common' (κοιναῖς), which runs through the narrative (7:1, 5, 15, 18, 20, 23) converse to 'private' (idios). κοιναῖς is used in 1 Macc 1:47, 62 for unclean animals (swine) and in Acts 10:14, 28, 11:8; Rev. 21:27 for unclean food. So the 'unclean or defiled' as meaning to κοιναῖς comes from a difference between what is deemed 'common' or general use and what has been specifically set apart or dedicated to God.<sup>11</sup> ἀνίπτους (unwashed) clarifies the technical term κοιναῖς χερσίν perhaps for the audience. In reference to "with defiled hands", the tradition of handwashing before ordinary meals is not corroborated by the Old Testament (see Lev. 15:11;

---

<sup>11</sup>See Malina, B. J. & Rohrbaugh, R. L. 1992. *Social science commentary on the Synoptic Gospels* for detailed treatment of purity and pollution.

ritual handwashing is upon contact with unclean objects, but ritual washings before prayer are present in Judith 12:7; Letter of Aristeas 305, and Sybilline Oracles 3.591-93)<sup>12</sup>.

The parenthetical comment in verses 3 to 4 is considered by many scholars as Markan redaction (Taylor 1966:335, Kümmel 1978:29, Lambrecht 1977:48, Quesnell 1969:90, Gnilka 1978:227, Booth 1986:35-46). Geulich disagrees with them based on the lexical and stylistic evidence and concludes that explanation of 7:2 in the parenthesis is likely to come from an earlier explanation of the disciples' behaviour in the light of tradition (1989:363). 'All the Jews' (πάντες οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι) is deemed historically difficult to be accurate (see Geulich 1989:363; Grudmann, 193; Gnilka 1:281). Though some interpreters link it to Diaspora Judaism, others caution against reading 'all Jews' as if it covered every one. It was the Pharisees who sought to make everyday life assume the purity required in the Temple (Neusner 1976:494) and the Essenes who applied themselves to implementing the purity provisions of the priest (Exodus 30:17-21; 40:12) among the laity, who were the Jews consumed by purity thoughts. 'All the Jews' expresses Mark's desire for universalizing scenes (Donahue & Harrington 2002:220).

'Wash their hands' (νίψονται τὰς χεῖρας) involves ritual washing which interpreters like Neusner (1976) maintained it was part of the purity not required by general law. Interpreters find πυγμῆ (fist; see Taylor 1966:335), which qualifies the washing of hands, as a difficult word (ἐὰν μὴ πυγμῆ νίψονται τὰς χεῖρας-literally meaning unless they wash their hands with a fist). Wellhausen believes no one knows what πυγμῆ means, Hengel argues that πυγμῆ is Latinism, and considers it to mean one of the four – a unit of measure (say a cubit) implying to the elbow, fist, that is rubbing the fist into the other hand, to the wrist, and with a hand full of water. Donahue and Harrington (2002) notes this puzzling word has prompted a number of

---

<sup>12</sup>See the Mishnah (ca 200 CE) FOR rules for impurity associated with the Hands (Yadayim), directions for handwashing (m. Yad. 1:1-24; m. Ha. 2:5-6), including long comments on washing before touching bread (m. Yad 2:4).

manuscript variations with limited manuscripts simply neglecting the term and other ancient manuscripts having replaced it with πύκνα (often, thoroughly; see also Danker, Bauer & Arndt 2000:896).

Tradition of the elders (παράδοσιν τῶν πρεσβυτέρων) implies the oral tradition that the Pharisees in particular held to be binding as the written law and handed down to the people. The tradition which was codified into the Mishnah by the end of the second century was considered the fence around the law. M. Yadim a tractate of ‘the tradition’ details out the washing of hand. The phrase ‘tradition of the elders’ is seen in Ant. 10:51, and a similar expression is found in Philo, Spec. Leg. 4:50. The Mishnaic tractate ‘Abot (1:1-18) begins with a long chain of traditions stretching from Moses to Simeon ben Gamaliel’ (after 135 CE) (Geulich 1989:365; Donahue & Harrington 2002:220).

‘Many other things received as tradition’ (πολλά ἐστὶν ἃ παρέλαβον) are taken as generalisation of tradition of washing, and of eating and defilement. The Evangelist is here giving his audience a general description of pharisaic ritual practices with some examples. ‘Drinking cups and measuring bowls – vessels and utensils’ (βαπτισμοὺς ποτηρίων καὶ ξεστῶν καὶ χαλκίων). The Mishnah, m. Kelim, especially 8:2-11:3 is about instructions for washing cooking utensils, ‘measuring bowl’ (ξεστῶν). ξεστῶν itself is from Latin *sextarius*, a unit of measurement transferred to a cup or bowl (e.g. pint). Such practices are attested to also in Q (Luke 11:39; Matt 23:25-26, see Donahue & Harrington 2002:221).

The tradition of the elders, called the Great tradition by modern anthropologists give the social dimension of it and the purity rituals. The tradition of the elders was basically outlined and practiced by the elite groups in the cities. However, the Pharisees and the Scribes required everyone to observe them. The Pharisees and the Scribes saw the unwashed Galilean peasants and fishermen as outside of the law (John 7:48-52). For the peasant farmers, fishermen and

travelling disciples keeping the law is near impossible. Fishermen have to deal with dead fish and animals almost always. Farmer may not have adequate water required for ritual bath and a travelling disciple would not have the time and space to observe all the regulations for ritual purity (see Malina & Rohrbaugh, 1992:221).

Verse 5 resumes the purity issue in verse 2 moving from the earlier concern of the Pharisees and the Scribes about some disciples eating with unwashed hands to include the tradition of the elders. ‘Not walking to the tradition of the elders’ (διὰ τί οὐ περιπατοῦσιν οἱ μαθηταὶ σου κατὰ τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν πρεσβυτέρων), becomes the main focus of 7:1-13. περιπατοῦσιν (walk) appears only in this verse in Mark and conveys a more technical sense of ‘to live by’ κοινᾶς χερσίν (defiled hands) as a charge comes to illustrate the disciples not living by the traditions of the elders. To these charges and concerns of the Pharisees and the Scribes, Jesus’ response in verse 5 and 15 (see Taylor 1966:337).

Now social interactional perspective is applied to verses 1 to 5. This interactional phrase οἱ Φαρισαῖοι καὶ τινες τῶν γραμματέων (the Pharisees and some Scribes) in verse 1, can be understood in the light of Goffman’s idea of personal front in dramaturgy (see Ch. 2.2.1.5). It was explained earlier that personal front on the social stage are those things that we most intimately identify with the performer himself or herself, and that we naturally expect will follow the performer wherever he or she goes. Appearance in Goffman’s stage making (see Ch. 2.2.1.5) also provides a window for understanding. Appearance is those stimuli with a person which function at the time to tell us of the performer’s social statuses, temporary ritual state that is, whether he is engaging in formal social activity, work, or informal recreation, whether or not he is celebrating a new phase in the season cycle or in his life-cycle among others.

The Pharisees and some Scribes were most likely recognised through their personal front involving their appearance (see Ch. 2.2.1.5) – their dressing, looks, posture, speech patterns, facial expressions, and bodily gestures. Obviously their front made it easy to identify them. They also used the team interactional approach, *συνάγονται πρὸς αὐτὸν* (gather together toward), to foster a single impression on Jesus and his disciples. Their gathering together signalled impression to Jesus of a purposive formidable team. *ἔλθόντες ἀπὸ Ἱεροσολύμων* (having come from Jerusalem) suggests that they have come with already determined interactive agenda. This agenda begins to unfold in verse 2.

Appearance in social interaction offers other interactants and observers the opportunity to glean clues from other performers, enabling them to apply their previous experience with such performers or other individuals roughly similar to the one before them. Thus Jesus and his disciples perhaps anticipated what this combination will be up to – accusation and confrontation. The interaction approach of the Pharisees and the Scribes is not uncommon in the traditional Ghanaian leadership; opponents of a particular tradition leader mostly put up such schemes and strategies to find fault with the leader. All kinds of allegations are thrown at the leaders.

The team of Pharisees and Scribes continue their interaction with the gesture of watching (see Ch. 2.2.2; gesture here, is a symbol used in interaction from which meaning is derived). The expression *καὶ ἰδόντες τινὰς τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ* (and having seen some of his disciples), means the Pharisees and Scribes observed for details, perhaps watching to affirm their repertoire of knowledge about Jesus and his disciples regarding purity matters ((knowledge with respect to Jesus sharing table-fellowship with outcasts (2:15-17), fasting (2:18-22) and Sabbath observance (2:23-28)), and is now exhibited in regard to ritual defilement.

The Pharisees and the Scribes in their gleaning for information from the performance of the disciples employed characterisation. κοιναῖς χερσίν τοῦτ' ἔστιν ἀνόητοις (with defiled hands that are unwashed), by this observation the disciples who ate with defiled hands were placed under categoric characterisation, labelling them impure, religiously inept, traditionally miscreants in the light of the question they put to Jesus in verse 5. The disciples though conscious of the presence of the Scribes and the Pharisees, yet performed the ritual of eating this time with unwashed hands and perhaps sought to create the impression to them of a new order implying a new kingdom, an impression of revolt that is to say we are not your subjects, we do not live by your interpretations. The disciples by this front appear to be rejecting the position of the Pharisees, in particular, on traditions and purity matters. This message the Pharisees and the Scribes got very well, and so questioned Jesus in the verse 5.

Verses 3 and 4 convey the rituals, the socio-religious and cultural values of the Pharisees and, as noted above, some of the Jews. These values of ritual purity are the internalised generalised other (see Ch. 2.2.2), which informed the interaction of the Pharisees and the Scribes in this narrative. The generalised other as modelled by them involves traditions and purity such as do not eat unless they wash their hands, observing the tradition of the elders, do not eat unless they purify themselves, there are many other traditions which they observe, and the washing of cups and pots and vessels of bronze.

It is therefore the expectation of the Pharisees that all Jews will follow their example and reflect the generalised other. The failure on the part of some disciples to do so meant Jesus must answer for them. The factor of cultural assumptions influencing leadership is much known to the Ghanaian traditional notion of leadership. Leaders are expected in traditional communities

to be the embodiment of the culture and traditions of the people even sometimes to the detriment of development in the communities.

In verse 5 the Pharisees and the Scribes use framing to interact with Jesus by asking a question, καὶ ἐπερωτῶσιν... διὰ τί οὐ περιπατοῦσιν οἱ μαθηταί σου κατὰ τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν πρεσβυτέρων, ἀλλὰ κοιναῖς χερσὶν ἐσθίουσιν τὸν ἄρτον ("they asked him, ...why do your disciples not live according to the tradition of the elders, but eat with hands defiled?"). By this frame, the Pharisees and the Scribes wanted their verbal interaction to remain with the tradition of the elders and ritual purity. The manner (Ch. 2.2.1.5) they put up before Jesus' presence through the question suggests they wanted to control the interaction and wanted Jesus to follow their course of the polemic. Their question to Jesus has a multidimensional impression it creates: Jesus is responsible for the actions of his disciples, Where is Jesus' commitment to the tradition of the elders and Jewish ritual purity? Is Jesus the one instigating the behaviour of his disciples or that Jesus does not understand the tradition of the elders and the Jewish purity system? Also is Jesus a true Jewish religious leader? These impressions influenced Jesus' response in verse 6.

Jesus cites Isaiah to respond to them in verses 6 and 7. The ability to draw on tradition in a creative way to make a point in a debate was deemed an honourable thing for males to do in the first century biblical Mediterranean world (Malina & Rohrbaugh 1992:221). *Isaiah prophesied rightly* (ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Καλῶς ἐπροφήτευσεν), he cites Isa. 29:13 (see also Isaiah in Mark 1:3, 27; 3:21; 9:12; 10:34, 45; 11:17; 12:32, 40; 13:8, 13, 31; 14:49, 61; 15:27). The quotation reflects more of the LXX compared to the Hebrew text yet differs in some respect from the LXX. The Hebrew text concludes by 'charging the people with lip service stemming

from a commandment of men learned by rote’, the LXX translation has ‘teachings and commandment of men’.

*About you hypocrites* (περὶ ὑμῶν τῶν ὑποκριτῶν) (pretender or dissembler) and the verb *hypokrinein* (‘to play a part’ or ‘to make believe’) come from the background of Greek drama (Gnilk 1978:282). ὑποκριτῶν though does not carry the negative moral sense of the English word ‘hypocrites’. It implies inconsistency in the behaviour of one who unconsciously has alienated oneself from God, an ungodly person by one’s actions. The people *honour me with their lips* (ὁ λαὸς τοῖς χεῖλεσίν με τιμᾷ) – Mark is close to the LXX here in abbreviating the Hebrew text. In both Hebrew text and the LXX disagreement in behaviour lies in the difference between lip service and where one’s heart really is (Geulich, 367; Donahue and Harrington, 122). The part of the citation, *their worship of me is empty* (μάτην δὲ σέβονταί με), here also Mark follows the LXX because the Hebrew text has no such phrase. *They teach human precepts as doctrine* (διδάσκοντες διδασκαλίας ἐντάλματα ἀνθρώπων), while the Hebrew text ends with “their worship of me is a human commandment learned by rote,” the LXX reads, “by teaching commandments of men and doctrines”. Mark makes adjustment to accentuate the ‘empty worship’ by doing away with the ‘and’ from the LXX, thus Isaiah charges the people with turning human precepts into doctrines rather than simply teaching human precepts and doctrines (Donahue & Harrington 2002:222; France 2002:284).

**In verses 6 and 7 Jesus changes the frame for the interaction with his response,** and reframes the interaction into an inquisition into the authenticity of the religiosity of the Pharisees and the Scribes. Having established himself as the true and concerned shepherd of the people in 6:30-44, Jesus comes into this interaction with the Pharisees and the Jerusalem Scribes creating the impression that he is the one who appreciated the true essence of the



tradition. Jesus perhaps came to such conclusions about the Pharisees and the Scribes by observing their own way of life, their beliefs and what they thought. It means while the Pharisees and the Scribes were observing Jesus and his disciples (see 7:2, 5), Jesus on the other hand was observing them. He performs in this interaction as one with surpassing knowledge of religious tradition and cultural purity, and puts up a front of ability to handle criticism and opposition – in this social situation he employs intellectual argument to deal with the situation. Hypocrisy is not a stranger in traditional Ghanaian leadership. Though the virtues of truth and integrity are extolled, they are virtually replaced with hypocrisy because of leadership inability to confront issues and deal with them as they are.

Verse 8, ‘you leave the commandment of God’ (ἀφέντες τὴν ἐντολὴν τοῦ θεοῦ); the commandment of God when considered within the broader teaching context of Jesus’ ministry leads interpreters to connect its use here to the commandment in Deut 6:4-6 as restated in Mk. 12:28-32. The commandment of God points to God’s laws as written law in contrast to tradition which consists of human commandments. ‘You hold fast the tradition of men’ (κρατεῖτε τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν ἀνθρώπων), the tradition of men obviously is the tradition of the elders (7:3,5) and as such, connects to the charge of Isaiah 29:13 that the people were following the doctrines and precepts of men. Interpreters like France (2002) notes the use of three sets of ἀφέντες (neglect or leave)... κρατεῖτε (hold or keep); ἐντολὴν (commandment)... παράδοσιν (tradition); and θεοῦ (God)... ἀνθρώπων (men) to make the charge for true religion which focuses on God with the heart in contrast with mere human activity (tradition of men). Mark contrasts the sombreness of God’s commandment with mere human tradition. It is to emphasise the point that what comes from God is sacred and authoritative so must be obeyed but traditions of men may or may not be valuable in themselves so cannot be placed at the same level of enforcement (see Geulich 1989:367; Donahue & Harrington 2002:222; France 2002:285).

Now Jesus moves from insinuation to direct accusation or attack changing the frame of the interaction once more, putting the Pharisees and the Scribes on the defence. ‘You leave the commandment of God (ἀφέντες τὴν ἐντολὴν τοῦ θεοῦ); by this Jesus creates the impression that he knows better than the Pharisees and the Scribes who leave the most valuable and substitute it with the less valuable. He accused the Pharisees and the Scribes as leaders with misplaced value systems. ‘You hold fast the tradition of men’ (κρατεῖτε τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν ἀνθρώπων), by this statement, Jesus demonstrates his understanding of the Pharisees and the Scribes as leaders who misrepresent religious facts if not twist facts. Thus, they are not credible. Jesus continues his interaction with the Pharisees in verses 9 to 13. Various interpreters have hypothesised Mark’s placement of this section in its present location. Some take it as the original response to the Pharisees’ charge in 7:5 while 7:6-8 is a later addition (Kümmel 1978:29 and Hübner 1973:144-146). There is also the argument that the location of the section is due to Mark’s redactional arrangement of different traditions to illustrate the response in 7:6-8 (Taylor 1966:339, Schweizer 1967:145, Gnllka 1978:277). Others have argued, based on the play on Καλῶς (well, beautiful, right, correct) in 7:6 in reference to Prophet Isaiah’s work against the Pharisees; and Καλῶς (well, beautiful, right, correct) used here (7:9) in reference to the activities of the Pharisees against the commandment of God is ironic.

Coupled with a shift from ‘tradition of men’ (7:8) to ‘your tradition’ (7:9), they advocate a possible earlier combination of 7:6-8 and 7:9-13 with 7:9-13 being a successive specification of 7:6-8. Others see verse 9 as a restatement of verse 8, hence a different source but this argument is countered by Mark’s love for repetition. The effect of the repetition is that Mark produces an escalating charge as expressed in replacement words with a more severe impact. For instance, ἀφέντες (having left or neglecting) in verse 8 is replaced by ἀθετεῖτε (you do set

aside); παράδοσιν τῶν ἀνθρώπων (tradition of men) in verse 8 becomes παράδοσιν ὑμῶν (your tradition) in verse 9; and the introduction of a purposive conjunction ἵνα (in order that) in verse 9 asserts the high degree of disregard of the commandment of God in favour of their own tradition (see Taylor 1966:339; Geulich 1989:368; Donahue & Harrington 2002:222; France 2002:285).

In verse 9, Jesus' interactional strategy continues with the counter accusation frame. 'And he said to them' (Καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς), Jesus was direct if not confrontational. This recalls other instances in Mark 2:25, 27; 3:4; 7:6, 9; 12:16 where the expression 'and he said to them' was used. The expression has become his interaction ritual, affirmed by twenty more instances where the expression is used in other interactional situations involving Jesus. By this direct approach he puts up a front of one ready to face the Pharisee and the Scribes. This creates an impression of one who wants to control the interaction and wants the Pharisees and Scribes to follow him (see Ch 2.2.1.5). 'You have a fine way of rejecting the commandment of God' (Καλῶς ἀθετεῖτε τὴν ἐντολὴν τοῦ θεοῦ), this accusation connotes routine on the part of the Pharisees, that is rejecting the commandment of God in a beautiful way (cunningly done) has become their routine performance. The performance of Jesus in this interaction fosters an impression of a courageous and forthright person; while it gives the impression of the Pharisees and the Scribes as cunning promoters of self-interest.

'In order to keep your tradition' (ἵνα τὴν παράδοσιν ὑμῶν), suggests that cleverly setting aside God's commandments and promoting their tradition is perfunctory to the Pharisees or things done routinely, brief expressions occurring incidental to everyday action. Given that traditional Ghana leadership is rooted in cultural values and tradition, it goes without saying that traditions do easily get into the way of good leadership. The tradition of letting go offenders when

someone has pleaded on their behalf, has led to situations where good corporate and political governance is hindered; corrupt practices go unpunished because people beg behind the scenes and family ties are exalted above principles.

In verses 10 and 11 Jesus illustrates his charge in verse 9 by citing Moses; ‘for Moses said...’ quoting almost verbatim the LXX text of Exodus 20:12 and 21:17 (see Deut. 5:16; Lev. 20:9). He employs contrast here, ‘but you say’ (ὁμοίως δὲ λέγετε) in 7:11 is contrasted with ‘for Moses said’ (Μωϋσῆς γὰρ εἶπεν, 7:10) to show how the ‘tradition ‘counters the ‘commandment’. ‘What you would have gained from me is Korban’ (Ἐὰν εἴπη ἄνθρωπος τῷ πατρὶ ἢ τῇ μητρὶ, Κορβάν), Korban is a technical term found in the priestly tradition of the Old Testament (see Lev. 2:1, 4, 12, 14; Num.; Ezek.) where it always meant an offering made to God. Mark's use of ὁ ἐστίν, δῶρον (is the gift) as an explanation to Korban is also in the technical sense a rendering for the oblation as in the Greek text of Lev. 2: I, 4, 12ff. (Williamson 1983:250). It is the usual Markan parenthetical explanation for foreign words and most likely it is redactional work.

Zeitlin (1962:160, 1968:133) cites Jerusalem translation of the New Testament, and explains Korban as “an Aramaic word, meaning an offering, especially to God” and further identifies it as a designation for an offering in the Pentateuch, a vow or an oath and later for prayer. Geulich (1989) argues that contemporary evidence in the first century supports its use as a ‘vow’. Josephus like Mark uses ‘gift’ as a translation of Korban (Ant. 4.72-73), but however, describes an oath taken by the Jews as Korban in Apion 1.167.

Fitzmyer (1959:60) cites an example of Korban on an ossuary cover from a Jewish tomb in Jebel Hallet et-Turi, southeast of Jerusalem dated in the Christian era<sup>13</sup>. Besides, and interesting parallel of Mark 7:10-11 is found in m. Nedarim 5:6<sup>14</sup>. Taylor (1966) and Geulich (1982), however note that the exact nature and the extent of the practice of Korban in the time of Jesus are not easy to determine due to the limited knowledge of existing conditions at the time. Korban in practice, some commentators opine that it is a vow that dedicates a particular object to God or the temple as a result of which the object becomes sacred and unavailable for normal use (Str-B, 1.711; K.H. Rengstorf 1965:862). Drawing on the Mishnah, others think it functions more like a ban than a dedicatory formula (cf. Taylor 1966:342, Falk 1966:309-312). To Fitzmyer (1971:97) it moved beyond an offering to God and assumed a form of a declaration and even an imprecatory utterance as contained in m.Ned.8:7.

France (2002) notes that in practice the formula seems to have been used primarily for the negative purpose of excluding a particular person from the use of the property as in m. Ned. 8:7 (see Taylor 1966:341-342; Williamson 1983:250-251; Geulich 1989:368-369; Donahue & Harrington 2002:223; France 2002:286-287). Jesus' use of the Korban metaphor in the interaction still under Pharisee and Scribes rejection of God's commandment frame fosters an impression of the Pharisees and the Scribes as a people who enforced wrong interpretation of the commandment of God, and speaks of Jesus as one who represents the true commandment of God.

---

<sup>13</sup> The inscription reads, "All that a man may find-to-his-profit in this ossuary (is) an offering to God from him who is within it."

<sup>14</sup>m. Nedarim 5:6 "it once happened that a man at Beth Horon, whose father was forbidden by vow to have any benefit from him, was giving his son in marriage, and he said to his fellow, 'The courtyard and the banquet are given to thee as a gift, but they are thine only that my father may come and eat with us at the banquet.' His fellow said, 'if they mine, they are dedicated to heaven.' The other answered, I did not give thee what is mine that thou shouldst dedicate it to heaven.' His fellow said, 'thou didst give me what is thine only that thou and thy father might eat and drink and be reconciled one with the other and that the sin should rest on his head (Daby, Mishnah, 271 cited in Geulich 1989:369).

In verses 12 and 13, Jesus concludes his counter charge against the Pharisees and the Scribes. “You no longer allow him...” (οὐκέτι ἀφίετε αὐτὸν) suggests that the Pharisees and the Scribes held unto the negative sense of the Korban formula robbing parents of support from children. “To do anything for his father or mother” (οὐδὲν ποιῆσαι τῷ πατρὶ ἢ τῇ μητρὶ), clearly things dedicated to God or the temple hence Korban were out of reach of the donor or his parents. Interpreters note a rift between rules on the observance of vows (Num. 30:1-2; Deut 23:21-23) and the commandment on honouring your father and mother (Exo. 20:12; Lev. 19:3). Williamson (1983:252) explains that the fault is not with the commandments but in an interpretive tradition of the Pharisees and the Scribes which did not take the Scripture as a whole. “Thus annulling the word of God with your tradition” (ἀκυροῦντες τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ τῇ παραδόσει ὑμῶν ἢ παρεδώκατε), ἀκυροῦντες (annulling or repealing) is a legal word used here (see Matt. 15:6; Gal. 3:17; Josephus, Ant. 18:304; 20.183).

The sequence of charges with escalating effect beginning with ‘neglecting’ (ἀφέντες; 7:8), through to ‘set aside or nullifying’ (ἀθετεῖτε; 7:9) concludes with ‘to annul or repeal’ (7:13; ἀκυροῦντες) God’s commandment, God’s word (ton logon tou qeou) with tradition of the elders, tradition of men, your tradition (παραδόσει ὑμῶν). Some interpreters find ‘which you pass on’ (παρεδώκατε) as further implicating the Pharisees and the Scribes as passive receivers and followers of tradition and actively promoting their tradition. ‘And you do many similar things’ (καὶ παρόμοια τοιαῦτα πολλὰ ποιεῖτε), reflects Mark for generalisation (7:3) and is likely to Mark’s redactional footprint. It indicates an expansion from the particular issue of Korban practice to other traditions employed by them to annul the commandment of God. In effect, from 7:6-13; Jesus makes the point rather forcefully that the ‘tradition of the elders’ is not the commandment of God but actually denotes ‘human commandments’ that violates ‘the

commandment of God' (7:8-9, 13) which is typified by the practice of Korban (see Taylor 1966:341; Williamson 1983:252; Geulich 1989:370; Donahue & Harrington 2002:223; France 2002:287-288).

From interactional perspective, in verses 10 to 13 Jesus continues with his counter charge frame of interaction. He illustrates his charge in verse 9 with the practice of Korban. This practice actually ensures parents are denied support especially as the Pharisees and the Scribes were upholding the Korban in the negative sense. Jesus by this creates the impression of the Pharisees and the Scribes as the ones who did not rightly interpret the law. The personal front Jesus presented in this interaction expresses deep knowledge of both the law and the tradition. He pointed out to the Pharisees and the Scribes who gave no response that:

- You leave the commandment of God...for the tradition of men (7:8)
- You have a fine way of rejecting the commandment of God...for your tradition (7:9)
- You no longer permit him to do anything for his father or mother...as against honour for father and mother (7:12)
- Making void the word of God through your tradition ...to promote your tradition (7:13)

Perhaps the above charges were to create the impression to the Pharisees and the Scribes that they are actually saboteurs of the commandment of God. As such they were unjustified in equating the tradition of men, in fact, their own tradition to the commandment of God. The charge 'making void the word of God through your tradition ...to promote your tradition (7:13), communicates about them that they are actually not representing God and his commandment but their interest and their tradition. By not responding or challenging Jesus' counter charges, the Pharisees and the Scribes had changed their earlier manner of wanting to control the

interaction to a manner which makes them followers of Jesus in the interaction. Probably, their silence was to foster an impression of admission of the charges of Jesus against them, or Jesus was so dominant that they could not debate him anymore, or surrender and retreat.

In the entire interaction with the Pharisees and the Scribes (7:5-13), as in the narrative, Jesus responded to their charge and inadvertently defended his disciples, absolving them of any wrong doing as breaking of the tradition (Jesus was more concerned with the superior tradition, that is obedience of the commandments of God and their unadulterated interpretation.) Jesus' performance, front, framing and reframing employed in this interaction dovetails into the traditional Ghanaian leadership notion of paternalistic leadership approach where the leader is seen as a father of the community. As a father, Jesus showed unparalleled knowledge of traditions and their revered norms, that is, the commandments of God while at the same time defending and protecting his associates and community from further damage through parochial interpretation of the law. For traditional Ghanaian notion of leadership where leadership is sacralised, interpretations and twisting of rules like the case of the Pharisees and the Scribes go unchallenged. No one dares challenge a chief or retort when the chief has spoken: sanctions are unbearable.

Jesus turns attention to the crowd again in verses 14 and 15 after dealing with the Pharisees and the Scribes. Interpreters connect 7:14a to Markan redaction (Lambrecht 1977:57, Marxsen 1969:16-20). Among other signals, the framework of Jesus' publicly addressing the crowd (7:14-15) and then privately clarifying the implications to the disciples because of their lack of understanding (7:17-18a) corresponds with 4:12-13 and the arrangement of 10:2-12. 'Summoning again the crowd (Καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος πάλιν τὸν ὄχλον) recalls 2:13; 4:1; 6:34 and picks up 'the crowd' motif 'again' from 6:45 where Jesus dismissed 'the crowd'. 'Listen

to me, all of you and understand' (ἀκούσατέ μου πάντες καὶ σύνετε), it echoes the language of Chapter 4 to 'hear' (ἀκούετε, 4:3, 9, 15, 16, 18, 23-24; 9:7), it demands addition to hearing, understanding. The use of both 'hear and understand' is specific to 7:14 (Matt 15:10). However, it contrast the lack of understanding on the part of the hearers – both 'the crowd' and specifically 'the disciples' as noted in 7:18 and ties in with the lack of understanding the motif the Gospel (e.g. 6:52; 7:18; 8:14-21) (see Taylor 1966:342; Williamson 1983:253-254; Geulich 1989:374; Donahue & Harrington 2002:223; France 2002:288-2).

'And he called the crowd to him again' (Καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος πάλιν τὸν ὄχλον), Jesus employs here the framing of familiarity. Calling them to himself does foster an impression of friendship, strong bond between them, and a shepherd calling sheep to the crowd. The shepherd is fond of his sheep and the sheep are fond of him. It also connotes a privacy impression between the crowd and Jesus to outsiders and a sense of one family or community in the kingdom. Within this family frame, he tells them, "Hear me, all of you, and understand" (Ἀκούσατέ μου πάντες καὶ σύνετε), this signals to the crowd the need for the gesture of focus and digest what he was about to share with them.

For verse 15, some commentators consider it as the core of the whole narrative and is received widely as an authentic saying of Jesus. The verse consists of antithetical parallelism, 'nothing...outside (οὐδέν ...ἔξωθεν). For France (2002) it is typical of Jesus' epigrammatic pronouncement and interpreters see 7:15 as a typical wisdom saying. When 7:15 is viewed in the light of 7:18b-19 it may connote what enters the mouth as food (τὰ βρώματα) and the parenthetical comment in 7:19b makes this reference even more clear. The issues of 7:2 (κοινᾶς χερσίν) and 7:5 (κοινῶσαι, κοινοῦντα) are eating with 'defiled hands' to which a response is provided in this verse 'The things coming out of a person...' (τὰ ἐκ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου

ἐκπορευόμενά), basically consist of all that comes from within a person including thoughts, actions, and words. In essence, a person's purity or acceptability before God involved one's whole being, one's 'heart', as seen reflected in one's thoughts and conduct not just what goes into a person (see Neusner, 1976:494). Mark 7:15 echoes Jesus' association with defiling settings – eating in homes where it was doubtful that food served was ritually clean (2:16); he touched lepers (1:41), touched the dead (5:41) and haemorrhaging woman (5:27-29). Jesus addresses the question of 'defiled hands' by addressing the larger issue of defilement itself.

From the social interactions perspective, Jesus continues with the family frame and unfolds to them the mystery of what causes actual defilement before God. "Nothing outside a man which by going into him can defile him". By this, Jesus creates an impression which redefines defilement and introduces new thought patterns in the socio-religious context of the people. Traditional few or the generalised other gets a new definition. "But the things which come out of a man are what defile him", is also a new way to reflect on purity and defilement. This should lead people to do a lot of self-interaction to inner purity. Neusner (1962) puts it succinctly, 'cleanse first the inside'.

Verse 17, 'and when he had entered the house' (Καὶ ὅτε εἰσῆλθεν εἰς οἶκον), some interpreters consign this change of setting to pre-Markan tradition (Marxsen 1969:16-20; Pesch 1976:380; Gnilka 1978:278). However most believe it is a Markan redaction just like 7:14 (Taylor 1966:344, Lambrecht 1977:61-62, Geulich 1989:377). 'From the crowd' (ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄχλου), this connects to a familiar pattern of private clarification to the disciples after a public teaching (4:10-12, 34; 7:17-23; 10:10-12; 10:23-31). This pattern of contrasting Jesus' public and private teaching some interpreters believe, came to Mark in the tradition underlying 4:1-20 used also in 9:28, 33; 10:10. Public teaching in parables and private interpretation to the

disciples, besides being a characteristic feature of Jesus, the ‘house’ (τὸν οἶκον) is mostly the setting for such in-depth exposition (Chs. 9:28, 33; 10:10). ‘His disciples asked him about the parable’ (ἐπηρώτων αὐτὸν οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ τὴν παραβολήν), παραβολή has understanding of proverbial saying and a riddle, some interpreters believe ‘riddle’ is better rendering here as the saying appears very strange to the disciples (Williamson 1983:255; Donahue & Harrington 2002:224).

From the social interactional understanding of verse 17, ‘when he had entered the house’ (Καὶ ὅτε εἰσῆλθεν εἰς οἶκον), the change of setting in verse 17 is critical to Jesus’ interactional strategy. As noted earlier in Goffman’s dramaturgy (see Ch. 2.2.1.5), setting is a front that interactants use to communicate their impression. The setting of a house creates the impression of a more inner caucus discussion. In this case, details that should not be available to the opponents, and the crowd were to be made available to them. This also finds expression within traditional Ghanaian notion of leadership, wherein the adage ‘somethings are better said in chambers’ is functional in the delivery of leadership. It is common practice in the Akan leadership polity that while in public discussions the few chief few elders are allowed to move in a private meeting before to returning to the public again

‘His disciples asked him about the parable’ (ἐπηρώτων αὐτὸν οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ τὴν παραβολήν), the interactional tool of speech (see Ch. 2.2.1.1) within Goffman’s idea of ritual making helps to explain this phrase better. The disciples asking for further instruction once again creates the impression of lack of understanding and continuously depicting them as learners. The use of the parable (τὴν παραβολήν) by Jesus in interactions is not merely a literary and rhetorical device but a major social interactional tool with which Jesus seeks to foster an impression of himself as a wise person, one deep in knowledge and apt in the tradition and

culture of the people. The use of parables is an effective tool for control and direction of an interaction (see Ch. 2.2.1.5). Goffman explained that if an individual wanted to direct others and take control in an interaction, he would often find it useful to keep strategic secrets from them. The corollary of this interaction tool used by Jesus is the disciples' coming back to him for explanation. This creates the impression of Jesus as the one with the knowledge, the one to go to in order to gain understanding.

In the Akan traditional leadership context, elders and chiefs are revered when they display their mastery of the language and tradition by speaking in riddles and proverbs. It becomes a means that leaders use to endear themselves to the people. It also signalled to the crowd the need to draw closer to him and seek understanding as it has become his interaction ritual to re-instruct the disciples whenever they asked. The parable (τὴν παραβολήν) functions here as a surprise front of Jesus which the crowd got attracted to and felt mesmerised by. The parables depicted Jesus as enigmatic and created insatiable longing in the crowd for more as they lived in a dispensation where orators were highly celebrated. The interaction with the disciples in an enclosed setting portrays Jesus like a typical Ghanaian traditional leader who will always hold a closed door interaction with the people closest to him before and after a public interaction with the community.

In verse 18 Jesus responds to the disciples' request. 'And he said' (καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς), these expressions reflect Mark's redactional style which he uses to introduce Jesus' own question to the disciples. 'Then are you also without understanding?' (Οὕτως καὶ ὑμεῖς ἀσύνετοί ἐστε), the disciples' apparent lack of understanding re-echoes 4:13; and 6:52 and anticipates 8:21; hence the disciples' lack of understanding is one major theme of the Gospel. Most interpreters find the disciples' request for clarity as legitimate. Taylor (1966:334) for instance describes the

aphorism of 7:15 as a dark saying. Jesus' question presumes a lack of understanding among the crowd and now, the disciples have also failed to comprehend what he sought to communicate. 'Do you not see' (οὐ νοεῖτε), puts Jesus' explanation in question form, an approach which is taken up later in 8:17 regarding a similar issue of lack of understanding.

Turning to the social interactional observation, in verse 18 Jesus continues with the enquiry frame of interaction began by the disciples in verse 17. 'Then are you also without understanding?' (Οὕτως καὶ ὑμεῖς ἀσύνητοί ἐστε), employing this inquisition in the interaction, Jesus creates an impression that he is surprised at them, even disappointed and that they had not met his expectation. The question further fosters an impression of demand on the disciples to come to a point of self-awareness and know that they are under-performing intellectually. Clearly, it creates an impression of a demand for more from them by Jesus; they should be above the crowd in terms of the kingdom.

'Do you not perceive...?' (οὐ νοεῖτε), still within the enquiry frame, Jesus puts up the gesture of further instruction and challenges the disciples to reason out the effect of what goes inside a man from outside. 'That whatever goes into a man from outside cannot defile him' (πᾶν τὸ ἔξωθεν εἰσπορευόμενον εἰς τὸν ἄνθρωπον οὐ δύναται αὐτὸν κοινῶσαι). Jesus brings them along to figure out that whatever enters a man from outside cannot defile him because it does not enter the heart. Due to the addition of 'since it enters not his heart' in verse nineteen, the frame of 'whatever enters a man' may be limited to food because what man sees, hears, touches and even smells can sometimes affect the heart and shape man's desires, will and subsequently his actions. Speaking to the crowd in parables and explaining same to the disciple in private including giving more details is a gesture Jesus used, which creates the impression of a leader empowering his associates, replicating himself in them and entrusting to them his heartfelt

convictions. The interaction routine of private instruction after public lecture probably created a feeling of importance among the disciples.

In verse 19, Jesus explains why what enters a man from outside does not defile him. ‘Since it enters, not his heart but his stomach’ (ὅτι οὐκ εἰσπορεύεται αὐτοῦ εἰς τὴν καρδίαν ἀλλ’ εἰς τὴν κοιλίαν), this explanation points to food through the mouth. Interpreters trace the verse to the Markan tradition from which the Evangelist found and joined to 7:15. The ‘heart’ here connects the verse to the Isaiah 29:13. ‘Into the stomach’ (εἰς τὴν κοιλίαν) and ‘goes out into the latrine (καὶ εἰς τὸν ἀφεδρῶνα ἐκπορεύεται). This explanation concludes that defiled food does not defile the person thus, the disciples are free from wrong doing. ‘Thus he cleansed all food’ (καθαρίζων πάντα τὰ βρώματα), some interpreters in terms of syntax take καθαρίζω as agreeing with the subject of λέγει in 7:18 which is Jesus (Lohmeyer 1967:142; Schweizer 1967:150; Berger (1972: 481); Lambrecht (1977:63); Pesch (1976:381); Lührmann (1981:85). The expression used for food (βρώματα) is a hepax legomenon.

Focusing social interactional analysis of nineteen at this point, Jesus reframes the interaction and changes to realisation or discovery frame. The disciples, by the stretch of their imagination within the interaction, were to realise what happens to anything that enters a person through the mouth. ‘It enters, not his heart but his stomach’ (ὅτι οὐκ εἰσπορεύεται αὐτοῦ εἰς τὴν καρδίαν ἀλλ’ εἰς τὴν κοιλίαν), the way Jesus puts ‘the belly’ and ‘the heart’, they become interactional symbols. And they assume Mead’s idea of symbolic meaning (see Ch. 2.1). Mead explains, a symbol contains information or concepts that the individual in interaction intends to convey, or does convey to interactional participants. In this case, the heart becomes the symbol for purity and the belly the symbol for dumpster (garbage bin which is emptied periodically).

For the heart rather than the stomach being the symbol of purity, Jesus took the lead from the traditional biblical thought, which considered the heart as the centre for a person's life, the seat of human activity and emotion and the battleground between good and evil (Donahue & Harrington 2002:224). The impression this symbolism creates is that what matters most is what goes into the heart because that stays and contributes to the formation of what comes from the heart. 'From outside' of a person and 'comes out' of a person (cf. Matt. 23:25-26, Luke 16:15, 1 Sam 16:7) are significant interactional imagery used by Jesus. If true cleanliness and uncleanness are from the inside of a person then judgement of what is clean and what is unclean is beyond the Pharisees and the Scribes for they have no way of determining what is inside a person.

Verses 20 to 23 gives a detailed illustration of 7:15b. Interpreters mostly agree that verse 20 restates 7:15b and introduces the illustration. Verses 21 and 22 provide a list of twelve vices preceded by evil thought or design (οἱ διαλογισμοὶ οἱ κακοὶ) making thirteen in number. οἱ διαλογισμοὶ οἱ κακοὶ. Taylor (1966:345) explains that they are not 'merely evil thoughts' rather they are 'evil devising' which produce the twelve vices following it. Mark's use of διαλογισμοὶ (devices or designs) has been with negative connotation (see 2:8, 8; 8:17).

The twelve divide equally into two groups of six; the first six are in the plural - sexual immorality (πορνεΐαι), thefts (κλοπαί), murders (φόνοι), adulteries (μοιχεΐαι), covetous desires (πλεονεξΐαι), wickednesses (πονηρίαι). The second set of six are in the singular – deceit (δόλος), sensuality (ἀσέλγεια), an evil eye (ὄφθαλμὸς πονηρός), slander (βλασφημία), pride (ὑπερηφανία), foolishness (ἄφροσύνη). It is argued that 'lack of moral sense' renders ἄφροσύνη which occurs in the LXX for one lacking ethical or religious perception (Cranfield, 242). Another argument is made that 'Selfishness explains the ethically laden 'evil eye'

(ὀφθαλμὸς πονηρός). In Jewish writings (Deut 15:9 LXX; Sir 14:10; 31:13) the ‘eye’ symbolically indicates ‘intent’ and ‘evil’ or ‘bad eye’ is generally the ‘antithesis of generosity: selfishness, covetousness, an evil and envious disposition, hatred of others (Allison 1987:77 cf Matt 20:15).

This catalogue of vices though has no parallels in the Old Testament, they are regular among Hellenistic moralists, and the later Jewish literature (see Wis. 14:25-26; 3 Bar.4:17; 1 Enoch 91:6-7; Jub. 23:14; 4 Macc 1:2-4, 1QS 4:9-11). Matthew 15:18-19 is the only parallel among the Gospels but the Pauline epistles have a number of parallels (Rom 1:29-31; 1Cor. 5:10-11; 2 Cor. 2:20-21; Gal. 5:19-21; Col 3:5-8; 1Tim 1:9-12; 2 Tim 3:2-5).

Turning social interactional observation of twenty to twenty-three, Jesus continues his interaction on the realisation or discovery frame, employs speech as a tool. He reveals thirteen different vices which take their root from the heart of a person and they defile a person. Jesus by this interactional approach creates the impression that the human heart is a seat of evil, defilement and cleanliness so must be watched. The disciples are to be worried about the state of their heart in relation to these vices more than what goes into them particularly food from outside. Traditional Ghanaian leadership perspective share similar views, potential leaders are warned against some of these vices mentioned, none will be eligible for appointment as a leader if found to be involved in thefts (κλοπαί), murders (φόννοι), adulteries (μοιχεῖαι), wickednesses; and lives a life of deception or a life of evil.

Verse twenty-three simply summarises the import of the catalogue as an explanation of how one is defiled by the vices (πάντα ταύτα τὰ πονηρά) that come ‘from within’. It recalls places in 7:15, which specify what really ‘defiles’ as grounded in the opening scene of 7:1-2.

## 4.5 Social Interactional Analysis of Mark 7:24-30

### The Narrative

<sup>24</sup>And from there he arose and went away to the region of Tyre and Sidon. And he entered a house, and would not have any one know it; yet he could not be hid.

<sup>25</sup>But immediately a woman, whose little daughter was possessed by an unclean spirit, heard of him, and came and fell down at his feet.

<sup>26</sup>Now the woman was a Greek, a Syrophenic'ian by birth. And she begged him to cast the demon out of her daughter.

<sup>27</sup>And he said to her, "Let the children first be fed, for it is not right to take the children's bread and throw it to the dogs." <sup>28</sup> But she answered him, "Yes, Lord; yet even the dogs under the table eat the children's crumbs."

<sup>29</sup>And he said to her, "For this saying you may go your way; the demon has left your daughter."

<sup>30</sup>And she went home, and found the child lying in bed, and the demon gone.

### 4.5.1 Literary Context

Mark's gospel is addressed to a population which was mostly Gentile at a period when Christianity was fast spreading among Gentiles (Boring 2006:16). Mark justifiably establishes to his majority gentile audience Jesus' dealings with and ministry to gentiles through this passage. In Mark 7:24-30, the author does this using what appears at a quick glance a healing and exorcism story, but depicts Jesus' social identity and interactional skills which shakes up the audience's understanding of how Jews relate to Gentiles. This passage deviates from the form of a classic healing or exorcism story to the point that the exorcism becomes secondary to the social interaction (Houck & Hoffman 2010:3). Its focus was on the interaction between Jesus and the woman rather than the healing or the exorcism. For Mark, speaking to a gentile audience, this particular conversation helps him to release his goal of revealing Jesus as the Christ and the leader the gentile world was yet to know and embrace.

The region of Tyre and Sidon of Phoenicia was tangent to Galilee some twenty miles northwest of Capernaum (Lane 1983:259). Mark gives explicit indications of geographical location to generate a Markan association of the two miracles worked by Jesus for Gentiles in Gentile land (Moloney 2012:144). The passage begins Jesus' long and circuitous walk through Tyre (7:24), Sidon (7:31), and the Decapolis (7:31).

The form of this passage has been described variously by interpreters as lacking in the key ingredients of the healing miracles. Thus, it is considered apophthegm or pronouncement story (Taylor 1966:347), teaching narrative (Gnilka 1978:291), miracle story (Nineham 1964:198) and an apophthegm miracle story (Koch 1975:85-86). Given the unique nature of this healing narrative, Lohmeyer (1967:145) posits that it is an apophthegm with the miracle features. The absence of the act of healing itself led to Pesch's (1976:385) conclusion that it is a distant healing, thereby positioning this narrative as a parallel to the healing of the Centurion's servant (Matt. 8:5-10, Luke 7:1-10, John 4:46-54) with both being conceived as distant healing narratives. Distant healing as has been identified in the gospels involves only gentiles and points to the assertion that the healing of the Syrophenician woman's daughter took place from a distance for purity considerations.

The source of narrative is traced to Mark's tradition with small redactional activities by the Evangelist. Scholars (Taylor 1966:349, Cranfield 1963:246) assign 7:24a, while other scholars (Pesch 1976:385) attribute 7:24-25a; and yet others (Burkill 1966:34; Kertelge 1970:151; Schweizer 1967:151; Gnilka 1978:290) to Mark's redaction. Many interpreters assign *πρῶτον* or the entire phrase of 7:27a to Mark's redaction as well. Mark 7:27a is attributed to Mark's redaction (Schweizer 1967:151; Kertelge 1970:153; Klauck 1978:273; Gnilka 1978:290). If sustained, both redactional elements colour how Mark utilized this traditional unit.

This narrative in Mark appropriately follows the narratives on defilement (7:1-13, 14-23), then, followed by two ministry journeys on gentile land. Specifically, Mark 7:24-30 begins Jesus' ministry trip with his disciples beyond the boundaries of the Jewish territory in what can be described as a circuitous route through Tyre (7:24), Sidon (7:31), and the region of the Decapolis (7:31).

Jesus now enters the gentile territory of Tyre north of Galilee and has contact with a gentile woman whose daughter has an unclean spirit. Jesus' behaviour was an obvious posterior of 7:1-23 where he sets aside the social boundaries of traditional Judaism based on ritual defilement (Kelber 1974:59). Recognisable is the consequences of this story for a community consisting at least in part of Gentiles (cf. "all the Jews", 7:3) while Jesus was engaged in mission to the Gentiles. The story's content speaks to Jesus' mission to both Jews and Gentiles (Geulich 1989:383). Obviously, the Evangelist, here, promotes the motif of ownership which, implies that the mission of Jesus belongs to the Gentiles as it does to the Jews.

The ἄρτον (bread) motif (Mark 2:26; 6:8, 37; 7:27; 8:4, 14, 16, 17; 14:1, 12, 20, 22) is pursued in this story of Mark's Gospel. The figurative use of "bread" (ἄρτον) in the Syrophenician woman's story is carefully placed in-between the two feedings (Mark 6:30-44; 8:4, 8), in which one took place on Jew territory (near Bethsaida, 6:30-44) and the other on Gentile soil (in the region of the Gerasenes, in the region around the Decapolis, 8:1-9). The idea of eating bread is not merely taking a bite but eating to satisfaction in 7:27a has parallels in the two feedings (6:42; 8:4, 8). The story begins the motive of gentiles' acceptance and belief in Jesus. The Syrophenician woman's expression of faith in 7:26 is echoed in the Roman Centurion's request of Jesus to heal the daughter (Matt. 8:5-13) and the great confession of the Centurion that Jesus is the Son of God in 15:39. The gentile factor in the Gospel of Mark expresses the universality of the gospel message to the world, in keeping with this assertion, Mark's Roman audience thus, understood their inclusion in the salvation of Christ as not accidental but part of God's providence.

#### 4.5.2 Social Interactional Observation and Analysis

Mark 7:24-30's narrative involving the Syrophenician woman is one of the few accounts in the Markan Gospel which is uniquely a gentile story. Like the others it brings the relationship between Jews, Gentiles and the Kingdom of God to the forefront of the Markan narrative (Iverson 2007:40). In verse 24, the idea of Jesus wanting to be alone or even hide from the public is familiar to the Gospel (1:35; 3:13; 4:10; 6:31-32). Similar to other instances Jesus uses a house for the purpose (1:29; 2:1; 3:20; 7:17) but characteristically Jesus was powerless to escape those in need (1:32-33, 36-37, 45; 2:2; 3:7-12, 20; 6:33-34; France 2002:297). France (2002:299) has rightly observed that it is impossible now to be sure on the basis of the printed text alone whether his words were designed to provoke such response in verse 28, or whether he genuinely did intend to refuse her request and was persuaded by her argument. "Much may have been conveyed by tone of voice and gesture".

Verse 7:24 derives its meaning from 1:28 where his fame spreads abroad and is authenticated by 3:7-8. Consequently, even in τὰ ὄρια Τύρου his fame sold him out. τὰ ὄρια Τύρου καὶ Σιδῶνος<sup>15</sup> (Region of Tyre and Sidon) the mention of Tyre along with Sidon is familiar in biblical corpus (Isa. 23:1-21; Jer. 47:4; Joel 3:4-8; Zech. 9:2). The area is a gentile territory. The visit to the Tyre region not necessarily the city of Tyre is significant for two reasons: First, it affirms the Markan Jesus' preference to remain out in the countryside (3:7). Second, Josephus', (Ap 1.70) description that the Tyrians were 'notoriously our bitterest enemies' (Geulich 1989:384; France 2002:297), means Jesus reached out to enemy territory not merely gentile communities.

Ἐκεῖθεν (from there) in reference to the house in 7:17 as also reflected in (6:1 [5:38-41]; 6:10-11; 9:30 [28-29]; 10:1 [9:33-50]) suggests Mark's redactional work (Geulich 1989:384).

---

<sup>15</sup> The addition of καὶ Σιδῶνος is not found in some Greek text like Novum Testamentum and The Greek New Testament but present in Westcott and Hort, Scriveneor's Textus Receptus 1894; Stephanus Textus Receptus and 1550

Regarding οὐδένα ἤθελεν γινῶναι (he was wishing no one to know it), interpreters argue that Jesus went into the region to seek privacy not to do missions (Williamson 1983:260). Thus consistent with the synoptic gospels' portrait of Jesus' mission as a mission to the Jews in particular not to the Gentiles and places him in the Galilean region. Geulich (1988:384) opines that the Syrophoenician woman's story, along with the centurion story, can rightly be considered exceptions rather than the rule of Jesus' ministry. καὶ εἰσελθὼν εἰς οἰκίαν (and he entered a house). House in the Gospel of Mark is a place of retreat and in-depth teaching for Jesus and his disciples (1:29; 2:1; 3:20; 7:17; 9:28). Williamson (1983:260) notes that the house is a place of faith, where persons who come seeking Jesus in a house were cast in the Gospel as having full faith in the Lord (2: 1-5; 3:20; 7:24-30). For καὶ οὐκ ἠδυνήθη λαθεῖν (and he was unable to be hidden) juxtapose with 1:28 and 3:8, this is so because his identity was known and any time he was found out it led to missions (1:44-45; 2:1-2; 3:20; 6:31). Perhaps, it can be argued that Jesus had a weakness of inability to avoid missions and ministry when people have come to his presence no matter the cost to him.

'He arose and went away to the region of Tyre and Sidon', this action of Jesus from the Social Interactions analysis is an interactional decision, in that the region becomes his interactional setting, and settings are mostly decided by the performer in this case, Jesus. Goffman's notion of setting (see Ch. 2.2.1.5) helps to elucidate Jesus' move to Tyre and Sidon. A setting tends to stay put, geographically speaking, until a performer has brought himself or herself to it. The choice of setting as noted earlier (Ch. 2.2.1.5) is determined by the kind of impression the performer wants to foster. When aligned with Josephus' (Ap 1.70) description of Tyre that the Tyrians were notoriously Israel's bitterest enemies, can lead to the conclusion that Jesus sought to create the impression of courage, adventure and a barrier breaker with his choice of Tyre and Sidon as his interactional setting.

In a Gentile territory, following immediately after 7:1-23, Jesus was fostering an impression of redefining and breaking the frontiers of traditional cleanliness. Though not explicitly stated, it can be argued rightly that his presence on a gentile territory was to tell all who will be in the social situation with him that his mission has no traditional barriers neither is it limited to Jews. Since the choice of a setting is a deliberate activity, Jesus obviously had interactional agenda going into the region of Tyre and Sidon.

Yet in this setting he ‘would not have any one know it’ (οὐδένα ἤθελεν γνῶναι), that is Jesus enters the community with a manner (see Ch. 2.2.2.1.5; manner is those stimuli which function at the time to indicate to us the interactional role the performer will expect to play in the on-coming interaction) which suggests he wanted to lie low, a humble disposition. By this manner, could it be that Jesus wanted to observe how the Tyrians would respond to him? It may be argued that this interactional manner Jesus adopted was to avoid attracting unwanted attention from supposed custodians of tradition on both sides – the Jewish and the Tyrian sides.

‘And he entered a house’, the choice of a house as a setting within the broader setting affirms this. However, the house has almost always turned out to be another busy missions interactional ground (1:45; 2:1; 3:20; 7:17; 9:28) hence defeating the manner he carried [himself] to the region of Tyre and Sidon. ‘Entering a house’ is an interactional gesture which creates an impression of ‘I am opened for friendship’, ‘I feel comfortable here’ and ‘this place is my home too’. ‘Yet he could not be hid’ (καὶ οὐκ ἠδυνήθη λαθεῖν), this is a familiar line in Mark’s narrative (1:45; 2:1; 3:20; 6:31). Interactionally, this creates the impression that Jesus is a welcoming person who will not drive away anyone who came to him. Similarly, it fosters a kind of impression that, the one (leader) who has something relevant to offer to others cannot hide, he or she would be sought after.

In verse 25, the Greek use of both the relative pronoun ‘whose’ (ἧς) and possessive pronoun ‘her’ (αὐτῆς) is for emphasis in pointing to the Syrophenician woman. Donahue and Harrington (2002:233) render ἧς εἶχεν τὸ θυγάτριον αὐτῆς as ‘whose daughter of her’ and conclude that it reflects Semitic grammar. ‘Unclean spirit’ (πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον), is used to describe the daughter of the woman, who herself is described according to where she hails from. As noted in ch. 3.3.1.4, the Syrophenician woman could be of high status but the purity rules of the ancient Mediterranean biblical world would deem her defiled (see 3.3.4.8). This is because her daughter was demon-possessed, and to them human beings possessed by evil spirits were in a devalued or defiled state (see 3.3.4.4). Even more challenging was when an otherwise pure person contacts or lives with what is deemed impure he or she becomes polluted (see 3.3.4.8). Thus, her contact with her daughter polluted her and put her on the margins. Jesus interacting with the Syrophenician woman, a person deemed shameful, thus, rendered him a fool (see 3.3.1.4) for he did not know how to maintain purity according to tradition.

Interpreters including Klauck (1978:273) and Geulich (1989:385) argue that πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον connects the unclean hand narrative in 7:1-23. Geulich believes that from the Jewish perspective ‘unclean spirit’ (πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον) asserts the ‘unclean’ vicinity for Jesus. It is difficult to subscribe to Geulich’s view given that ‘unclean spirit’ (πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον) is an expression Mark uses in different context (Mark 1:23, 26; 3:30; 5:2, 8; 7:25; 9:25a). ‘Unclean spirit’ also translates as ‘impure spirit’ or ‘evil spirit’ which contrasts God’s realm of purity and holiness thus making impure spirits oppose God and his purpose. ‘Fell at his feet’ (προσέπεσεν πρὸς τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ); this gesture is construed by interpreters as placing the woman at the mercy of Jesus. The use of two participles in succession ‘having heard’

(ἀκούσασα) and ‘having come’ (ἐλθοῦσα) underscores the eager faith, desperation and swift movement of the woman to Jesus (Donahue & Harrington 2002:233; France 2002:297).

Verse 25 through the lens of social interactional observation, ‘but immediately a woman, whose little daughter was possessed by an unclean spirit’ (ἥς εἶχεν τὸ θυγάτριον αὐτῆς πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον), this interactional phrase can be appreciated in the light of Goffman’s idea of personal front in dramaturgy (Ch. 2.2.2.5). One’s front on the social stage is those things that we most intimately identify with the performer himself or herself and that we naturally expect will follow the performer wherever he or she goes. Her personal front (manner) comes as a result of the characterisation of ‘a demon possessed girl’s mother’ consequently gives her a front of uncleanness, vulnerability and creates an impression of need. Consequently, she ‘came and fell down at his feet’ (ἐλθοῦσα προσέπεσεν πρὸς τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ). Falling at the feet of Jesus obviously is her interaction strategy emanating from macro social structure of the patron-client social system.

The idea of ritual-making as a tool within Goffman’s dramaturgy (Ch. 2.2.1.1) helps to understand the woman’s action. Ritual is understood as an action of a performer in a social encounter either face-to-face or mediated acted out in a kind of pattern, verbal or nonverbal, consciously or not by which he expresses his view of the situation and by it evaluates participants. The gesture of falling at Jesus’ feet is a ritual that reflected the macro patron-client system. By this, the woman fostered an impression of a client, respect, submission and dependence on Jesus Christ. She further created the impression that she acknowledges the Lord’s authority over and control of her. The gesture of the woman bowing to a male religious leader is also evident in the Akan traditional cultural system. In the Akan traditional situation it is more of humility and respect to the religious leader than being a client.

Verse 26, the ‘woman was a gentile, a Syrophenician’ (γυνὴ ἦν Ἑλληνίς, Συροφονίκισσα), this is a treble description of the one who prostrated (προσέπεσεν) before Jesus, ‘a woman, a gentile and a Syrophenician’. France (2002:297) argues that the treble designation is to make the point of unworthiness (uncleanliness) of the person engaging Jesus, someone a respectable Jewish religious leader should have nothing do with from a traditional Jewish point of view. Gentile and Syrophenician (Ἑλληνίς, Συροφονίκισσα), the literary arrangement also reflects Mark’s penchant to use double expressions where the following term specifies the preceding one (1:32; 35; 4:35; 14:12; 15:42; Donahue & Harrington 2002:233).

The use of Ἑλληνίς (female Greek) has been found not to be limited to racial origin but applies also to the one who has assimilated Greek language and culture. Thus, in this context the word carries the usual biblical understanding ‘Gentile’ as a contrast to Jewish (Donahue & Harrington 2002:233; France 2002:297; Geulich 1989:385). Geulich (1989:385) adds that the label ‘Gentile’ references the ‘gentile’ setting of the territory Jesus found himself. The next term is Συροφονίκισσα, which has a prefix ‘Συρο’ indicating Phoenicians (φονίκισσα) of Levant not the Lipophoenicians as used to describe Phoenicians from North Africa (Carthage) (Donahue & Harrington 2002:233; France 2002:297; Geulich 1989:385).

‘And she begged him’ (καὶ ἠρώτα αὐτὸν), some English translations including the Revised Standard Version render the ἠρώτα ‘begged’ but ἠρώτα being imperfect Indicative Active, looses the continuous aspect of her plea with such rendering; I suppose ‘kept beseeching’ will suffice. Mindful of the discussion on tradition and ritual cleanliness in 7:1-23, France (2002:297) is right in positing that Jesus entertaining the woman shows his lack of concern for conventions and traditions when they stood in the way of his mission. The phrase ‘cast the demon out’ (τὸ δαιμόνιον ἐκβάλη ἐκ); in the antecedent of this verse, that is, verse 25, Mark had described the spirit as unclean spirit but in this verse he returns to the use of his favourite

term ‘demon’. For Mark, demons must be cast out (ἐκβάλη) so he conjointly uses ‘demon’ with ‘cast out’ (1:34, 39; 3:15, 22: 6:13; 9:38). The tradition of the Church holds that the woman was Justa and the daughter was Bernice (Pseudo-Clementine Homilies 2:19; 3:73; Geulich 1989:385; Donahue & Harrington 2002:233).

Now the Social Interactional analysis of verse 26; ‘now the woman was a Greek, a Syrophoenician by birth’. This phrase describes the state of the woman coming in the social situation. Characterisation as a tool discussed (Ch. 2.2.1.3) in understanding social interaction is relevant here. The woman is placed under categoric characterisation (a Greek, a Syrophoenician by birth), which became her personal front while before the response presence of Jesus. Being characterised as a Greek and Syrophoenician woman allowed Jesus, an observer, glean clues from her conduct and appearance and also apply his previous experience with gentiles (Greeks) to her, more importantly, to apply his untested stereotypes to her. Such characterisation obviously led to the shared information between the woman and Jesus that the woman is an ‘outsider and unworthy’ of Jewish salvation agenda; and Jesus, a foreigner to the Tyre and Sidon community.

Characterisation according to where one hails from, is very much a part of the Akan social system. Unconsciously, such characterisation influences the interactional approach one will adopt in the Akan social context, for example, how a person is treated, liked or favoured by another in a social situation has everything to do with what the other person perceives to be his or her background. Jesus countenancing and sustaining interaction with an ‘outsider and unworthy’ person, reveals him as non-discriminatory on the bases of gender and race, and an impression of accepting all is created with this gesture of his.

‘And she begged him to cast the demon out of her daughter’ (καὶ ἠρώτα αὐτὸν ἵνα τὸ δαιμόνιον ἐκβάλη ἐκ τῆς θυγατρὸς αὐτῆς). In tandem with her personal front, the woman pleaded with

Jesus for help. The woman initiated the interaction. Employing the social interactional resource of ‘speech’ (Ch. 2.2.1.1; according to Goffman speech, plays a special role in interaction, allowing matters sited outside the social situation to be brought into the collaborative process, and allowing plans to be negotiated regarding matters to be dealt with beyond the current situation) to frame the interaction. In framing the interaction, she limits the interaction to deal with her need and by extension her daughter’s. As noted earlier ‘ἠρώτα’ (imperfect indicative active in grammatical function) suggests that she was repetitive in her plea, she kept beseeching Jesus; coupled with the gesture of bowing down she thereby created a total submissive impression and a desperation visual regard to Jesus.

It can be gleaned from her plea that she characterised Jesus as powerful, a healer and an exorcist and as such mightier than herself. And she plainly implied an acceptance and belief in Jesus’ ministry and mission. Hospitality and kindness as being an important part of Akan traditional leadership is reflected in Jesus’ interaction response to the woman. Countenancing a foreign woman is clear act of good leadership and good neighbourliness, as Akan leaders who do such things are highly commended. This leadership orientation is underpinned by the communal sense of living in the Akan communities.

Verse 27, ‘let the children be satisfied first’ (Ἄφες πρῶτον χορτασθῆναι τὰ τέκνα). Some scholars (Kertelge 1970:153; Schweitzer 1967:151; Gnllka 1978:290, 292; Klauck 1978:279) attribute the phrase to Markan redaction. Other scholars (Roloff 1970:160, Koch 1975:88) assign it to pre-Markan redactor.<sup>16</sup> The words ‘the children’ (τὰ τέκνα) is generally taken to echo the idea of the people of Israel as children of God (Deut. 32:20, 43; Psalm 82:6; Isa. 1:2; 17:9; 63:8; Hos. 11:1).

---

<sup>16</sup> Cited in Geulich (1989:385)

‘First’ (πρῶτον), this was thought of as a Markan addition to the original story, introduced by Mark or a later redactor under the influence of Pauline teaching in Romans 1:16 (Taylor 1966:350). However, Taylor (1966) from the position of internal consistency believes there is good reason to think that 27a is original. It is generally agreed that the ‘first’ here anticipates a second feeding that is the Jews first and the gentiles second. This view coincides with Pauline theology of the Gospel’s progression “to the Jews and also to the Greeks (Romans 1:16; 2:9; 1 Cor. 1:24). ‘First’, no doubt makes allusion to the first feeding miracle (6:30-44) which was for Jews and projects the second feeding miracle (8:1-11) which will be for the gentiles (Donahue & Harrington 2002:233). ‘First’ (πρῶτον), thus, suggests that the gentiles are at the end of the queue (France 2002:298) and leading to the suggestion that Israel’s claim to salvation is not exclusive (Geulich 1989:386).

‘Be satisfied’ (χορτασθῆναι) combined with ‘bread’ (ἄρτον) resulting in a pattern ‘bread-eat-be satisfied’. This pattern is seen in both of the feeding miracle (6:42; 8:2), thus, connecting this verse to both feeding narratives and explaining them as Jews first and Gentiles second (Taylor 1966:350; Donahue & Harrington 2002:233; Geulich 1989:386).

‘It is not right’ (οὐ γὰρ ἐστὶν καλόν), this phrase implies not ‘morally good, proper, worthy, honourable’ in terms of contributing to salvation (Donahue & Harrington 2002:234).

‘Take the children’s bread’ (λαβεῖν τὸν ἄρτον τῶν τέκνων), the expression also connects the two feeding narratives, and serves as a symbol in a broad context of acceptance and claim of God’s salvation benefit (Donahue & Harrington 2002:234).

‘And throw it to little dogs’ (καὶ τοῖς κυναρίοις βαλεῖν); the diminutive kynarion (little dog) used connotes house dogs, different from street scavenger dogs (Geulich 1989:386; Lohmeyer 1967:147; Lane 1974:262; Schweizer 1967:152). It is only in this narrative that the diminutive form of κύων is used in biblical literature (Donahue & Harrington 2002:234; France

2002:298). The household setting is to differentiate ‘children’ and ‘dogs’, where ‘children’ and ‘dogs’ are employed as metaphors referring to ‘Jews’ and ‘Gentiles’ respectively.

France (2002:298) disagrees with assigning significant meaning to the diminutive form of the Greek used in the narrative. Noting diminutives such as θυγάτριον (v. 25), δαιμόνιον (v. 25, 29, 30), κυνάριον (v. 27, 28), ψυχίον (v. 28) and παιδίον (v. 28, 30), he argues that their presence could indicate a style of storytelling during Mark’s period of writing. This means Jesus’ use of κυνάριον (little dog) makes no difference, and no sense should be made of it. To agree with France however is to discount the value of diminutives altogether, yet diminutives were introduced for a purpose, to make a point. For example, ‘little boy’ is not the same as ‘boy’. The qualitative adjective ‘little’ makes all the difference.

This response of Jesus is seen by interpreters as harsh and even insulting (Donahue & Harrington 2002:234; France 2002:298). From the Old Testament to call someone a dog is to insult (1 Samuel 17:43; Isa. 56:10-11). Jews traditionally viewed and even called Gentiles dogs due to their vices (Taylor 1966:350; France 2002:298), so France, (2002:298) describes Jesus’ utterance as shocking though it is to be expected from a Jew. Geulich (1989) however, disagrees with France. He perceives the distinction between ‘children’ and ‘dogs’ in terms of a “contrast in kind rather than degree”.

Given Jesus’ position and attitude towards Gentiles and the people at the margins of Society in general (Matt 8:28-34; Luke 17:12-19; John 4: 5-42), it may be difficult to sustain the thought that Jesus intended to abuse the woman, rather he employed the cultural categories to let her know how far away she stood in relation to what he was offering yet that was about to change. To Jews, dogs were unclean animals (1 Sam 24:14; 2Kings 8:13; Proverbs 26:11) and the Gospel of Matthew is emphatic ‘do not give dogs what is holy’ (Matt 7:6). In the Lukan narrative of the rich man and Lazarus, Luke uses dogs to demonstrate how deplorable the state

of Lazarus was. Lazarus salivated for the crumbs from the rich man's table meant for dogs and as if to punish him for his competing desire, the dogs licked his sores; the effect is that Lazarus was despicable (Luke 16:19-22). Again, in Pauline thought opponents are called dogs (Phil. 3:2) and to Revelation, dogs cannot inherit the kingdom of God (Rev. 22:15).

Focusing on social interactional observation of verse 27, "and he said to her, 'let the children first be fed', for it is not right to take the children's bread and throw it to the dogs." Jesus' response brings a couple of social interactional issues to the fore involving what Goffman calls people processing encounter (Ch. 2.2.1.2).

This is an encounter in which the impression subjects make during the interaction affects their life chances. Processing encounter is ubiquitous in that they happen everywhere between any two or more individuals; in this sense, everyone is a gatekeeper regarding something and everyone is subject regarding something. First, Jesus affirms the Syrophenician woman's categoric characterisation which leads to the conclusion that she is an outsider by his metaphorical response. Jesus shows knowledge of existing stereotypes of the Jewish people against Gentiles. His response to her uses two characterisations: those who are deserving of what the woman was requesting he characterised as 'children' and outsiders he characterised as 'dogs'.

Jesus could be testing the Jewish stereotype which described Gentiles as dogs on her. This characterisation creates the impression to the Syrophenician woman that according to tradition she did not have the right to make such a request of him. Second, Jesus by his response modifies the interactional frame into a processing encounter, where the woman's subsequent responses or impression created will determine whether her request will be granted or not.

Using processing encounter, Jesus intended the woman to merit her request, or at least transcend beyond those traditional stereotypes. Here, Jesus as a gatekeeper (decider), his most

important indicator will be the woman's faith in him, a Jewish religious leader. He further with his response, fosters the impression that he is the sole decider as to whether her request will be granted or not, he is the one to take the 'children's' bread and throw it to the 'dogs'. As it were, Jesus was fully aware of his right and his responsibility. A traditional leadership orientation celebrates cultural values and traditions as Jesus demonstrated in his response to the woman but the leaders expected to transcend the negative stereotypes and prejudices which arise out of ethnocentricity.

Verse 28, 'but the woman answered and saying to him' (ἡ δὲ ἀπεκρίθη καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ): This expression is high in rhetoric with a parallel in Ch. 15:9 expressed by Pontius Pilate (Donahue & Harrington 2002:234). 'Lord' (Κύριε), the word also means 'Sir' or 'Master' so it can be a reverential address or an allusion to a divine figure (Donahue & Harrington 2002:234).

The vocative 'Κύριε' used by the woman means she acknowledged Jesus' authority and her dependence on him for help (France 2002:299). 'Even the dogs' (καὶ τὰ κυνάρια), this phrase suggests an acceptance of what Jesus said by the Syrophenician woman; 'bread' is for children not necessarily dogs. However, 'even the dogs' (καὶ τὰ κυνάρια) under the table lay claim to crumbs thus have their own share of the bread. Geulich (1989) opines that the 'even the dogs' (καὶ τὰ κυνάρια) did not exploit the opportunity Jesus' use of 'first' in verse 27 offered. As a typical client, she advanced her argument to her patron (Jesus) in humility. 'Even the dogs' (καὶ τὰ κυνάρια), the woman echoes Jesus' metaphor in her response and uses a counter-metaphor. She equates herself (gentiles in general) to the house dogs which in Greek culture were present at table during meals (Donahue & Harrington 2002:234). Donahue and Harrington (2002) posit that the "dog talk in this narrative is symbolic of a deeper cultural gap between Jews and Greeks"

‘Even the dogs under the table eat the children’s crumbs’ (καὶ τὰ κυνάρια ὑποκάτω τῆς τραπέζης ἐσθίουσιν ἀπὸ τῶν ψιγίων τῶν παιδίων). In this clause, the woman employs the custom of children feeding dogs which negates perhaps Jesus’ graded right to the bread. Jesus’ supposed harsh response is turned around by the woman’s witty response regarding the simultaneous place of the dogs with the children at table. Donahue and Harrington (2002) wildly suggest that Jesus was ‘overcome in this verbal repartee’ by the woman. Well, no verbal contest is actually seen in this narrative, Hooker (1991:185) argues that in the context of the discussion, the use of dogs is a “challenge to the woman to justify her request” rather than a demeaning statement. Camery-Hoggatt (1992:150-151) shares a similar view and calls Jesus’ response peirastic irony.<sup>17</sup> It has been quizzed, was not the entire clause of verse 27 or just the key term ‘first’ added to echo the early Christian mission’s struggles with the prerogatives of the Jews and the mission to the Gentiles? (Geulich 1989:387).

Turning now to social interactional analysis, “but she answered him, “Yes, Lord; yet even the dogs under the table eat the children's crumbs.” ‘Yes, Lord’, here, the woman explicitly characterises Jesus as ‘Lord’, which is an individual characterisation perhaps based on what she had heard from others about him (7:24). In terms of her interactional approach in this response, she puts up a meek manner. From social interactional perspective, manner refers to those stimuli which function at the time to indicate the interaction role the performer will expect to play in the social situation (Ch. 2.2.1.5). Employing a meek, apologetic manner the Syrophenician woman gives the impression that she wants to follow the lead of Jesus. It must be said that macro sociocultural arrangement of patron-client relationship of their time most likely influenced her manner. The woman, continued with Jesus’ modified frame of processing

---

<sup>17</sup>Peirastic irony is a form of verbal challenge intended to test the other’s response. It may in fact declare the opposite of the speaker’s actual intention.

encounter by employing his ‘dog’ stereotype in giving a clever response ‘even the dogs under the table eat the children's crumbs’.

An impression fostered with this response to Jesus, is a woman who is not backing off, though might not be a ‘child’ by tradition the ‘dogs’ within the same tradition are permitted to be under the table when meals are served. ‘The crumbs’ falling from the table are the ‘dogs’ portion of the same meal, the woman asserted. Let us now observe, the decider (Jesus) whether the woman’s manner combined with speech has created the impression which meets Jesus’ indicator.

Verse 29, ‘and he said to her, "For this saying you may go your way (καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῇ, Διὰ τοῦτον τὸν λόγον ὕπαγε). This response of Jesus leads to the suggestion that he interpreted what the woman said to be her faith confession hence his response to her like he usually does to those who express faith in him (2:5; 5:34; 10:52; 9:22). ‘The demon has left your daughter’ (ἐξελήλυθεν ἐκ τῆς θυγατρὸς σου τὸ δαιμόνιον). The use of the perfect tense ἐξελήλυθεν (has gone already) makes it a unique exorcism, there is no command, no confrontation between Jesus and the demon. It is described as distance healing (Donahue & Harrington 2002:235); one which the Markan community may read as a hope for the power of the Gospel in the Gentile land.

Continuing with the Social Interactional observation, “and he said to her, "For this saying you may go your way; the demon has left your daughter.” Jesus also stays with the people processing encounter approach in this response. It can be garnered from Jesus here that the woman’s impression had met his indicator – faith in himself. After processing the woman’s response in the light of his indicator, he found the woman a believer in his ministry and mission and as such worthy of help.

Though Jesus begun processing the woman's performance in the interaction from a Jewish position, one may call it a position of bias, he will not allow that to influence his decision. It was not about where the woman was coming from, it is about what the woman believed, that is the very essence of Jesus ministry - belief in God and submission to him. His interactional processing of the woman creates the impression of impartiality, fairness and equity to all. Consequently, he affirms and commends her, 'for this saying'. He goes on to assure her 'you may go your way'. He concludes with an audacious declaration of hope, 'the demon has left your daughter'. By these words, Jesus creates the impression 'I care'. Though tradition put you at the margins or under the table, I bring you to sit at table like the children and share in the meal with them. The emphatic statement, 'the demon has left your daughter' creates an impression which affirms the woman's earlier characterisation of Jesus as powerful, a healer, an exorcist and a mightier one. Jesus, like a good traditional Akan leader, though the Jewish cultural and traditional stereotypes and prejudices set against gentiles were fresh on his mind, he transcended beyond them and then helped the gentile woman.

Verse 30, 'and found the child lying in bed' (εὗρεν τὸ παιδίον βεβλημένον ἐπὶ τὴν κλίνην), the use of 'bed' (κλίνην), suggests the higher social status of the woman. 'And the demon gone' (καὶ τὸ δαιμόνιον ἐξεληλυθός), the phrase used here is an affirmation of Jesus' word and the confirmation of the miracle. As such the perfect participle active (ἐξεληλυθός) is used in the light of the perfect indicative (ἐξελήλυθεν) in the previous verse, these give the effect of amplified power of the word of Jesus (Donahue & Harrington 2002:235; France 2002:299).

Considering verse 30 from Social Interactional observation, "and she went home, and found the child lying in bed, and the demon gone". Upon realising this, her confidence and faith in the Lord grew stronger and the credibility and the fame of the Lord obviously increased on the Gentile land. This creates the impression that Jesus indeed is powerful and caring.

## 4.6 Social Interactional Analysis of Mark 10:35-45

### The Narrative

<sup>35</sup>And James and John, the sons of Zeb'edee, came forward to him, and said to him, "Teacher, we want you to do for us whatever we ask of you."

<sup>36</sup>And he said to them, "What do you want me to do for you?"

<sup>37</sup>And they said to him, "Grant us to sit, one at your right hand and one at your left, in your glory."

<sup>38</sup>But Jesus said to them, "You do not know what you are asking. Are you able to drink the cup that I drink, or to be baptized with the baptism with which I am baptized?"

<sup>39</sup>And they said to him, "We are able." And Jesus said to them, "The cup that I drink you will drink; and with the baptism with which I am baptized, you will be baptized;

<sup>40</sup>but to sit at my right hand or at my left is not mine to grant, but it is for those for whom it has been prepared."

<sup>41</sup>And when the ten heard it, they began to be indignant at James and John.

<sup>42</sup>And Jesus called them to him and said to them, "You know that those who are supposed to rule over the Gentiles lord it over them, and their great men exercise authority over them.

<sup>43</sup>But it shall not be so among you; but whoever would be great among you must be your servant,

<sup>44</sup>and whoever would be first among you must be slave of all.

<sup>45</sup>For the Son of man also came not to be served but to serve, and to give his life as a ransom for many."

### 4.6.1 The Literary Context -

The narrative Mark 10:35-45 directly follows after Jesus' third and final passion prediction (10:32-34) making it assume a structure parallel with the second passion prediction (9:31-37). Both the second (9:30-32) and third (10:32-34) passion predictions followed by an instruction on how to straighten up the disciples' presuppositions on greatness. Lane (1974:378) notes that the two occurrences portray that the disciples were yet to fully assimilate the spirit of self-renunciation required by the cross and the sons of Zebedee might have understood the Lord's teaching very superficially (Lane 1974:378).

In their bid to reconstruct Mark 10:35-45 to identify a basic unit and ensure conformity in 10:35-45 through the work of both Source and Form Criticism (Taylor 1966:439), the narrative has been assigned different components. Taylor (1966:443) thinks that the sayings on rank and precedence (42b-4) have a parallel in 9:35, but the more important parallel is Lk. xxii. 24-7 in the Lukan Passion Narrative. He further argues that the teaching on true greatness which was given on more occasions than one, but (Mk. 10 41-4 and Lk. 22: 24-7) appear to be a doublet.

Taylor (1966:438-439) profiling the works of other scholars, said Dibelius (1919:43, 60), put 10:35-45 in Paradigms of 'a less pure type', and considers 38-40 as a prophecy after the event, and wondered if originally 41 or 42ff. followed 37. Wendling (1905) finds the primitive unit in 35-37 and 41-44, with 45 loosely attached. Bultmann (1947:23, 72, 370) classifies the narrative as an Apothegm. He regards 38ff. as secondary. In his view 35-37 and 40 is a 'community-formation' inferring belief in Jesus as the Messiah, and 41-45 as a supplement parallel to Lk. xxii. 24-7 (True Greatness). Evans (2001) also outlining the works of other scholars argues that Dibelius (1919:51), and Gnllka (1979:99) consider 10:35-38 as original and 10:39-40 are a latter expansion. Bultmann (1947:24, 69) classifies 10:38-39 as independent and Lohmeyer (1967:222-23) maintains that 10:38-40 echoes later leadership controversies in the early church.

However, Gundry (581-82) has debated for the unity of the passage. Taylor (1935:66) opines that 10:44-45 is the Evangelist's addition to the story of the request of the sons of Zebedee. Taylor (1935: states that 10:41-45, "may have been the immediate sequel." Davis and Allison (Matthew 3:85) argue that vv. 41-44 are pre-Markan material "of uncertain origin," to which the Evangelist or his tradition added 10:45.

Mark 10:45 in particular has been under the spotlight of many scholars. Lindars (Son of man, 80), argues that 'as a ransom' was later added to original "A man may risk his life for the sake of the many," meanwhile, it is believed the Evangelist joined the two parts of the saying. Crosan (1983:291) claims the Evangelist made two additions; first "the son of man" to verse 45a and then verse 45b. On their part Wilcox ("On the Ransom Saying") and Pesch (1977:262-67) maintain that the saying in verse 45 is unified and should be taken as historical.

Relating to source, it is considered the most disputed saying in Mark and is mostly regarded as an independent saying originally (Evans 2001:119). Some interpreters have regarded it as later

Christian formulation in the light of its parallel in Luke 22:24-27 (Klostermann, 1950:108-109). Some other commentators view it as Pauline theology which is added (Nineham 1964:280-282). Still others believe the saying is an independent logion emanating from 'Hellenistic-Jewish Christianity' (Strecker Int.22 [1968] 432 n. 30). More so, others like Bultmann argue that the saying is originating from the redemption theories of the Hellenistic Christianity and as such a secondary formulation of later stage (1963:144, 155).

In terms of authenticity, interpreters like Lohse (1953:117-122) think that the saying is inauthentic and is sourced from the early Jewish community. Lohse is in the company of Pesch (1977:162-64); Williams (1975:211-212) along with Roloff (1970:38-64). Interpreters who argue that the saying is authentic include Stuhlmacher (1986:16-29), 231-77), Rawlinson (1949:146-48), Barrett (1961), Cranfield (1963:343-44) and Evans (2001:120).

Evans (2001:1200) surmises that the disputations around verse 45 are three in number. One, the unity of the saying and its relationship to verse 35-44. Two, the relationship of the saying to Second Isaiah, especially the suffering Servant song of Isaiah 52:13-53:12. Three, the authenticity of the saying. He takes the position that the saying was originally a unit that it was part of the whole narrative that makes up verses 35-45, and that themes from Second Isaiah do actually lie behind it, and most importantly the saying originates from Jesus.

Evans (2001:114) surmises the argument that in the midst of all the objections by various scholars Gundry's arguments for the original unity of verses 35-45 are to be chosen. His argument is that the entire passage, plus verse 45 make good sense as a fragment of embarrassment but an authentic tradition of which the disciples of Jesus are concerned with positions of the greatest in the kingdom to come (Evans 2001:114). To him verses 35-40 form the natural prelude to what happens and what is said in verse 41-45. The entire passage hangs together as the genuineness of the disciples' request for the seats of highest honour "is in every

way credible” (Taylor, 1966:439). The Evangelist made use of the tradition of the disciples’ request to allow Jesus the opportunity to teach the true value of the kingdom which demand willingness to suffer and to serve. As a teaching dovetailed into Jesus’ own death on the cross (Evans 2001:114).

#### **4.6.2 Social Interactional Observational Analysis**

Interpreters have been quick to identify that the three passion predictions of Jesus was each followed by an instruction on self-denial, service and even martyrdom (8:31, 34-9:1; 9:31-32, 33-37; 10:32-34, 38-39, 41-45). This probably may imply that the disciples had failed to fully comprehend the essence of Jesus' teaching that he would be treated with contempt and be put to death (Lane 1978:378) or it may be for mere emphasis given the importance of such new kingdom ethics. Such repetition by Jesus echoes his words in 4:13 and 7:18 and touches on the disciples grasping what he has been teaching and modelling to them. Turning to the issues in the individual verses:

Verse 35, James and John, sons of Zebedee (Ἰάκωβος καὶ Ἰωάννης οἱ υἱοὶ Ζεβεδαίου); James and John who together with Peter constituted the inner circle of Jesus out of the twelve disciples (5:37; 9:2; 14:33), were also called together to become disciples of Christ (1:19-20). Donahue and Harrington (2002) argue like France (2002:415) that this is the only incident in which they were on their own. Jesus named them Boanerges (3:17) meaning ‘sons of thunder’, which name has become an epithet which is problematic for interpreters to crack (Evans 2001:115). ‘Came forward’ (προσπορεύονται), France (2002:415) construes the word to imply an attempt on the part of James and John to corner Jesus. ‘And said to him, Teacher’ (λέγοντες αὐτῷ, Διδάσκαλε), addressing Jesus reflects 4:38; 9:38; 5:35; 9:17; 10:17, 20. ‘We wish that you do for us whatever we ask you’ (θέλομεν ἵνα ὃ ἐὰν αἰτήσωμέν σε ποιήσης ἡμῖν). Their request for

this open ended favour echoes the disciples lack of full appreciation of what Jesus taught and meant by the passion (8:32-33; 9:33-34; Donahue & Harrington 2002:311)

Turning to Social Interactional Analysis of verse 35, James and John, sons of Zebedee, came forward to him (Καὶ προσπορεύονται αὐτῷ, Ἰάκωβος καὶ Ἰωάννης οἱ υἱοὶ Ζεβεδαίου), and initiated the interaction with Jesus. They come to Jesus with a front of a team, which means they have been to the back region (see Ch 2.2.1.5) and rehearsed (planned) the single impression they were going to foster on Jesus. Goffman reveals that the way we commonly divide social settings into front region where performance is given and back region where impression is fostered as evidence of the staged character of everyday social life. Perhaps the desire of being a team stems from their calling into discipleship; Jesus called them together (1:19-20) and also the fact that they are siblings. Καὶ προσπορεύονται αὐτῷ (and they came up to him), this social interactionally, implies a motif and intention, meaning the interaction with Jesus was planned not a coincidence to achieve something.

‘And said to him, Teacher’ (λέγοντες αὐτῷ, Διδάσκαλε), James and John use categorical characterisation of honour for Jesus, he was addressed as Teacher. This characterisation speaks (see Ch 2.2.1.3) of their manner, which is one of submission and willingness to follow Jesus’ leading as a teacher. Their characterisation may be argued, from the interactional point of view, that it was likely to get Jesus to listen to them and oblige them regarding what they were about to present.

‘We wish that you do for us whatever we ask you’ (θέλομεν ἵνα ὃ ἐὰν αἰτήσωμέν σε ποιήσης ἡμῖν). James and John coming from the background of patron – client system where favouritism was the main quality of such relationships may be pardoned to make such a request without recourse to the other disciples (see 3.3.3.2). Here James and John in their interactional approach are using speech to reframe the interaction with Jesus which is contrary to what their

manner would have suggested to Jesus. Now they want Jesus to follow their lead in the interaction and simply comply with what they say. France (2002:415) could be right when he said, “perhaps the brothers attempted to ‘corner Jesus’. Again, this request presumes Jesus’ capacity to do everything they asked him, an expression of confidence in Jesus’ ability is created here. However, it also creates an impression of attempted abuse of Jesus’ acts of kindness and mercy, because they had never seen him turn people away with their request hence their opened-ended request. From the Akan traditional leadership perspective, the action of James and John is a regular occurrence when people exploit their relationship with the leader to take advantage of the system. Sadly in the Akan traditional leadership context these persons, more often than not, succeed in their ambitions.

Verse 36 "What do you want me to do for you?" (Τί θέλετέ με ποιήσω ὑμῶν). Interpreters consider the syntax of this question as compressed. Confusion exists in MSS regarding a construction with the subjunctive ποιήσω or with the infinitive ποιήσαι (see France 2002:415). The expression is likely to be a conflation of two constructions Τί θέλ με ποιήσαι and Τί θέλ ποιήσω (Taylor 1966:440; France 2002:414). Based on the confusion some interpreters have seen Jesus’ response as a polite question and others see it as a statement. Given what we know, that Jesus did not grant their request (10:40), it is reasonable to take it as a question (Donahue & Harrington 2002:311). Jesus makes no hasty promise (Evans 2001:116), he inquired for clarity of intent.

Turning to Social Interactional Analysis of verse 36, "What do you want me to do for you?" (Τί θέλετέ με ποιήσω ὑμῶν), staying within their frame Jesus, employs speech as an interactional tool to ply the actual intent for their request which he has not gleaned from them yet. Τί θέλετέ με ποιήσω ὑμῶν - the question meant that Jesus was not in any hurry to make a promise or commitment. By this, he fosters an impression to James and John as one who cannot be taken

for granted despite his kindness. It portrays him as one who will not commit to anything without first clarifying. And by extension, one who will not dismiss you without first understanding your point of view or your need.

Verse 37, ‘grant us’ (δός ἡμῖν), this request is negated in verse 40 (is not mine to give, οὐκ ἔστιν ἐμὸν δοῦναι), suggesting that the assumption of James and John that Jesus has places of honour thereby inspiring this request is not correct (France 2002:415; Lane 1971:379). ‘We might sit’ (καθίσωμεν), the use of sitting rather than reclining at someone’s right or left denotes royal throne with its paces of honour (France 2002:415). For Donahue and Harrington (2002:311), James and John were invoking the messianic banquet (Luke 14:15-24; Matt 22:1-10) or the heavenly throne room (Rev. 4-5).

‘One at your right hand and one at your left’ (εἷς σου ἐκ δεξιῶν καὶ εἷς ἐξ ἀριστερῶν). Mark uses the two Greek words for ‘left’ (ἀριστερῶν in verse 37 and ἐδωνύμων in verse 40). Generally, the position of honour is the seat on the right (10:40, 12:36, 14:62, 15:27, 16:5, 19; I Kings 2:19; Ps. 110:1; I Esdras 4:29; Ecc1us.12:12; Josephus, Antiquities VI. xi. 9), and next to it the seat on the left (Taylor 1966:440; Lane 1971:379), which incidentally was the lucky side among the pagan Greeks. Their request bordered on the top positions in the new kingdom that they anticipate will be established soon (Evans 2002:116). Lane (1978) finds the expressions of James and John in 35 excitement terms, which inadvertently anchor their petition in verse 37. Within the setting of the journey to Jerusalem amidst their show of lack of understanding earlier, the brothers who regard Jesus as the eschatological Lord presumably anticipated the restoration of Jerusalem to the glory of the fallen throne of David (378).

‘In your glory’ (ἐν τῇ δόξῃ σου), the use of ‘glory’ (δόξα) echoes 8:38; Dan 7:14 where the Son shares the glory of the Father and carries an underlining assumption that Jesus is King

(France 2002:415). Interpreters (Wellhausen 1909:84, Taylor 1966:440) take the 'glory' (δόξα) to imply the Parousia but Evans (2001:116) is sceptical about it. Evans (2001), rather argues that James and John were alluding to 9:1 (And he said to them, "Truly, I say to you, there are some standing here who will not taste death before they see that the kingdom of God has come with power), and as such were referring to an event in the life of Jesus (*Sitz im Leben Jesu*) whereby will be Israel restored upon his visit to Jerusalem. His position is rooted in the view that the request of James and John is not a post- Easter event which, reference to the glory of Jesus connects to the Parousia.

Beyond Mark, in the Gospel tradition (See Q)<sup>18</sup>, Jesus makes a significant declaration about an imminent rule of the twelve disciples in his kingdom, 'and I assign to you, as my Father assigned to me, a kingdom, that you may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom, and sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel (Luke 22:29-30, see Matt 29:28). Matthew specifically talks about twelve thrones. If this promise existed in the oral tradition of the Q and the Q predates Mark as has been argued by some scholars then, it could be that James and John were alluding to this promise. Evans (2001) argues that Jesus himself talks about the kingdom with Daniel in mind, the Son of Man in Daniel 7:13-14, will take over the thrones in Daniel 7:9 (see Psalm 122:3-5), the twelve disciples will govern the twelve tribes and Jesus himself will partake in the throne of his father (Psalm 110:1). With these in mind, could some legitimacy be given to the request of James and John?

Turning to Social Interactional Analysis of verse 37, 'grant us' (δός ἡμῖν), James and John continue to use the frame of interaction along their self-interest. Which is most likely informed

---

<sup>18</sup> Q is the acronym for "Quelle," a German word for source. It is a source in the Gospel tradition which, many scholars are convinced that it ever circulated in early Christian communities, though no real copy has ever been found. Q, thus existed as a hypothesis until a chance discovery in Egypt in 1945 ignited interest in the possible existence of Q.

by their closeness to Jesus, being a part of the inner circle and emboldened by Jesus' words that the disciples will judge the twelve tribes of Israel. Per their interactional persuasive appeal, they seek to foster an impression which will elicit a response from Jesus involving using his discretion to favour them.

‘One at your right hand and one at your left’ (εἷς σου ἐκ δεξιῶν καὶ εἷς ἐξ ἀριστερῶν). By this request they are stage-making (see Ch 2.2.1.5), by which they present a character (see Ch. 2.2.1.5) of prominence who must occupy the most revered position in the new kingdom. They wanted the most significant thrones (Taylor 1966:440). Lane (1974:378) rightly noted that the question of rank, involved an inflated understanding of their own position. Yet by the content of their request, an impression beyond their mere ambition is created, they are better qualified and know exactly the thrones which they are worthy of. For them, they are the characters who are fit to occupy those two seats beside Jesus. Again, their interactional approach also creates an impression of team players. They want to serve on the leadership team of Jesus in the kingdom. So for them it is not about thrones, it is about the thrones next to Jesus. The Akan traditional leader is also inundated with such tempting request from very close associates, perhaps on a daily basis.

Verse 38, some interpreters view this verse and what follows as a *vaticinium ex eventu*<sup>19</sup> (Wellhausen 1909:84, Klostermann 1950:12; Bultmann 1963:23, Dibelius 1919:60, Branscomb 1937:189) but Taylor (1966:441) rejects such view on the basis that it easily accepts the Papias tradition regarding the death of James and John and barely interprets the saying as a prophecy of martyrdom (see Schmid, 199, Schweitzer, 218, Anderson, 255, Books,

---

<sup>19</sup> The term applied to a passage in the prophets or the gospels which has the form of a prediction but is in fact written in the knowledge of the event having occurred (see Browning, W.R.F., 2009, *A Dictionary of the Bible*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edn., Oxford University Press, Oxford)

168-69; Hooker, 247; Casey, Aramaic Source, 206). Jesus' expectation that James and John will drink the cup of suffering, even martyrdom is original (Evans 2001:117).

"You do not know what you are asking' (Ὁὐκ οἶδατε τί αἰτεῖσθε), here Jesus states their lack of full appreciation of the cost of sharing in his messianic suffering hence the reward of messianic glory. 'Are you able to drink the cup that I drink...?' (δύνασθε πιεῖν τὸ ποτήριον ὃ ἐγὼ πίνω), the symbolism of the cup is used at the last supper (14:23-24) and in Gethsemane (14:36). Evans (2001:117) says the actual idiom 'cup of death' is Targumic and is the closest parallel to the words of Jesus (see *Tf. Neof. Gen 40:23; Tf. Neof Deut. 32:1; Mart. Ascen. Isa. 5:13*).

The cup (τὸ ποτήριον) is significant for Jesus as a path to honour and glory. It is τὸ ποτήριον (the cup), which is the fate which awaits himself. Anyone who wants to share the glory must first share the experience of drinking the cup. The cup is a symbol of destined suffering for Jesus. Its use here projects 14:36 (France 2002:416). Lane (1974) argues differently; the sufferings and death which await Jesus, expressed by the two images of the cup and baptism, belong to the unique messianic mission of the Son of Man; thus verse 38 expresses an impossibility, and not the requisite condition for association with Jesus' glory (379). The cup is what Jesus himself is drinking, special attention may be paid to ὃ ἐγὼ πίνω (which I drink). The use of the present is instructive, suggesting a practice already begun (Taylor 1966:441, Plummer 247). Elsewhere the cup has been identified to be a symbol of blessings (Psalm 16:5; 23:5; 116:13). It also symbolises judgement (Psalm 75:8; Jer. 25:15-29; 46:12; Ezekiel 23:31-34; Hab. 2:16, cf. Rev 14:10; 16:19) relating to punishment (Isa. 51:17-23, Lam. 4:21) in the Old Testament. Jesus drinks the cup which legitimately the wicked should drink (France 2002:416). The cup, James and John were quizzed about is not mediated but destined suffering (France 2002:416).

‘To be baptized with the baptism with which I am baptized’ (ἢ τὸ βάπτισμα ὃ ἐγὼ βαπτίζομαι βαπτισθῆναι), as parallel in Luke 12:50 ‘I have a baptism to be baptized with’ (βάπτισμα δὲ ἔχω βαπτισθῆναι). Like the cup metaphor, baptism (βάπτισμα) here implies the suffering that Christ was to experience. The symbol of baptism articulates the same idea as the cup (Taylor 1966:441). Commentators opine that baptism here could echo John’s baptism (Mark 1:4-9), but the use of this metaphor for suffering or death has no antecedent in Scripture except in secular Greek culture – like overwhelmed with debt, drowned in misery (see Bauer, Arndt, Gringrich & Danker 1979:132, 3.C).

However, based on Pauline theology the Church later developed baptism into Christ as a symbol of death occasioning a new life (Romans 6:2-11) (France 2002:416). On this, Paul's statement in Rom. 6:3 may be a development and an application of the saying of Mark 10:38 (Taylor 1966:441). It is worth noting that the use of the symbolism of water for the notion of calamity is common in the Old Testament (Psalm 42:7, Psalm 69:2, 15, Isa. 43:2). In all these, sacraments of Baptism and the Eucharist may have been in the mind of Mark as well (Bacon, BGS, 148; Rawlinson, 145; Lohmeyer, 223) but Taylor (1966:441) disputes and rather argues that “it is more justly interpreted as an original and creative utterance”.

Turning to Social Interactional Analysis, in verse 38 Jesus, using speech as a tool stated, "you do not know what you are asking' (Οὐκ οἴδατε τί αἰτεῖσθε), while this statement interactionally sought to challenge James and John to rethink their request, in other words, the impression they had fostered on Jesus, it creates the impression of Jesus as one who knows and on top of issues being raised by the two brothers, at the same time it points to the ignorance of their performance as a team (see Ch. 2.2.1.5) of James and John. Jesus at this point employs the interactional device of control and direction (see Ch. 2.2.1.5), with this device Goffman (1959) posits “If an individual is to direct others, he will often find it useful to keep strategic secrets from them”.

Jesus changes the frame of the interaction leaving James and John to wonder, ‘what is it we do not know? Jesus uses the control and direction device to bring the two disciples along to discover what they should have known before their ambitious request.

‘Are you able to drink the cup that I drink...?’ (δύνασθε πιεῖν τὸ ποτήριον ὃ ἐγὼ πίνω). Here Jesus continues the interaction in his new frame, challenging the two brothers first, to discover the cup he Jesus drinks and second, to assess themselves whether they are able to drink of it. The cup as noted in the earlier discussion is the destined suffering that Jesus had to suffer for humanity’s salvation. The Cup metaphor points to Jesus’ appeal to the generalised other (see Ch. 2.2.2) in his interaction approach. Generalised other has been explained to comprise of the organized attitudes of the whole community. Mead explains that the matured-self arises when a Generalised Other is assimilated so that the community exercises control over the conduct of its individuals (Wallace & Wolf 2005:209). Drawing from their Old Testament background per earlier discussion James and John had internalised the cup image as representing blessing, judgment and suffering hence they could discover what Jesus meant. By this, Jesus fosters an impression which suggests seating on thrones does not come easy, it costs, and it exacts sacrifice and suffering first. Meaning, to ascend you must have paid the price of descent first.

‘To be baptized with the baptism with which I am baptized’ (ἢ τὸ βάπτισμα ὃ ἐγὼ βαπτίζομαι βαπτισθῆναι). While the cup metaphor communicates what goes into a person indicating how internal the suffering is – lonely pain, emotional torturing, mental torture, and self-denial. By the baptism metaphor, interactionally, Jesus is using this symbol to graphically revealing to them the overwhelming nature of the suffering to be experienced first. James and John being Jews know from their generalised other that baptism is about immersion, an impression thus is created that the price to pay can be submerging.

Verse 39, ‘We are able’, (δυνάμεθα), this phrase portray James and John that though they lack understanding, their loyalty, courage (France 2002:417) and their commitment to suffering as followers remain unshaken. Perhaps their answer reflected 8:34-38 and anticipated James martyrdom in Acts 12:2 and John’s imprisonment at Patmos. Conversely, Donahue and Harrington (2002:311) see ‘we are able’ as a confident but foolish response on the part of James and John who rather displayed cowardice when it came to the crux of the fulfilment of the passion prediction in 14:50. It may be argued they had still not apprised themselves with the depth of the cup and the volume of water for the baptism.

‘The cup that I drink you will drink and with the baptism with which I am baptized, you will be baptized’ (Τὸ ποτήριον ὃ ἐγὼ πίνω πίεσθε καὶ τὸ βάπτισμα ὃ ἐγὼ βαπτίζομαι βαπτισθήσεσθε). This is an acknowledgement of the answer from James and John yet subsequent remarks suggest that the ‘cup’ and ‘baptism’ are not conditions for the position of honour after all. Interpreters maintain that Jesus’ pronouncement in verse 39 does not suggest that automatically James and John will suffer martyrdom. In essence it affirms that they will suffer on the account of Jesus, however precluding martyrdom (Donahue & Harrington 2002:312).

Turning to Social Interactional Analysis verse 39 ‘we are able’ (δυνάμεθα). Proceeding along the new frame Jesus puts up, they give a response to create the front of sincere performers (see Ch. 2.2.1.5) who are very much true to their request in verse 37 and up to the task in verse 38. Goffman has explained that a sincere performer is the individual who believes in the impression fostered by their own performance. In this response lies the impression of confidence and determination being fostered on Jesus by James and John.

‘The cup that I drink you will drink and with the baptism with which I am baptized, you will be baptized’ (Τὸ ποτήριον ὃ ἐγὼ πίνω πίεσθε καὶ τὸ βάπτισμα ὃ ἐγὼ βαπτίζομαι

βαπτισθήσεσθε). Jesus by this response acknowledges their show of confidence and willingness to share in the suffering experience of the Son of Man. This brings them to the first point of realisation, that is, the certainty of them drinking the cup and undergoing the baptism. Through this response Jesus creates an impression of one who has the ability to discern the future.

Verse 40, 'but to sit at my right hand or at my left is not mine to grant' (τὸ δὲ καθίσαι ἐκ δεξιῶν μου ἢ ἐξ εὐωνύμων οὐκ ἔστιν ἐμὸν δοῦναι). Evans (2001) finds it remarkable addition on the part of Jesus, arguing that Jesus can promise his disciples to reign with him but he does not make the appointment (11:8). Some interpreters connect this verse to 13:32 and conclude that both verses suggest that some functions and decisions are the sole reserve of God the Father (Donahue & Harrington 2002:312).

'But it is for those for whom it has been prepared' (ἀλλ' οἷς ἡτοίμασται). Interpreters consider this phrase as a compressed expression in which the relative stands in for the main clause, we must assume a main verb such as 'it will be given', contrasting with the preceding statement that it is not for Jesus to give it. Those to who, it will be given are those οἷς ἡτοίμασται, where the passive without expressed agent must in this context, as often in Jewish writings, indicative God as the one who has prepared it. Between ἀλλοις and ἀλλ' οἷς (but those for whom) it is agreed that there is confusion in MSS because of the absence of word divisions (France 2002:414). The result was that some interpreters took the Greek ἄλλοις (for others) rather than as ἀλλ' οἷς (but... for whom). 'Prepared' (ἡτοίμασται) used here need not be construed to connote predestination; rather it suggests no more than that places of honour are of the Father's appointing (Taylor 1966:441).

Turning to Social Interactional Analysis of verse 40, 'but to sit at my right hand or at my left is not mine to grant' (τὸ δὲ καθίσαι ἐκ δεξιῶν μου ἢ ἐξ εὐωνύμων οὐκ ἔστιν ἐμὸν δοῦναι). Still

on his control and direction frame, Jesus proceeds to make this declaration to James and John, “to sit at my right hand or at my left is not mine to grant”. Though the response will surprise James and John it creates impression of Jesus as a forthright person, one who knows the limits of his authority as well as one who is candid not to brag to impress anyone. By this response Jesus puts up the front of one who is not prepared to bend the rules to favour cronies and close family members. Obviously James and John will be left with nothing more to say after having come to the realisation that their request is impossible to be granted because they had presumed wrongly. Jesus’ response to James and John poses a big challenge to Akan traditional leaders with the leadership orientation practice and by extension African leaders on being able to say no to friends, cronies and family on various requests which easily soil their integrity on the grounds of conflict of interest, corruption and abuse of office.

Verse 41, ‘And when the ten heard it, they began to be indignant at James and John’, (Καὶ ἀκούσαντες οἱ δέκα ἤρξαντο ἀγανακτεῖν περὶ Ἰακώβου καὶ Ἰωάννου). It can be noted that the word ἀγανακτέω (to be indignant) is the same word used in 10:14 when Jesus was displeased with the disciples. Does this anger of the ten (οἱ δέκα) result from their grasp of Jesus’ teaching on self-renunciation, service and even martyrdom so as to denounce the self-centred attitude, status-seeking or prominence-seeking attitude of the two? Or their annoyance is against the fact that the two have taken unfair advantage with their absence to take the lead in the struggle for such cherish seats beside Jesus (Donahue & Harrington 2002:312; France 2002:418).

Jesus’ admonition to follow in 10:42-45 gives inclination that the latter suggestion is likely to be the reason for their indignation. It is also suggested that the other ten disciples were indignant because they were jealous of their own dignity and dreaded that the two brothers should secure some advantage over them (Lane 1974:384). This explains why Jesus joined them to James and John, and instructed them on rank, precedence and service. The request of

James and John, combined with the indignation of the ten, Lane (1974:384) argues, shows the extent to which selfish ambition and rivalry among peers were the bases upon which Jesus rolled out his instructions on the leadership for his followers.

Turning to Social Interactional Analysis on verse 41, ‘and when the ten heard it, they began to be indignant at James and John’, (Καὶ ἀκούσαντες οἱ δέκα ἤρξαντο ἀγανακτεῖν περὶ Ἰακώβου καὶ Ἰωάννου). Interaction between the ten, on the one hand and James and John and Jesus on another failed to communicate who initiated. However, most probably uses social ritualization that is bodily gestures, modified contact rituals and facial expression (see Ch. 2.2.1.1) to indicate their indignation.

Social Ritualization has been explained as ‘the standardization of bodily and vocal behaviour through socialization, affording such behaviour – such gestures, if you will – a specialized communicative function in the stream of behaviour’ (Goffman 1983:3). Jesus and the two disciples might have gleaned such expression of indignation by the ten. Such indignation obviously creates an impression on Jesus that there could be potential conflicts in his absence in the future. Again, selfish ambitions still reigned among them the disciples. It also created the impression that their struggle for rank and precedence could lead to wrongful exercise of authority for personal gains, and by so doing following the example of the gentile leaders. An impression of broken trust and seeds of discord sown cannot be discounted.

Verse 42, “And Jesus called them to him and said to them” (καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος αὐτοὺς ὁ Ἰησοῦς λέγει αὐτοῖς), προσκαλεσάμενος (having called them) suggests Jesus reassembled them together after the anger of the ten (France 2002:418). The use of προσκαλεσάμενος appears to be Mark’s recalling tool which Jesus employed to precede major pronouncement (3:32; 7:14; 8:34; 12:43; France 2002:418). Jesus regroups the disciples and recalls to them the conventions of leadership in their day (Evans 2001:118) particularly among the Greeks and Jewish rebels

who are desirous of capturing power, which leadership is described by Josephus as ‘tyrant’ and acting like a tyrant.

"You know that those who are supposed to rule over the Gentiles lord it over them" (οἴδατε ὅτι οἱ δοκοῦντες ἄρχειν τῶν ἐθνῶν κατακυριεύουσιν αὐτῶν). This saying considered as synonymous parallelism<sup>20</sup> (Taylor 1966:443). Οἴδατε (you know) introduces a familiar subject, a general truth. ἐθνῶν (Gentiles) in its plural form in the New Testament is understood as Gentiles but in its singular form ἔθνος refers to any nation or political unit hence how authority is exercised in any nation (France 2002:418). Again the use of ἐθνῶν (Gentiles) perhaps echoes Herod’s dynasty which could be a good example of what Jesus was talking about (France 2002:418). οἱ δοκοῦντες ἄρχειν (those being accounted or supposed to rule); here it is not doubting the rule rather it draws attention to those who are seen to rule, who are openly recognised as rulers (France 2002:418). Donahue and Harrington (2002:312) believe that the word ‘rule’ (ἄρχειν) and ‘lord it over’ (κατακυριεύουσιν) help to depict the delivery of leadership as one of being subject to unlimited and overwhelming imperial power. Domination was a means value (see 3.3.4.7) in the ancient mediterranean world. Lording it over others was an accepted and cherished leadership practice. ‘Lord’ was understood as “a person with the right to control other persons totally and at will, with the right of life and death over another, with full rights to the property and being of another” (Pilch 1993:46). Lording it over others and being subject to others in the ancient Mediterranean biblical world were means by which honour was gained and shame imposed. This value was realized by subjecting others.

---

<sup>20</sup> Synonymous parallelism involves the repetition in the second part of what has already been expressed in the first, while simply varying the words.

The participle δοκοῦντες (who are supposed) presents a note of irony and creates the platform for Jesus' concept of leadership to be introduced (Donahue & Harrington 2002:312).

'And their great men exercise authority over them' (καὶ οἱ μεγάλοι αὐτῶν κατεξουσιάζουσιν αὐτῶν). Both ἄρχειν (rule over) and οἱ μεγάλοι (great ones) do not refer to specific office; they describe all who are in position of authority (France 2002:41-419). κατεξουσιάζουσιν (exercise lordship over) and κατεξουσιάζουσιν (exercise authority over) are used in a derogatory sense, carrying the idea of oppressive and uncontrolled exploitation of power contrary to benevolent exercise of authority (France 2002:419). It has been described as an exercise of raw power (Donahue & Harrington 2002:312).

In Greco-Roman world οἱ μεγάλοι (great ones) are those who rule over others, who κατακυριεύουσιν (lord it over others). Evans (2001:118) maintains that such great ones were eulogized (cf. Virgil's flattery of Augustus [Georg, 1:24-42, 503-4; 4.559-62] Aen. 6.791-93). It is presumable that greatness in Jesus' day was identified by power, coercive power, something the disciples could not be said to be uninformed about (Evans 2001:118). ἐξουσία (authority) itself is identified as one of the key themes in the Gospel of Mark as it relates to Jesus (1:22, 27; 2:10) and his use of authority of it to his disciples (3:15; 6:7).

Turning to Social Interactional Analysis of verse 42, 'and Jesus called them to him and said to them' (καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος αὐτοὺς ὁ Ἰησοῦς λέγει αὐτοῖς), Jesus initiates the interaction with all the twelve together. He uses speech and the gesture (see Ch 2.2.1) of grouping to frame the interaction along the lines of unity, oneness and cohesion. By calling them together, Jesus obviously was creating an impression of rebuilding broken trust, and uprooting seeds of discord, if any. It is also to forge an impression of one people and a team. At a personal level with this interactional approach, Jesus presents himself to them as one who cares about unity

and deals with issues when they have arisen. Significantly, this interactional approach was to reinvigorate team energy, rev morale and to build fresh emotional energy among disciples, which obviously might have waned through the request of the two and the subsequent indignation of the ten. Given that previously (9:35; 8:34), upon similar incidence when they had debated greatness and Jesus had called them together and given an instruction on self-renunciation, service and even martyrdom, this call perceptibly would have created an impression of expectation of a lecture on a similar subject, which becomes the new frame for the later interaction.

‘You know that those who are supposed to’ (Οἴδατε ὅτι οἱ δοκοῦντες). With these words routed through the generalised other interactional tool (Ch. 2:22), Jesus guides the disciples to start reflecting on leadership. The words interactionally project the leaders at the time as cynical performers (Ch. 2.2.1.5). Goffman’s notion of a cynical performer is a performer who does not believe in the impression fostered by his or her own performance, cynics will do so for self-interest or private gain. In other words the leadership actors of the time were fostering leadership impression on the people, which does not reflect true leadership; it was all about self gain.

‘Rule over the Gentiles lord it over them’ (ἄρχειν τῶν ἐθνῶν κατακυριεύουσιν αὐτῶν). Still using the leadership frame, Jesus introduces three terms ‘rulers or rule’ (ἄρχειν), ‘Gentiles’ (ἐθνῶν) and ‘lord over’ (κατακυριεύουσιν) while describing their contemporary leadership. These terms interactionally are significant for the impression they foster. The characterisation ‘rulers or rule’ (ἄρχειν) creates the impression of people with legitimate right to exercise rule or power over the people but they do so by ‘lording over’ (κατακυριεύουσιν) the people that is, pressing and exploiting the people or making it burdensome on the people. In effect, an

impression of bad leadership, typified by abuse of power, and leaders who are overwhelmed by personal gains in terms of perpetuating themselves and material gains like Caesar Augustus. The use of ‘Gentiles’ (ἐθνῶν) is to contrast the kingdom of God to create the impression that leadership outside of the kingdom of God is seen as coercive use of power and self-centredness. ‘And their great men exercise authority over them’ (καὶ οἱ μεγάλοι αὐτῶν κατεξουσιάζουσιν αὐτῶν). This speech is just like what he said earlier, except that ‘their great men’ (οἱ μεγάλοι) perhaps refers to patrons who might also exercise high handedness in the use of authority. Even the absolute authority of the *Pater Familias* (male head of the family) whereby he can even sell his children can be a part of οἱ μεγάλοι. The overall impression created by this instruction is that authority is abused by those to whom it has been entrusted.

Verse 43, ‘But it shall not be so among you’ (οὐχ οὕτως δέ ἐστιν ἐν ὑμῖν), it is argued that the use of present tense (ἐστιν) for the verb ‘be’ conveys the sense of a command (it shall not be so) (Donahue & Harrington 2002:312-313). France (2002) considers this phrase as a slogan which captures the revolutionary ethic of Jesus’ teaching about the kingdom. The οὐχ (but) negates what are natural assumptions and valuations of leadership with which people live and lead in everyday Societies, and are accepted in the Kingdom of God. The Kingdom of God is an alternative Society with alternative assumptions of life. Jesus definitely rejects the leadership style of the of the Greco-Roman world and his commands to his disciples could not possibly be more at odds with conventional wisdom (Evans 2001:119).

‘But whoever would be great among you must be your servant’ (ἀλλ’ ὃς ἂν θέλη μέγας γενέσθαι ἐν ὑμῖν ἔσται ὑμῶν διάκονος). The use of διάκονος (servant) recalls 9:35 and further defines greatness and leadership as being in the service of another, thus under the authority of others. μέγας echoes 9:34 (τίς μείζων) in both cases, followed by how to attain such greatness.

διάκονος (servant) comparatively is a little higher than δοῦλος (slave)' but clearly both signify, an inferior position. διάκονος is one who waits at table (Luke 17:8; Acts 6:2; Evans 2001:119). In Greek culture the word διάκονος (service) was contrary to happiness, as Plato says 'How can one be happy when he has to serve' (Gorg. 491e). However, the Jewish world had a higher appreciation of service (Evans 2001:119; Qidd. 33b). For the disciples to become the slave of all, Jesus is promoting his ideal of universal service towards others (Donahue & Harrington 2002:313).

Turning to Social Interactional Analysis of verse 43, 'But it shall not be so among you' (οὐχ οὕτως δέ ἐστιν ἐν ὑμῖν). Jesus proceeds on his leadership instruction frame and categorically commands this disciple to be different in leadership. The speech which captures the revolutionary ethic of Jesus' teaching about the kingdom (France 2002). Interactionally, this speech creates an impression for the disciples to avoid the leadership style of the Gentiles, and adopt a new leadership culture. More so, it carries with it the impression of a new paradigm for the now and the future, for the specific leadership situation and for the generic at the same time. The statement sets the stage for Jesus to make known the kind of leadership style the disciples are to adopt.

'But whoever would be great among you must be your servant' (ἀλλ' ὃς ἂν θέλη μέγας γενέσθαι ἐν ὑμῖν ἔσται ὑμῶν διάκονος). Jesus employs symbolism to establish his leadership style. The great one (the leader) as noted in verse 42 should be a servant that is, the leader must be a servant not lord. Jesus uses the household servant symbolism because they are men and women whose activities are not directed toward their own interests but to those of another. Servants have a self-understanding that whatever they do or do not do is not about them but one in whose service they are engaged. This symbolism fosters the impression that a leader is

with a servant mind-set and servant attitude, does not necessarily do the meaner jobs. The leadership by service orientation as Jesus sought to establish finds full expression in Akan traditional leadership. For the Akans leadership is about service not lordship though in practice this cherished virtue is neglected regularly yet is a principal means of leading which will stay with the Akans for a long time.

Verse 44 ‘and whoever would be first among you must be slave of all’ (καὶ ὃς ἂν θέλῃ ἐν ὑμῖν εἶναι πρῶτος ἔσται πάντων δοῦλος). A new term δοῦλος (slave) is introduced which is a further extension of διάκονος (servant) relating to the idea of subjection, δοῦλος has less self-determination even than a διάκονος. The point must be made that service neither as διακονεῖν ‘to serve’ as a servant nor δουλεύειν ‘to serve as slave’ was viewed in the Old Testament and early Judaism nearly as negatively as it was in the Greco-Roman World (Evans 2001:119),

Turning to Social Interactional Analysis of verse 44, ‘and whoever would be first among you must be slave of all’ (καὶ ὃς ἂν θέλῃ ἐν ὑμῖν εἶναι πρῶτος ἔσται πάντων δοῦλος). Like verse 43, Jesus continues to use the household symbolism within his leadership instruction frame. He uses ‘slave’ as the metaphor. Slave symbolism has similar effect like the servant except that slave is a virtual non-existent self-freedom. Jesus also uses the category of ‘all’ must receive service from the slave. By this, Jesus creates the impression that the leader is the property of those he or she serves. He has ceded his or her right to the service to which he or she is engaged. The leader’s personal interest is subsidiary to the interest of the people he serves. Furthermore, the ‘all’ category fosters the impression on non-discriminatory service irrespective of gender, race and age. In effect, Jesus creates an impression of a new leadership culture defined by service, self-renunciation, and self-giving to the goals and aspirations of the people the leader leads.

Verse 45, ‘for the Son of man also came not to be served but to serve’ (ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἦλθεν διακονηθῆναι ἀλλὰ διακονῆσαι). This verse has attracted a lot of comments from interpreters. καὶ γὰρ (for even) a conjunction which combines with the subject of service connects the verse to earlier thoughts of Jesus (9:43-44; 9:35). ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου (the Son of man), referring to Jesus himself provides the ultimate pattern of status reversal (France 2002:419). διακονηθῆναι (to serve) has been suggested to refer to the Servant of Isa. 52:13; 53:11 and its synonym δουλεύειν (to serve as slave) also appears LXX Isa. 53:11 (Evans 2001:120).

Alluding to Daniel 7:13-14 (LXX), the υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ...πάντες οἱ λαοὶ φυλαί καὶ γλώσσαι αὐτῷ δουλεύουσιν (the son of man...all the people, tribes, and languages must serve him) rather becomes servant of all (διάκονος πάντες). Διακονέω in reference to Jesus is not explicit except in Luke 22:27 and practical demonstration in the foot washing in John 13:1-17. διακονῆσαι as used, does not depict any specific role except that it represents a paradoxical subordinate status (France 2002:419). It is therefore possible to portray Jesus, the servant also in the enigmatic notion of the son of man as a διάκονος (France 2002:420).

‘And to give his life as a ransom for many’ (καὶ δοῦναι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν). Some interpreters see this declaration of Jesus in the light of Isaiah 53. λύτρον (ransom for) carries the notion of guilt offering in Isa. 53 (Evans 2001:121). λύτρον only appears in the parallel of this verse in Matthew 20:28. καὶ δοῦναι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ (and to give his life) virtually approximate part of Isaiah 53:10 (Evans 2001:121). In Pauline thought, λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν is reflected in ‘who gave himself as a ransom for all’ (ἀντίλυτρον ὑπὲρ πάντων). In the LXX, λύτρον frequently denotes redemption of God’s people from slavery and spiritual oppression (France 2002:420). λύτρον is also used for compensation to preserve a life which is legally forfeited or subjected to divine punishment. The vital meaning is deliverance by

payment of an equivalent (France 2002:420). Taylor (1966:446) concludes “Jesus died to fulfil the Servant's destiny and His service is that of vicarious and representative suffering”.

Turning to Social Interactional Analysis of verse 45, ‘for the Son of man also came not to be served but to serve’ (ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἦλθεν διακονηθῆναι ἀλλὰ διακονῆσαι). Jesus concludes his instruction and interaction with the twelve by using another metaphor ‘son of man’. This metaphor should be familiar to the disciples through the generalised other (Jesus called himself the Son of Man 2:10; 2:28; 8:38; 9:12,31; 10:33,45; 13:26; 14:21-2,41,62). Though, according to Daniel 7:13-14, the Son of Man should be served, he had come not to receive service but to give service. In the use of the Son of Man metaphor Jesus creates the impression to the disciples that he their teacher, Lord and leader is a servant. Service is thus the destiny of the Son of Man.

‘And to give his life as a ransom for many’ (καὶ δοῦναι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν). Jesus continues to say that the Son of Man gives his life as ransom for many. In other words, Jesus, the Son of Man, seals his service with the sacrifice of his life for the many. The impressions Jesus creates with his last speech in the leadership instruction frame is that he lays down his life for the people he serves. The ransom involves death, so he dies to redeem those he serves.

#### **4.7 Summary**

The chapter considered four passages from Mark's Gospel (Mark 6:30-44; 7:1-23; 7:24-30; 10:35-45) by paying attention to the social interactional activities of Jesus. This was done using social interactional analytical tools from Goffman and Mead. Employing Ritual making, Frame making, Characterisation, Encounter processing, Stage making and Role-taking to analyse the passages have established that Jesus demonstrated great leadership principles in his everyday interaction. The chapter appreciated Jesus' social interactions and asserted their relevance with inferences from the Akan traditional notion of leadership. Some of the Jesus-performed leadership principles that could be gleaned in this chapter are outlined in the next.

## CHAPTER FIVE

### TOWARDS A SOCIAL INTERACTIONAL LEADERSHIP MODEL:

#### JESUS - PERFORMED LEADERSHIP PRINCIPLES

##### 5. Introduction

The ultimate goal of the study is to formulate principles about the basic variables of Jesus' social interaction, which inform leadership. These principles articulate the relationships among variable processes in the contemporary world. It is noteworthy that "the top leaders, the big winners, energized other people around them, and got energy from them in return. They were experts at the art of social interaction" (Collins 2016:8), by which bond is created and emotional energy<sup>21</sup> generated between them and their followers.

Jesus' social interaction and leadership are inseparable as every move of his was a step in touch with his leadership philosophy and agenda. As evident in the previous chapter, Jesus Christ's expert use of social interactions in creating the emotional energy and getting across his vision, mission and message leaves us with palpable leadership principles and values to explore and follow. This chapter, thus, discusses some of the leadership principles gleaned from his social interactions with his followers and opponents. The value of this is enshrined in the words of Hettinga (1996:17) that "the ultimate issue in the universe is leadership, who you follow and what directs your life is the single most important thing about you". Before proceeding to glean the leadership principles emanating from the micro-analysis of his social interactions, it is relevant to do this in the light of the macro context of his leadership by looking at Jesus as the expected leader and the leader in the households.

---

<sup>21</sup>Emotional Energy, according Randall Collins is feeling pumped up, bodily and mentally (2016:11).

## **5.1 The Markan Jesus as the Expected Leader**

Across the ages the question about Jesus' identity has been the centre of the gospel studies and has resulted in many different Christological theories. Perhaps one theoretical and practical response to the identity question without dispute is the Jesus' leadership identity. The Markan Jesus is presented in the narrative as a religious leader. He erupts into a scene of the narrative as an instant leader through John the Baptist's introduction and baptism. Mark places the source of Jesus' leadership in God (Son of God, leadership with divine accent), who was considered the chief patron and the ultimate leader of the Jewish people and as such Jesus becomes a mediator-leader. These Christological titles (Son of God, Son of Man, and Son of David) are actually leadership titles, for the Jewish people's reception of the individual who carried any of these titles was one of a leader.

'Son of God' and 'Son of Man' titles have been understood as theological (Christological) titles but I understand them as village situational titles of somebody who performs a particular role in the community, and such roles I can find linkage in comparative aspect from a Ghanaian perspective. Titles reflect roles given to people, which are performed in the community; in other words, the titles are performative. As a way of giving fresh articulation, the titles Son of God and Son of Man, as applied to Jesus, must be received as a leader in our context (moving from theological usage to everyday usage, – Son of God, the divine person, the expected one and Son of Man, a human like us.

This study submits that whenever we see these titles being used in the Gospel of Mark, we should understand them not merely in a theological or Christological sense but rather we must understand them in their sociological function regarding what type of leadership the bearer of these titles, Jesus was expected to provide. For instance, the question by the disciples in Acts

1:6 "...Lord, will you at this time restore the kingdom to Israel?", suggests that the disciples maintained a leadership expectation which hoped to see the kingdom of God realized in the restoration of Israel as an independent nation again (Bruce 1988:6-7). Germane to the discussions on these Christological titles is the need to look at the titles in greater detail.

### **5.1.1 *The Son of God***

Mark's opening statement 'The beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ the Son of God' (Ἀρχὴ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ υἱοῦ θεοῦ) importantly announces who the narrative is about; the Son of God, Jesus the Christ. The title 'Son of God' describes one with special relationship with God. In the Old Testament it applied to angels and kings. Reference to kings tacitly connotes leadership; and the idea of leadership is also reflected in Nathanael's enquiry of Jesus in John 1:49 – "Rabbi, you are the Son of God! You are the King of Israel!". Schnackenburg (1995:45) observes that the picture of Jesus as painted by Mark is thoroughly permeated with the idea of the divine sonship of Jesus.

The description of Jesus as the Son of God occurs in the Gospel of Mark five times (see 1:11; 3:11, 5:7; 9:7; 15:39 in addition to 1:1; Schnackenburg 1995:45). There are other parts of the narrative which do not make direct use of the designation "Son of God" but make allusions to it. For instance, the parable of the wicked tenants which alludes to Jesus as the υἱὸν ἀγαπητόν 'beloved son' (12:6) is one case in point. This points to Jesus because the same expression υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός was used by Mark at the baptism of Jesus in direct reference to him when the voice from heavens spoke. Similar inferences are made in the Parousia passage (13:32), although the "Son of God" is not the subject, it is stated that about that day or hour no one knows, neither the angels in heaven, nor the Son, but only the Father. And the high priest enquiry of Jesus: 'are you the Messiah'? The son of the Blessed One' (14:61).

The Markan Jesus follows after John the Baptist who prepares the way and predicts the coming of the Mightier One, which is fulfilled at once in the arrival of Jesus from Galilee (1:9-13). Kingsbury (1981:33) rightly maintains that to Mark, Jesus is the Mightier One, a view he strengthens when the Spirit descended on him (1:10), and the voice from heaven declared “Thou art my beloved Son; with thee I am well pleased” (1:11; see Gen 22:2; Psalm 2:7; 42:1) following his baptism by John. Mark characterises Jesus as the only, or unique, Son whom God has chosen for eschatological ministry in Israel. Who, then, is this Jesus, the Mightier One, whom God at his baptism empowers with his Holy Spirit for eschatological ministry? He is the long-awaited Davidic Messiah, the Royal Son of God, the very portrait encoded in the superscription of his Gospel: “The beginning of the Gospel of Jesus [the] Messiah, the Son of God” (Kingsbury 1981:33).

Jesus Christ, the Son of God, according to Kelber (1979:17), is presented by Mark as a ‘figure of extraordinary authority’. Ten times ‘authority’ (ἐξουσία) is used in the Gospel of Mark, six in direct reference to Jesus (1:22, 27; 2:10; 11:28, 29, 33). In the four occurrences of ἐξουσία (3:15; 6:7; 10:42; 13:34) where Jesus is not the subject, ἐξουσία was used in relation to the conferring of his authority on the disciples (Edwards 1994:220). The public ministry of Jesus is announced in Mark (1:283:7-12; 5:1-20-29) with the establishment of his authority in both human and supernatural domain. To the extent that supernatural powers themselves – the demons, acknowledged the mission and authority of Jesus before humanity did (1:24; 3:11; 5:7). A demon will cry out, "What have you to do with us, Jesus of Nazareth? Have you come to destroy us?" "I know who you are, the Holy One of God" (1:24) (Edwards 1994:221).

Authority here refers to the leadership role expected of Jesus, the right to prevail over all things including evil spirits; the authority obviously devolved to him from his divine gene. The Son of God is not in any sense point of exclusivism or departure from humanity and human

interaction. Jesus as the Son of God, unlike His cousin John the Baptist, who was had ascetic dwelling in the Wilderness, Jesus, the Son of God was a man of social interaction, and even entered into fellowship with ἁμαρτωλοὶ (sinners). ἁμαρτωλοὶ is a composite word which refers to tax collectors (2:18), adulterers and those outside of the kingdom. It is in these interactions that he expressed his leadership. To Mark the identity of Jesus as the divine Son of God is inextricably bound up with his leadership destiny as the suffering Son of God that is his obedient willingness to go the way of the cross (14:35-36).

### **5.1.2 Son of Man**

The Markan Jesus is not only the Son of God, he is also ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου (Son of Man) as the narrative reveals. “Son of Man” as a designation for Jesus Christ occurs in the Gospel of Mark 14 times (2:10, 28; 8:31, 38; 9:9,12,31; 10:33,45; 13:26; 14:21,21,41,62) within various contexts. Rather amazingly, the designation the “Son of Man” is found exclusively on the lips of Jesus Christ throughout the Gospel except for Acts 7:56. Never was Jesus confessed or addressed as Son of Man; neither was it in the divine voice nor in the reports of other people (Schnackenburg 1995:52) though Jesus openly referred to himself as the son of man in the presence of both the Scribes (2:6, 10) and the Pharisees (2:48, 28) (Kingsbury 1981:39). ‘Son of Man’ relates to the person of Jesus and relates exclusively to him. Certainly, Jesus’ use of “Son of Man” is to give credence to his humanity. To Mark, Jesus is the “Son of God” just as he is the “Son of Man” (Schnackenburg 1995:53).

Hay (1970), like most scholars, believes the title “Son of Man” used by Jesus has Semitic origin and the Hebrew Bible is explicit on it. The Prophet Ezekiel for example, uses it 93 times as an enigmatic, indirect reference to himself and as a means of God addressing the prophet (Nel 2017:3). Nel (2017) argues that when Jesus used the title ‘Son of Man’, in reference to himself

he was inadvertently categorising himself as the eschatological prophet whom Ezekiel (Ezekiel 4, 7, 10, 22, 40–48) speaks about in relation to the destruction of the temple and Jerusalem, and the restoration of the kingdom of Israel.

Prophets among the Jews were received as religious leaders, and the voice of God to the people. If Jesus is the Son of Man then he is a leader by default in terms of his social function among the Jews.

Scholars group the ‘Son of Man’ sayings into three: i. Those that speak of the future coming of the Son of Man and his unique function at the final judgement (often denoted the *Parousia* - 8:38; 13:26; 62) ii. Those that refer to the suffering and death of the Son of Man (8:31; 9:9, 12, 31; 10:33, 45; 14:21, 21, 41) iii. Those that deal with his present ministry on earth (2:10, 28) (Hay 1970:70). Since, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου could be translated ‘the man’s son, or ‘the son of man’, the appeal to the Semitic origin of the term should illuminate our understanding of the title ‘Son of Man’. In Judaism, three basic usages are noted; first, the title ‘Son of Man’ is used as an expression for man, a human being. It refers to people’s humanity (Nm 23:19; Job 16:21; 25:6; 35:8; Ps 8:4; 80:17; 146:3; Is 51:12; 56:2; Jr 49:18, 33; 50:40; 51:43). The usage of Son of Man in Psalm 8:4 juxtaposed with Hebrews 2:6 and 9 illustrates the point better, where man and Son of Man are used interchangeably as contradistinction of man’s frailty and mortality to the grace bestowed upon man (Nel 2017:2).

Second, ‘son of man’ is used as periphrasis for the pronoun ‘I’. And third, the title as it appears in Dan 7:13 identifies the Son of Man as an honorific figure in Jewish apocalyptic tradition. This tradition exercises an immense influence on early Christianity and perhaps on Jesus himself (Hay 1970:69). By appropriating the ‘Son of Man’ in Daniel 7:13-14 to Jesus Christ

points us to the leadership expected of the Son of Man. He is expected to have dominion, glory and kingdom; and all people, nations, and languages must serve him. Thus the Son of Man is a leader from his inception.

A good number of scholars such as J. Hering, E. Sjöberg, P. Vielhauer, R. Bultmann, H. E. Todt, and J. Knox identify with the third meaning of 'Son of Man'. They argue that the Jewish apocalyptic literature conceived the idea of a 'Son of Man' who is a supernatural, transcendent, or heavenly being who is to appear at the end-time as a judge, and whose word will ultimately decide the fate of men. Bultmann (1955) maintains that 'only the future sayings had any claim to authenticity, and here Jesus was referring to someone other than himself'.

Equally a good number of scholars disagree with Bultmann and the others on their position. Scholars such as T. W. Manson, C. K. Barrett, G. S. Duncan, O. Cullmann, and M. D. Hooker identify with the first meaning. They argue that the figure 'Son of Man' has some sort of representative or corporate significance (Hay 1970:70). Regarding the specific meaning of 'Son of Man', Hay (1970) argues that based on later gospel traditions, the overwhelming majority of scholars believe that the term has 'an honorific or titular sense and is used to speak of Jesus as the exalted apocalyptic figure who is, even in his earthly ministry, revealing his authority in forgiving sins' (Hay 1970:72). This honorific figure, Jesus, is expected to come to lead his people to freedom once more.

In his earthly ministry, with regards to Jesus the Son of Man, Koester (1992:7) succinctly indicates that "we are again on the way toward a human Jesus who is just like one of us, one who holds values that are very close to our ideological commitments, a Jesus who is a social reformer and who attacks patriarchal orders, a Jesus who, as a real human person, can stand as an example and inspiration for the worthy". This Markan Jesus is depicted as one who is going

around practising leadership in inclusivism, commensality, hospitality and transformation under this Christological titles ‘Son of God’ and ‘Son of Man’.

## **5.2. The Jesus Leadership as Practised in the Household**

The activities of the Markan Jesus and his followers are located within the house or household in the village setting. These give an indication of where they are placed in the system of social and economic order. It has been pointed out that the concept of place (e.g. house or household) does not just imply geographical locations. We may also, for instance, speak of social, ideological or mental places in terms of gender, ideology or power (Moxnes 2003:2). Household in Mark therefore, is both a metaphor and a reality. Household as both a model and a metaphor became a reference value for the early Christians in their attempt, not only at self-definition and community organization, but also at describing their relationship with God (Moxnes 1997:26; Clarke 2000:79). It is the real physical place where Jesus’ interaction took place.

The Markan Jesus is characterised by undertaking activities meant for the temple like healing, exorcism and teaching in the households – individual homes and seashores. And Jesus was very careful on how believers within the Jesus households should relate to each other. The implication is that the Markan Jesus took leadership to the people, for leadership was not formalities and institutionalised arrangement but rather it was being at the base to influence the margins. It was about the ordinary everyday people.

Most of Jesus’ public career took place outside of his home village, in other parts of Galilee – he and his followers were known as Galileans (Moxnes 2003:2). In speaking about Jesus’ position in relation to places in Galilee, it points toward Jesus’ break with, and challenges to

other places of power and symbolic order namely the temple and Jerusalem. We have noticed how Jesus chose a place on the margins of Galilee, exemplified in his death outside Jerusalem – at the absolute margin, Golgotha (Moxnes 2003:3).

Choosing the households over the temple meant he would not lead according to formal structures but would live out his leadership while interacting with the everyday people, his disciples and even his opponents at locations sometimes not prescribed for a Jewish religious leader like him. Therefore, to discover Jesus' leadership practice and principles his interactions with the people at the base provide the window.

### **5.3 The Jesus-Performed Leadership Principles**

Based on the social interactional observation and analysis of Jesus' performance in Mark 6:30-44; 7:1-23; 7:24-30; and 10:35-45 the study concludes on some leadership principles and values of Jesus which informed his interactional approaches and strategies. These principles are gleaned, conscious of the fact that they were performed in a far distant culture from ours today. However, the impetus resides in the fact that leadership principles have been proven to be timeless and borderless.

The following statements, based on his interactional situation encapsulate the leadership principles of Jesus and his values. These statements from the previous chapter are restated to serve as a foundation for the corresponding principle to be stated.

### **5.3.1 Principle 1 – The Choice of Setting for Leader-Associate Interaction**

Jesus' choice of the desolate place as a setting communicates his interactional motif of inclusive-exclusivism approach to both the disciples and the crowd. It exudes the following principles:

- The leader's mission and vision guide the choice of the place of engagement with associates, of which the place of engagement becomes a tool for realising vision and mission.
- The setting for leader-follower engagement must communicate a sense of respect for followers' self-value, distinguish them and create an expectation of serious intent on the part of the leader to the followers.

### **5.3.2 Principle 2 – Characterisation of Followers**

The use of the term 'apostles' as a frame for Jesus' associates to indicate their functionality as emissaries within this interactive framework suggests:

- The name a leader chooses to identify his/her followers with should inspire and create intrinsic motivation and help direct their thoughts and actions toward what the leader seeks to achieve with them.
- The leader defines clearly the status of his/her followers and the parameters of their operation(s) in every situation and every assignment.

### **5.3.3 Principle 3 – Creation of Team Mind-Set**

On their return from missions work, the disciples presented a team front to Jesus thereby creating an impression of a team with singleness of purpose:

- The Leader creates and inculcates a team spirit among his/her associates and in order that his/her associates naturally gravitate toward team formation and team function.

#### **5.3.4 Principle 4 – Being a Part of Associates**

Jesus' routine of associating with crowds at the margins even more than individuals cast Jesus in the light of the people's leader and places his leadership at the level of the masses:

- The leader must be at the level of his or her followers to take them to where he or she wants them to be.

#### **5.3.5 Principle 5 – Indicators That Associates and Followers are Following**

On their return to Jesus and reporting to him, the apostles interactionally were signalling a meek manner; and by this gesture fostered an impression of acknowledgment of Jesus' authority over them as their leader and their willingness to submit to him:

- The leader creates and maintains the atmosphere for willing humility and submission on the part of associates and followers. This is key to the leader-associates-followers relationship to ensure harmony and success in the realisation of the leader's mission.

#### **5.3.6 Principle 6 – The Third Eye of the Leader**

One can plausibly imagine Jesus observing and analysing even the unintended impression of the bodily gestures of the disciples:

- The leader must develop a third eye to observe and pay attention to details about his associates and followers to pick up signals and address them to thrill and win their confidence.

#### **5.3.7 Principle 7 – The Leader's Concern, Care and Attention to Followers**

Jesus maintained a self-conception of care and he rightly fostered the impression of one who cares and pays attention to the other:

- The leader must be seen to be concerned, cares and pays attention to associates and followers. His or her actions must demonstrate these to them.

- The leader must have a self-definition to associate and followers which resonates with his philosophy of leadership.

### **5.3.8 Principle 8 – The Leader’s Provision for Associates**

Jesus as a patron-leader proceeded to provide a solution to the need (come, eat and rest) – an act of mercy and favour expected of patrons:

- The leader provides to meet the needs of the associates and followers when identified.

### **5.3.9 Principle 9 – Relational Bond between the Leader and Associates and Followers**

πεζῆ (on foot) ... προῆλθον αὐτούς (ahead of them) suggest how they longed to be in interaction with Jesus and how they cherished the impression or the effect of his interactions on them:

- The leader’s interaction with his associates and followers must leave them to long for more. The leader’s interactions with his followers must create a bond between them.

### **5.3.10 Principle 10 – Compassion: A Key Value to a Leader’s Approach**

Jesus’ response to what he saw is one of positive emotion – “compassion” for they were like “sheep without a shepherd”:

- The leader’s show of compassion in his dealings with his followers will endear him to them.

### **5.3.11 Principle 11 – The Leader’s Critical Understanding of His Followers and Associates**

Jesus uses characterisation in his interaction with the multitude. He applies categorical characterisation to them, and concludes they are ‘πρόβατα μὴ ἔχοντα ποιμένα’ (sheep without a shepherd):

- The leader must have a perfect definition of followers in order to respond to them at the level of their greatest need.
- The leader cannot afford to misunderstand his followers and their needs.

#### **5.3.12 Principle 12- Resourcefulness of the Leader**

Jesus began to interact with his associates and followers as a teacher; instructing them in many things and going ahead of them (leader):

- The leader must be resourceful and offer to educate the followers on matters pertaining to their needs and the overall goal and mission.

#### **5.3.13 Principle 13 – Associates’ Reflection of the Leader’s Leadership Orientation**

The disciples came to Jesus out of concern for the crowd. They had concluded that it was late and that the crowd was hungry:

- The leader creatively ensures associates reflect his leadership orientation
- The leader develops the fora for associates to have no inhibitions in making proactive suggestions to the leader on matters pertaining to their mission.

#### **5.3.14 Principle 14 – Accessibility and Receptiveness are Vital Values of a Leader**

The disciples were direct and instructional in their words to Jesus, in such a highly stratified socio-cultural context. For Jesus not to have rebuffed those words or rebuked them for it suggests the kind of humble and tolerant leader he was:

- Humility and receptiveness must be part of the leader’s personal character expression and leadership approach.

#### **5.3.15 Principle 15 – Developing Associates’ Creativity and Capacity with Challenging Task**

Jesus responds: ‘You give them something to eat’ (δότε αὐτοῖς ὑμεῖς φαγεῖν):

- Challenging associates with seemingly difficult tasks must be part of a leader's capacity building strategy for the associates.

### ***5.3.16 Principle 16 – Facing Reality with Associates Regarding the Task of the Leadership in Meeting the Needs of Followers***

Jesus' response does not amount to absurdity or confusion but rather a wise interactional framing which keeps the disciples from going hay-wire in their thinking and returns them to the framework of the functionality of a shepherd:

- The leader must be honest with associates on the burden of leadership, particularly in meeting the needs of followers.
- The leader consistently keeps associates within the framework of their common mission and vision by guiding their thinking.
- The leader grows associates to see the needs of followers as their burden, work to find solutions and not merely describe problems.

### ***5.3.17 Principle 17 – Modelling Leadership Orientation to Associates***

By their response, the disciples created the impression that it was beyond them, that it was not their task. Unlike Jesus, perhaps, they had not defined themselves as shepherds yet (c.f. Acts 2:42, 45-46; 6:1-3). Jesus' interactional approach clearly was to model being a shepherd to the disciples:

- The leader models his or her leadership orientation to the associates.

### ***5.3.18 Principle 18 – Defying the Odds to Meet the Needs of Followers and Realise the Mission***

The gestures of movement and finding out on the part of the disciples create the impression of the effort a shepherd makes in feeding the flock:

- The leader goes against odds and defies impossibilities to meet the needs of the followers.

### ***5.3.19 Principle 19 – Turning the Few into Many***

Five loaves and two fishes are significant to their performance as shepherds. By this front, the disciples were to understand that meeting the needs of the flock is based on resources available to you as a shepherd:

- The leader's ingenuity turns the few into many for the good of all followers
- The leader draws on the limited available resource to make a difference and need not wait for wishful plenty resources before acting.

### ***5.3.20 Principle 20 – Hospitality is a Necessary Virtue of the Leader.***

When the people sat down Jesus assumed the position of a host (shepherd) offering a banquet to his guests:

- The leader's hospitality generates excitement among followers. It makes them feel welcomed, valued and cared for.

### ***5.3.21 Principle 21- Generation of Hope and Excitement among Followers***

While the reclining frame created an impression to the crowd of submission, relaxation and calming effect, and relief; it most importantly created an impression of expectation in the crowd - hence faith.

- The leader creates a sense of hope and expectation among followers.

### **5.3.22 Principle 22 – Creating a Sense of Equality and Interconnectedness among Followers**

The frame of sitting in groups of hundred and fifty conveys an impression of interconnectedness, being at the same level, facilitation of assistance, fellowship – a new kind of communion and community:

- The leader creates among the followers a sense of interconnectedness and bond amongst them which become a support system for the followers.

### **5.3.23 Principle 23- Creating System to Carry Vision and Mission**

The frame of sitting in groups of hundred and fifty builds first of all, framework for the implementation of the vision of the shepherd:

- The leader is defined by the systems or framework he or she creates to carry out his or her vision and mission.

### **5.3.24 Principles 24 – The God Factor in Leadership**

With the gesture of looking up to heaven ((ἀναβλέψας εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν) Jesus creates the impression of communion or interaction with God (the divine). This impression was to communicate to the disciples and even the crowd that God is the key interlocutor when it comes to meeting the needs of the sheep in the kingdom:

- The Christian leader involves God in all things knowing that he has to be successful on two counts: be successful with God and successful with the people.

### **5.3.25 Principle 25 – Team Approach in Getting Things Done**

The interactional strategy of giving the bread and the fishes to the disciples (καὶ ἐδίδου τοῖς μαθηταῖς) to set before the crowd (παρατιθῶσιν αὐτοῖς) is instructional. Jesus by this gesture,

fosters an impression of team effort (Mk. 3:25-26), delegation and division of labour in the provision of the needs of the sheep or the crowd and today's audience of the Gospel of Mark:

- The leader constitutes himself and his or her associates into a formidable team wherein delegation and team assignment can take precedence.

#### **5.3.26 Principle 26 – Every Follower Matter**

Even more importantly is that πάντες (all), which suggests absence of discrimination:

- The leader avoids discrimination and treats all associates and followers equally and fairly.

#### **5.3.27 Principle 27 – Judicious Use of Resources**

An impression of avoidance of waste of resources and preservation is also created. One may even stretch the impression to purity and cleanliness, not leaving the place defiled after meals:

- The leader is judicious in the use of resources and ensures his or her associates and followers are not wasteful of these resources.

#### **5.3.28 Principle 28 – Connecting the Present State of Affairs and the Better Future**

The disciples see the role of a shepherd between scarcity and abundance for the sheep:

- The leader is the connecting factor of the present state of affairs and the common desired future of the followers, for example from scarcity to abundance; poverty to riches.

#### **5.3.29 Principle 29 – Records Critical for Planning**

Again, the social interactions use of statistics in this narrative from five loaves and two fishes, groups of hundreds and fifties to five thousand men foster an impression of records keeping which is critical to leadership:

- The leader keeps good records of all happenings regarding the fulfilment of his vision and mission.

### **5.3.30 Principle 30 – Reality of Opponents and Opposition to Mission and Vision**

Jesus and his disciples perhaps anticipated what this combination of Pharisees and Scribes will be up to - confrontation and accusation:

- The leader takes note of opponents and opposition to his or her mission and vision and cannot afford to be distracted by them

### **5.3.31 Principle 31 – Opponents and Cynics Come with a Strategy**

συνάγονται πρὸς αὐτὸν (gather together toward him), the Pharisees and the Scribes gathering together signalled to Jesus a purposeful formidable team of opposition:

- The leader never underrates the scheming of opponents and knows that opponents will always join forces with others of similar intent against him or her and the vision and mission he carries.

### **5.3.32 Principle 32 – Culture and Leadership have Reciprocal Relationship**

Jesus also uses the generalised other employed by the Pharisees and the Scribes in verse five but he draws on the prophetic tradition, Isaiah 29:13:

- The leader understands the culture of the people he leads, in fact, he must demonstrate superior knowledge in it.

### **5.3.33 Principle 33 – Answering Critics and Opponents**

Jesus responds through characterisation, first with individual characterisation. He called them hypocrites:

- The leader answers his critics and opponents with insights and great wisdom to disable their front.

#### ***5.3.34 Principle 34 – Keeping an Eye on the Opponents and Critics***

It means while the Pharisees and the Scribes were observing Jesus and his disciples (see 7:2, 5), Jesus on the other hand was observing them:

- The leader keeps an eye on what critics and opponents are doing in order to answer appropriately and foil their schemes.

#### ***5.3.35 Principle 35 – Challenging Opponents with Facts then a Riposte***

The Pharisees and the Scribes are actually what Isaiah prophesied against, and he produces a riposte, a counter accusation against them:

- The leader challenges opponents with facts and a riposte to silence them.

#### ***5.3.36 Principle 36 – Dealing with Opponents***

‘You have a fine way of rejecting the commandment of God’ (Καλῶς ἀθετεῖτε τὴν ἐντολὴν τοῦ θεοῦ) – this accusation connotes routine performance on the part of the Pharisee. That is to say, rejecting the commandment of God in a beautiful way (cunningly done) had become their routine performance. The performance of Jesus in this interaction fosters an impression of courageous and forthright person:

- The leader is courageous and forthright in dealing with opposition and critics.

#### ***5.3.37 Principle 37 – Articulating the Laws and Traditions of the Land***

The personal front Jesus presented in his interaction expresses deep knowledge of both the law and the tradition:

- The leader articulates the laws and traditions of the land with distinction.

### ***5.3.38 Principle 38 – Exposing the Opponents***

Perhaps Jesus' charges against the Pharisees and the Scribes were to create the impression to the Pharisees and the Scribes that they were actually saboteurs of the commandment of God. As such they were unjustified in equating the traditions of men, in fact, their own traditions, to the commandment of God:

- The leader exposes all underlying intents, systems and schemes that govern the operations of his or her opponents.

### ***5.3.39 Principle 39 – Taking Charge of the Opposition and the Criticism***

By not responding to or challenging Jesus' counter charges, the Pharisees and the Scribes had changed their earlier manner of wanting to control the interaction to a manner which makes them followers of Jesus in the interaction:

- The leader is sharp and broad in knowledge so as to be able to lead even his critics and opponents with sound intellectual argument.

### ***5.3.40 Principle 40 – Protecting Associates***

In his entire interaction with the Pharisees and the Scribes (7:5-13) in the narrative, Jesus both responded to their charges, and consciously defended his disciples:

- The leader protects and defends his or her associates and followers.

### ***5.3.41 Principle 41 – Preserving the Right Tradition***

Jesus absolved them (his disciples) of any break of tradition, as he was more concerned with superior tradition that is the commandments of God and their unadulterated interpretation:

- The leader helps associates and followers identify the right traditions and to know how to preserve them as they discard wrong traditions.

#### **5.3.42 Principle 42 – Empowering the Inner Caucus**

The setting of a house creates the impression of a more inner caucus discussion. In this case, details that should not be available to the opponents and the crowd were to be made available to them (the disciples).

- The leader consciously raises an inner caucus or associates he personally teaches, whom he empowers with exposure to the unparalleled insights about the establishment, and entrusts the deep things of the establishment, so they advance it in his absence.

#### **5.3.43 Principle 43 – Continuous Instruction of Associates**

The disciples asking for further instruction once again creates the impression of lack of understanding and this continuously depicts them as learners:

- The leader continues to instruct and equip his or her associates till they attain the measure of knowledge and skill he or she desires them to.

#### **5.3.44 Principle 44: Public Image of the Leader**

The use of the parable (τὴν παραβολήν) by Jesus in interactions is not merely a literary and rhetorical device but a major social interactional tool with which Jesus seeks to foster an impression of himself as a wise person – one deep in knowledge and apt in the tradition and the culture of the people:

- The leader of necessity demonstrates deep and versatile knowledge about life and culture in order to be a resource person and a point of reference to associates and followers.

#### **5.3.45 Principle 45 – The Leader as a Reference Point**

- The leader positions himself or herself as a consultant on many issues to the associates and the followers.

#### **5.3.46 Principle 46 – The Leader’s Oratory Prowess**

The parables depicted Jesus as enigmatic and created insatiable longing in the crowd for more as they lived in a dispensation where orators were highly celebrated.

- The leader is as good as his ability to communicate; associates and followers should aspire to be like him.

#### **5.3.47 Principle 47 – Challenging Associates and Followers**

‘Then are you also without understanding?’ (Οὕτως καὶ ὑμεῖς ἀσύνετοί ἐστε); employing this inquisition in the interaction, Jesus creates an impression that he is surprised at them, even disappointed and that they have not met his expectation.

- The leader challenges his or her associates and followers to go beyond themselves and do more to be competent.

#### **5.3.48 Principle 48 – Confronting Associates and Followers**

The question, further fosters an impression of demand on the disciples to come to a point of self-awareness and to know that they were under performing intellectually:

- The leader confronts his or her associates and followers with their under-performance where necessary.

#### **5.3.49 Principle 49 – Setting High Standard for Associate**

Clearly, it creates an impression of a demand for more from them by Jesus, they should be ahead of the crowd in terms of matters concerning the kingdom:

- The leader is intentional in raising standards for associates for they are the next generation of leaders.

#### ***5.3.50 Principle 50 – Replication of a Leader’s Orientation***

Speaking to the crowd in parables and explaining same to the disciples in private including giving more details is a gesture Jesus used, which creates the impression of a leader empowering his associates, replicating himself in them and entrusting to them his heartfelt convictions:

- The leader as a matter of necessity creatively replicates his or her orientation in his or her associates by consistent interactions and instructions.

#### ***5.3.51 Principle 51 – Air of Importance***

The interaction routine of private instruction after public lecture must probably have created a feeling of importance among the disciples:

- The leader creates a feeling of importance among associates to enhance their commitment and loyalty.

#### ***5.3.52 Principle 52 – Morality***

The impression this symbolism creates is that what matters most is what goes into the heart because that stays and contributes to the formation of what comes from the heart that is what defiles a person:

- The leader maintains a high standard of morality, expects and enforces same among associates.

### ***5.3.53 Principle 53 – Attention on the Heart***

Jesus by this interactional approach creates the impression that the human heart is a seat of evil, defilement and cleanliness so must be watched:

- The leader pays attention to what he sustains in his or her heart in order to avoid setbacks and scandals. He or she encourages his or her associates and followers to do same.

### ***5.3.54 Principle 54 – Expanding the Frontiers of Tradition Limits***

The choice of setting as noted earlier (Ch. 2.2.1.5) is determined by the kind of impression the performer wants to foster. When the choice of this setting is aligned with Josephus' (Ap. 1.70) description of Tyre that the Tyrians were notoriously Israel's bitterest enemies. We are led to the conclusion that Jesus sought to create the impression of courage, adventure and a barrier-breaker with his choice of Tyre and Sidon as his interactional setting:

- The leader wisely and courageously expands the frontiers of traditional limits and thus becomes a barrier breaker.
- The leader expands his or her scope of influence by reaching the unreached.

### ***5.3.55 Principle 55 – Rewriting the Negative Narrative***

In a Gentile territory, following immediately after Mark 7:1-23, Jesus was fostering an impression of redefining and breaking the frontiers of traditional cleanliness:

- The leader seeks and works in creative ways to make changes which rewrite and turn negative narratives into positive.

### ***5.3.56 Principle 56 – Reaching Out to those whom Tradition Ostracises***

Though not explicitly stated, it can be argued rightly that Jesus' presence on a gentile territory was to tell all who will be in the social situation with him that his mission had no traditional

barriers neither was it limited to Jews. Since the choice of a setting is a deliberate activity, Jesus obviously had interactional agenda going into the region of Tyre and Sidon:

- The leader shows leadership by reaching out to and welcoming all even those who alienated by traditions, social systems, traditional leadership and organisational culture.

### **5.3.57 Principle 57 – Strategic Moves to Unchartered Area.**

Yet in this setting he ‘would not have any one know it’ (οὐδένα ἤθελεν γινῶναι). That is Jesus enters the community with a manner, (see Ch. 2.2.2.1.5; manner is those stimuli which function at the time to warn us of the interactional role the performer will expect to play in the on-coming situation). This suggests he wants to lie low, a humble disposition:

- The leader makes strategic moves to reach unchartered territories.
- The leader sometimes takes the background and lowly position to observe

### **5.3.58 Principle 58 – Friendship Disposition**

‘Entering a house’ is an interactional gesture which creates an impression of ‘I am opened for friendship’, ‘I feel comfortable here’ and ‘this place is my home too’:

- The leader positions himself or herself as a friend first for others to respond.

### **5.3.59 Principle 59 – Relevance and Resourcefulness of the Leader**

‘Yet he could not be hid’ (καὶ οὐκ ἠδυνήθη λαθεῖν), this is a familiar line in Mark’s narrative (1:45; 2:1; 3:20; 6:31). Interactionally, this creates the impression that Jesus is a welcoming person who will not drive away anyone who come to him. Similarly, it fosters the impression that, the one (leader) who has something relevant to offer to others cannot hide, he or she would be sought after:

- The leader positions himself or herself in practice as one who has something relevant to offer and when people have engaged him, they return with results.

#### **5.3.60 Principle 60 – The Leader as a Solution**

- The leader helps followers solve problems, finds answers to questions and a way out of life's puzzles.

#### **5.3.61 Principle 61 – Earning and Commanding Respect as a Leader**

The gesture of falling at Jesus' feet is a ritual that reflected the macro patron-client system. By this, the woman fosters an impression of a client, respect of, submission to and dependence on Jesus Christ. She further creates the impression that she acknowledges the Lord's authority over and control of her:

- The true leader is naturally respected and submitted to by others through his or her influence not necessarily his or her position.

#### **5.3.62 Principle 62 – Being All Things to All People**

Jesus countenancing and sustaining interaction with an 'outsider and an unworthy' person, reveals him as non-discriminatory on the basis of gender and race, and an impression of accepting all is created with this gesture of his:

- The leader ascends and descends to everyone's level, and tries to identify with everyone's level and status.

#### **5.3.63 Principle 63 – Followers' Confidence in the Leader**

It can be gleaned from her plea that she characterised Jesus as powerful, a healer and an exorcist and as such mightier than herself. And she plainly implied an acceptance and believe in Jesus' ministry and mission:

- A leader is received according to what followers see him or her do. Followers will go to a leader for what they perceive he or she can offer.
- The true leader is the one followers believe in that he or she can deliver.

#### ***5.3.64 Principle 64 – Challenging Abusive and Discriminatory Stereotypes***

Jesus shows knowledge of existing stereotypes of the Jewish people against Gentiles.

- The leader creatively challenges and works at abusive, demeaning and discriminatory stereotypes and prejudices among followers and others, on the path of achieving his or her mission and vision.

#### ***5.3.65 Principle 65 – Followers' Faith in the Leader***

Using processing encounter, Jesus intended the woman to merit her request, or at least transcend beyond those traditional stereotypes. Here, Jesus as a gatekeeper (decider), his most important indicator will be the woman's faith in him, a Jewish religious leader:

- Followers' faith in the leader is critical for the leadership success
- The leader ensures associates merit their demands by challenging their long held views with new insights.

#### ***5.3.66 Principle 66 – Committing to Responsibility and Keeping an Open Mind on Right***

He further with his response, fosters the impression that he is the sole decider as to whether her request will be granted or not, he is the one to take the 'children's' bread and throw it to the 'dogs'. As it were, Jesus was fully aware of his right and his responsibility:

- The leader lives in constant awareness of his rights and responsibilities, commits to responsibilities and keeps an open mind on his right for they come under consistent scrutiny anytime and at any place.

### **5.3.67 Principle 67 – Following the Leader’s Lead**

Employing a meek, apologetic manner, the Syrophenician woman gives the impression that she wants to follow the lead of Jesus:

- The leader gets others to willingly follow his or her lead even when he or she is not in the position of authority and power.

### **5.3.68 Principle 68 – Going Beyond Human Barriers to Act for Human Good**

Though Jesus began processing the woman’s performance in the interaction from a Jewish position. Though one may call it a position of bias, he will not allow that to influence his decision. It was not about where the woman was coming from, it was about what the woman believed, that is the very essence of Jesus’ ministry - believe in God and submission to him. His interactional processing of the woman creates the impression of impartiality to, fairness and equity for all:

- The leader defies human artificial barriers to act for the good of fellow humans
- A leader resists the lures of cultural partiality and delivers fairness, and equity and just judgement in all matters.

### **5.3.69 Principle 69 – Acknowledging Followers**

Consequently, he affirms and commends her, ‘for this saying’. He goes on to assure her ‘you may go your way’:

- The leader acknowledges and motivates the efforts of followers by using words of affirmation and commendation.

### **5.3.70 Principle 70 – The Power of the Leader’s Words**

He (Jesus) concludes with an audacious declaration of hope, ‘the demon has left your daughter’.

- The leader's words inspire hope and deliver confidence to followers.

### **5.3.71 Principle 71 – Connecting Words and Action – Integrity**

The emphatic statement, 'the demon has left your daughter' creates an impression which affirms the woman's earlier characterisation of Jesus as powerful, a healer, an exorcist and a mightier one.

- A leader's words and action (character) must connect to justify the positive aspirations and belief followers have in him or her.

### **5.3.72 Principle 72 – Credibility Issues of the Leader**

Upon realising this, her confidence and faith in the Lord grew stronger and the credibility and the fame of the Lord obviously increased on the Gentile land. This creates the impression that Jesus indeed was powerful and caring:

- The leader's promises and declarations are fulfilled.
- The leader demonstrates care at all times and in all circumstances.

### **5.3.73 Principle 73 – Personal Interest and Personal Agenda of Followers**

They came to Jesus with a front of a team, which means they have been to the back region and rehearsed (planned) the single impression they were going to foster on Jesus:

- The leader must be conscious of the fact that followers always have behind their request of him or her pre-conceived intent.

### **5.3.74 Principle 74 – The Real Intention**

Καὶ προσπορεύονται αὐτῷ (and they came up to him), this social interaction implies a motive and intention, meaning the interaction with Jesus was planned, not a coincidence, to achieve something:

- Followers' true motives are hidden until the leader probes their request.

#### **5.3.75 Principle 75 – The Leader's Ability**

Again, this requests presumes Jesus' capacity to do everything they asked of him; an expression of confidence in Jesus' ability is created here:

- The leader carries out his or her function in such a way that followers believe in his or her ability to make things happen.

#### **5.3.76 Principle 76 - Keeping an Eye on Followers**

However, it also creates an impression of attempted abuse of Jesus' acts of kindness and mercy, because they had never seen him turn people away with their request hence their opened-ended request:

- The leader maintains vigilance to pick up signs whenever followers want to take advantage of him or her in whichever way possible particularly concerning his or her leadership approach.

#### **5.3.77 Principle 77 – Probing Followers Intentions**

"What do you want me to do for you?" (Τί θέλετέ με ποιήσω ὑμῖν). The question meant that Jesus was not in any hurry to make a promise or commit:

- The leader probes intentions and is in no hurry to commit to proposals or give promise to things without first clarifying to gain full understanding.

#### **5.3.78 Principle 78 – Firmness of the Leader**

By this, he fosters an impression to James and John as one who cannot be taken for granted despite his kindness:

- The leader carries himself or herself in a friendly but firm manner such that followers may know they cannot take him or her for granted.

**5.3.79 Principle 79 – Tolerance as a Critical Virtue for Dealing with Followers**

It portrays him as one who will not commit to anything without first clarifying. And by extension, one who will not dismiss you without first understanding your point of view or your need:

- The leader is patient and tolerant with followers to understand their concerns before acting. He or she rarely dismisses followers without hearing them.

**5.3.80 Principle 80 – Keeping an Eye on Close Associates and Family**

Which is most likely informed by their closeness to Jesus, being a part of the inner circle and emboldened by Jesus' words that the disciples will judge the twelve tribes of Israel:

- The leader knows and is alert to close associates' penchant to exploit their relationship for personal gains and gain leverage over others.
- The leader knows that associates and followers will like to exploit what he or she says so he or she carefully weighs his or her pronouncements.

**5.3.81 Principle 81 – Use of Discretionary Powers**

Per their interactional persuasive appeal they seek to foster an impression which will elicit a response from Jesus involving using his discretion to favour them.

- The leader passes the temptation of using discretion arbitrarily to favour one against the other.

### **5.3.82 Principle 82 – Associates Lobby**

Yet by the content of their request, an impression beyond their mere ambition is created, they are better qualified and know exactly the thrones of which they are worthy:

- The leader is wary of associates and followers as they lobby for positions and offices not necessarily due them.

### **5.3.83 Principle 83 – Institutional Knowledge of the Leader**

This statement interactionally sought to challenge James and John to rethink their request, in other words the impression they had fostered on Jesus. It creates the impression of Jesus as one who knows and on top of the issues being raised by the two brothers. At the same time it points to the ignorance of their performance as a team:

- The leader shows thorough knowledge of the institution or the establishment so he or she is not misled or fooled by any associate or follower.

### **5.3.84 Principle 84 – Guiding the Thoughts of Associates and Followers**

Jesus uses the control and direction device to bring the two disciples along to discover what they should have known before their ambitious request:

- The leader seizes every opportunity to help associates and followers to know what is right and do right regarding the institution, the vision and the mission.

### **5.3.85 Principle 85 – Helping Associates and Followers to Rethink their Position**

Here Jesus continues the interaction in his new frame challenging the two brothers first to discover the cup he Jesus drinks and second, to assess themselves whether they would be able to drink of it:

- The leader creatively engages associates and followers to rethink their positions when they are not tenable pertaining to the institutional structure or the mission and vision.

### **5.3.86 Principle 86 – Keeping to Agreed Processes and Procedures**

By this, Jesus fosters an impression which suggests sitting on thrones does not come easy. It costs, and it exacts sacrifice and suffering first, meaning, to ascend you must have paid the price through descent first:

- The leader is intentional in preventing associates and followers from circumventing processes or procedures but encourages them to pay the high price of following them for it is the right thing to do.

### **5.3.87 Principle 87 – Disclosing both the Blessing and the Cost**

Jesus by this symbol is graphically revealing to them the overwhelming nature of suffering to be experienced first. James and John being Jews know from their generalised other that baptism is about immersion. An impression is thus created that the price to pay can be submerging:

- The leader gives full disclosure of demands of the establishment on associates and followers for their promotion or increase. The lines of progression should be made clear to all.

### **5.3.88 Principle 88 – Truth in Leadership**

Though the response will surprise James and John it creates an impression of Jesus as a forthright person:

- The leader states the absolute truth in all things and at all times before his or her associates and followers.

### **5.3.89 Principle 89 – Staying Within the Limit of Authority**

One who knows the limits of his authority as well as one who is candid and not given to bragging to impress anyone:

- The leader knows the limits of his or her authority and must function strictly within them.

### ***5.3.90 Principle 90 – Compromising the Rule on Personal Grounds***

By this response Jesus puts up the front of one who is not prepared to bend the rules to favour cronies and close family members:

- The leader maintains a high level of integrity with the application of rules and principles without allowing family ties and cronies to compromise him or her.

### ***5.3.91 Principle 91 – Anticipating Future Danger***

Such indignation obviously creates an impression on Jesus that there could be potential conflicts in his absence in the future, and again, that selfish ambitions still reigned among them (the disciples):

- The leader deals with any signs of negative emotions, wrong priorities and wrong ambitions or anything that will break the front of associates or followers now and in the future.
- The leader is farsighted so is able to anticipate future threats and dangers and puts in place interventions to avert them.

### ***5.3.92 Principle 92 – Dealing with Potential Sources of Conflict among Associates and Followers***

It also created the impression that their struggle for rank and precedence could lead to wrongful exercise of authority for personal gains, and by so doing follow the wrong example of the gentile leaders. An impression of broken trust and seeds of discord sown cannot be discounted.

- The leader pays attention to group dynamics in order to identify group tension and uproots it before it diffuses group energy and creates cracks within the team.

- The leader consciously assuages the struggle for power and recognition among associates.
- The leader carefully whittles away the feeling of self-importance and self-interest over team importance and collective interest among associates and followers.

### ***5.3.93 Principle 93 – Regrouping the Team***

By calling them together, Jesus obviously was creating an impression of rebuilding broken trust, and uprooting seeds of discord, if any. It was also to forge an impression of one people and a team:

- The leader, whenever there is perceived or actual tension among the team takes immediate steps to regroup the team, refocuses it and rebuilds trust to maintain group energy to accomplish the common mission and vision.

### ***5.3.94 Principle 94 – The Leader as a Unifier***

At a personal level with this interactional approach, Jesus presents himself to them as one who cares about unity and deals with issues when they arise:

- The leader always seeks unity in the team or the establishment and presents himself or herself as unifier.

### ***5.3.95 Principle 95 – Re-Energising the Team of Associates or Followers***

Significantly, this interactional approach was to reinvigorate energy, rev morale and build fresh emotional energy which obviously might have waned through the request of the two and the subsequent indignation of the ten:

- The leader holds himself or herself responsible for the emotional energy and morale of the team or the establishment, so acts swiftly to reinvigorate the team's energy whenever there are signs of decline.

#### ***5.3.96 Principle 96 – The Core Tenets of Leadership Philosophy***

Given that previously (Mark 8:34; 9:35), upon a similar incidence, when they had debated greatness, Jesus called them together and gave an instruction on self-renunciation, service and even martyrdom. This call perceptibly would have created an impression of expectation of a lecture on a similar subject, which becomes the new frame for the later interaction:

- The leader uses any opportunity to re-establish the core tenets of his or her leadership orientation, for example self-renunciation, service and even martyrdom in the realisation of the vision and mission.

#### ***5.3.97 Principle 97 – The Leadership Culture of Establishment***

Interactionally, this speech creates an impression for the disciples to avoid the leadership style of the Gentiles, and adopt a new leadership culture. Moreover, it carries with it the impression of a new paradigm for the now and the future, for the specific leadership situation and for the generic at the same time:

- The leader defines himself or herself by his leadership culture and he or she is responsible for the leadership culture of the team and the establishment, so he creatively builds a leadership culture for the establishment to ensure the smooth achievement of the vision and mission.

#### ***5.3.98 Principle 98 – Jesus' Leadership Culture***

This symbolism fosters the impression that a leader is with a servant mindset and servant attitude not necessarily doing the meaner jobs:

- Jesus' leadership culture works with the leader having a servant-slave mindset in his or her function and evinces same in his or her attitude and every day actions.

### ***5.3.99 Principle 99 – The Leader's Commitment***

By this, Jesus creates the impression that the leader is the property of those he or she serves.

He has ceded his or her right to the service to which he or she is engaged:

- The leader's level of commitment is at the level he or she sees himself or herself sold out to the good of the people he or she leads.

### ***5.3.100 Principle 100 – The Leadership Task and Personal Interest***

The leader's personal interest is subsidiary to the interest of the people he serves:

- The leader always puts personal interest secondary to the interest of the people he or she leads.

### ***5.3.101 Principle 101 – The Leadership Task and the People***

Furthermore, the 'all' category fosters the impression of non-discriminatory service irrespective of gender, race and age:

- The leader strives to serve all without any discrimination.

### ***5.3.102 Principle 102 – Foundations of Jesus' Leadership Philosophy***

In effect, Jesus creates an impression of a new leadership philosophy defined by service, self-renunciation, and self-giving to the goals and aspirations of the people the leader leads.

- Jesus' leadership philosophy is defined by service, self-renunciation, and self-giving even to the point of martyrdom to the goals and aspirations of the people the leader leads.

### **5.3.103**      *Principle 103 – Destiny of the Leader*

In the use of the ‘Son of Man’ metaphor Jesus creates the impression to the disciples that he their Teacher, Lord and leader is a servant. Service is thus the destiny of the ‘Son of Man’:

- Sincere service is the destiny of the leader.

### **5.3.104**      *Principle 104 – The Epitome of Leadership Task*

The impressions Jesus creates with his last speech in the leadership instruction frame is that he lays down his life for the people he serves.

- The leader makes extreme sacrifices not precluding death for the people he or she leads.

## **5.4 Social Interactional Leadership Model**

Social Interactional Leadership Model orates a humane leadership, which is effectively delivered through conscious dynamic social interactions with followers. It employs all social interactional techniques particularly using gestures, bodily movement, words, role-taking and settings among others to deliberately create impression of leadership which influences the followers to the goal.

Social Interactional Leadership Model promotes a kind of leadership which is people-centred and characterised by service, self-renunciation and self-giving to the needs of the led that is the vision and mission. In effect, the leader shares his life with others, he or she is unrestrained fighting for the common good. Its presupposition is that leadership is not superficial but a practical social phenomenon in essence; so it is lived out in the normal everyday life. Through the social interaction a bond of strong relationship is created between the leader and the followers which constitutes them into a team.

## **5.5 Summary**

The chapter situated Jesus in his macro socio-cultural context, it was established that his reception as the Son of God and Son of Man are not mere Christological titles but more significantly, leadership categories. It was noted that these titles carried sociological functions, which functions were leadership in nature in the Jew context. Functioning as a leader at micro level through his daily interaction with ordinary people, women, Pharisees and the Scribes and his own disciples offered a window to observe him in a thorough examination in the previous chapter.

The chapter proceeded to outline the leadership principles gleaned from such interactions in the four passages: Mark 6:30-44; 7:1-23; 7:24-30 and 10:35-35 as analysed in the previous chapter. In all 104 leadership principles were gleaned from the four interactions. These interactional leadership principles form the foundation for a theoretical social interactional leadership model, which in the next chapter is looked at in terms of implications on good leadership practice in Ghana.

## CHAPTER SIX

### SUMMARY, RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSION OF THE STUDY

#### 6. Introduction

The problem of discovering the underlying nuances in the social interactions of Jesus, which contribute to understanding his leadership and provide resources for African leaders in terms of performativity to enhance leadership delivery (see Ch 1.1), receives attention here. From the standpoint of the Akan traditional notion of leadership under the controlling heuristic lens of Social Interactional observation, this study has been delivered as both a social interactional reading of Jesus' leadership and an Africanization of Jesus' leadership values and principles.

The result is that some performed leadership principles of Jesus, which are woven within his interactions have been meticulously garnered and stated in chapter five. These principles make it compelling for the final phase to discuss them as a treasured reference point for leadership realignment. It is the case that leadership is a contextual issue for Jesus, who does not see leadership as an episode of life, but a way of life. Rather than putting on his cloak as a leader in the temple or at leadership seminars or while performing an official function, he chose to live it out through his daily activities. Leadership thus, should be received as an everyday life affair which must be lived out naturally and suffuse every action or inaction of a person in leadership. Such consciousness caused him to offer a leadership identity which, from an empirical perspective, does not only portend as a standard measure for leadership in practice but also a challenge to current leadership being experienced at all levels and in all aspects of the Ghanaian society.

The Chapter's focus of promoting the Jesus-performed leadership principles is critical, for many more people are developing the ambition to becoming effective leaders and the populace is growing restless and anxious by the day to experience good leadership. Good leadership will

involve a move beyond the present practice of leadership into something more ambitious, more effective, more encompassing and more relevant.

As discussed in Chapter One (see Ch. 1.7.1) leadership in Africa (Ghana) is fraught with challenges. A quick survey will discover all across the Continent leadership issues of unequal and unjust order, satisfaction with mediocrity, gullibility to vague political promises, leaders fanning tribalism, nepotism and xenophobia, corruption, clamour for development assistance from the Western world, visionless leadership, and abuse of power and authority.

Rotberg (2004:14) has similar things to say, that “Africa has long been saddled with poor, even malevolent, leadership: predatory kleptocrats, military-installed autocrats, economic illiterates, and puffed-up posturers”. On the contrary, Jesus’ leadership principles offer reforms and social transformation, which begin from within a person (leader) and manifest in transforming the social structure from without for common good.

## **6.1 The Leadership Order of Jesus**

“To encourage the practice of leadership, one needs to discuss the possible range of ‘new orders of things’ and their potential consequences for the people involved” (Starratt 1993:3). This is what Jesus did through his social interactions (Mark 6:30-44; 7:1-23; 7:24-30; 10:35-45) discussing and modelling new orders of leadership to redirect the course of leadership practice. Jesus leadership trajectory is summarised below:

### **6.1.1 Leadership as Interactional and Relational Endeavour**

Jesus projects leadership basically as interaction and a relationship milieu controlled by mission and vision. He developed a relationship with his disciples (associates) and followers (the crowd) and paid special attention to them. By his decisions, choices and actions he created

a sense of respect for the associates and the followers building a unique sense of self-value and made them feel distinguished and cherished.

This leadership expression of Jesus agrees with the African worldview, which focuses on people and their dignity as of the highest significance. The focus is on the collective neighbourhood of mankind. (see Ch. 1.7). Being at the level of his followers was one of the unique characteristics of Jesus' leadership given the context of the highly stratified society he functioned in. His leadership skills, displayed through his interactions, powerfully glued his disciples and followers to himself, creating a strong bond of relationship between them. This resulted in associates and followers who, with humility, willingly submitted to him and even died for his cause. Jesus as a leader was not excluded from the people. This reflects the African notion of leadership that “good leadership in Africa always shares life to others” (Gumede 2017:717; see Ch. 1.7.1).

### **6.1.2 Leadership is Developing and Resourcing Associates**

Fundamental to Jesus' leadership orientation was directing the thoughts and actions of associates and followers to stay on the mission and vision of his leadership. He portrayed consistent education and empowerment of them with unparalleled insight. With respect to his mission and vision, he taught the associates and followers what will constitute the valuable and the right traditions and how to preserve them while discarding wrong traditions.

Marked by his empowerment approach, he continued to empower the associates through instruction till they attained the measure of knowledge and skill he required of them. He challenged them to go beyond themselves and do more to be competent. Just as he boldly challenged his opponents, so did he boldly confront his associates and followers with their mediocre standards and under-performance.

Jesus performed leadership by building the capacity and creativity of his associates. He challenged them to do what they had never thought of or ever imagined they could accomplish as a task. In this Jesus was reflected as a developer of leaders. He was intentional in raising the standards for associates, for to them, he would bequeath leadership for the next generation of the kingdom business. He was calling on them to replicate his leadership after he had left the leadership stage.

He seized every opportunity to guide the thoughts of associates and followers, pointing them to the right and doing right in the Kingdom of God. He brought his associates and followers to the point of rethinking their convictions, positions, and general orientation in order to adopt new ones meant to enhance the quality of their lives and improve their social impact. It was leading them to be their best selves (Manz 2005:96). In building them up, he took the associates and followers along the path of observing procedures and processes while eschewing circumventing these all important procedures and processes.

### **6.1.3 Leadership is Teamwork**

In the discharge of his leadership, Jesus created and inculcated team spirit among his disciples and consequently built in them the inclination toward team formation and team function. Jesus' leadership practice depicted effective team management. He paid attention to the group dynamics of this discipleship team in order to identify group tension and uproot it before it diffused group energy and created cracks among the team. The consequence was that he was able sense future threat like signs of negative emotions, wrong priorities and wrong ambitions to team stability; and he was able to diffuse them.

Jesus was swift to regroup the team, refocus it and rebuild trust among team members whenever he picked up signs of tension. Understanding himself as responsible for the emotional energy and morale of the team, he creatively reinvigorated the team's emotional energy whenever there were signs of decline. Jesus' leadership projects him as a leader who is a unifier. Teamwork and team leadership championed by Jesus is African. For instance, *Ubuntu* – a popular African cultural concept, has been noted earlier as a source of effective teamwork and in the spirit of *Ubuntu* teamwork, leadership replaces individual effort as the dynamic force for creativity. To the African, leadership is shared by all villagers or community members rather than a leadership invested in one person (see Ch. 1.7).

#### **6.1.4 Leadership is Caring and Being Compassionate**

Analysis of his interactions revealed a special attention paid to his associates and followers, hence his ability to identify their needs, which evoked his immediate interventions to address them. He positioned himself as a caring and proactive leader. Jesus did not only show care, he was compassionate to his followers, characterising him as a compassionate leader. A leadership marked by care and compassion was what he modelled in his interaction for the emulation and reflection of the disciples.

Caring and compassionate leadership are Africa values and sociality reality that Jesus advanced. African reality is construed and identified by such values as caring, reciprocity, sharing, compassion, hospitality, cohabitation, cooperation and tolerance (see Ch. 1.7). In other words this kind of leadership that Jesus promoted is to be found in the African cultural value system.

### **6.1.5 Leadership is Being Insightful and Knowledgeable**

Jesus demonstrated a leadership of insight categorised by in-depth understanding of both his associates and his followers in terms of their abilities and their development needs. This in-depth knowledge, coupled with his unparalleled knowledge about the kingdom of God provided a basis for his instructions to them. His depth of knowledge and resourcefulness distinguished him as a great leader. Jesus kept a public image of a leader with deep and versatile knowledge about life and culture. His mission and vision positioned him as a resource person and a point of reference to associates and followers, and even his opponents. It is said that a leader is as good as communication. Jesus' prowess in leadership oratory, without doubt, was one of his major strengths.

### **6.1.6 Leadership is Being Accessible and Receptive**

Jesus also displayed the leadership style of accessibility and receptiveness in his interactions. All manner of persons could approach him without him denying them audience. Obviously, Jesus' leadership model finds space in Africa where leadership is communal in nature (see Ch. 1.7).

### **6.1.7 Leadership is Meeting Needs and Solving Problems**

Jesus depicted himself in his interactions as a resourceful leader and a problem solver. For him, meeting the needs of the followers and associates was his task. He modelled this to them by defying the odds of scarcity to provide bread and fish for thousands of people in a desolate place. This kind of leadership exhibited in his interactions was laced with the mind-set of a shepherd – the sheep without understanding looks to the shepherd for food which the shepherd goes to every extent to provide.

Thus, Jesus was a shepherd-leader. In practical terms, he presented himself as one who had something relevant to offer and when people engaged him they returned with results. He sought

solutions to his followers' problems, found answers to questions and a way out of puzzles of life that followers had to deal with. By so doing he earned and commanded respect as a leader. Jesus was naturally respected and submitted to by others through his influence, not necessarily his position. In his leadership he exalted his responsibility to others above his right as a person. That defined him as a selfless leader.

#### **6.1.8 Leadership is Creativity and Ingenuity**

Jesus as a leader showed so much ingenuity in turning a few loaves into a major meal for thousands of people. That is to say making a difference with limited resources, which can be construed as creative leadership. In his leadership, Jesus gave himself to generating hope and expectation among his followers. And he created systems, implementation of which ensured equality and fairness, as well as the interconnectedness of his associates and followers.

#### **6.1.9 Leadership is Fairness, Equity and Justice**

Jesus' leadership avoided discrimination of persons – everyone was of equal importance to him. These tie in with the African value systems. They resonate with the essential principles of African leadership: humanity, harmony, respect, and integrity (see Ch. 1.7).

#### **6.1.10 Leadership is Judicious Use of Resources**

In his leadership, Jesus represented a judicious use of resources and insisted on it among his associates and followers.

#### **6.1.11 Leadership is Records Keeping**

In spite of the many things he had to deal with, Jesus meticulously kept statistical records of the happenings in his leadership in the fulfilment of his vision and mission.

#### **6.1.12 Leadership is Defeating Opponents and Critics with Wisdom, Knowledge and Intelligent Arguments**

Jesus understood leadership as a service which never lacks opponents and cynics who often frustrate efforts toward the realisation of missions and visions. His approach for dealing with

this inevitable leadership concern was to master religious values and rules, the culture and traditions of the people, and rules and principles that exist in the socio-cultural context of his leadership.

In a social context, which is arranged on honour and shame system, Jesus showed leadership in his consistent victory over the Pharisees and the Scribes in all religious and social debates. Not losing face before opponents increased his credibility among his associates and followers. He answered his critics and opponents with insights and great wisdom disabling them in the process. Jesus strategically kept an eye on his opponents and critics and as such was never found wanting before them. Rather, he challenged them with facts, and with riposte, he silenced his critics and opponents. He would counter-attack the opponents by exposing their misinterpretations, misjudgements and misdeeds.

For Jesus, leadership is not about self-satisfaction, it is about satisfying others. So he protected his associates and followers against the scathing attacks of the opponents. Jesus can be described as a courageous leader.

#### **6.1.13 Leadership as Being Ethically and Morally Upright**

Jesus showed, through his interaction, that leadership is a heart and a moral issue. He maintained a high standard of morality, which he also expected from, and enforced among his associates. He paid attention to what he sustained in his heart in order to avoid setbacks and scandals and encouraged his associates and followers to do same. Sincerity and genuineness characterised Jesus' leadership practice, which he demonstrated in his interactions. He would give full disclosure of demands of the kingdom of God on his associates and followers for their promotion or increase and remained truthful to them.

#### **6.1.14 Leadership is Being a Reformer or a Transformer**

Another distinguishing factor of leadership demonstrated by Jesus in his interactions is giving himself to reforming the social and traditional value system, traditional thinking and social action. He corrected defective traditional value systems, engineered a rethinking of traditional thought patterns and inspired new social action through his social action and interactional decisions. Jesus challenged traditional and long-held societal views with new insights. He wisely and courageously expanded the frontiers of traditional limits which served as barriers to the purpose of the kingdom of God. Thus, Jesus can be described as a reformer and barrier breaker leader for the common good.

In creative ways he made changes which rewrote and turned negative narratives that existed among the neighbours into positive narratives of acceptance of each other. Jesus' approach coalesces with Burn's notion of transforming leadership, which tries to elevate members' self-centred attitudes, values and beliefs to higher, altruistic attitudes, values and beliefs (Starrat 1993:7).

For Jesus, leadership is making a difference in the lives of those who the social system rejects or alienates. He personally reached out and welcomed those ostracised by traditions, suffered social systems alienation, traditional leadership rejection as well as organisational culture estrangement. Similarly, another significant leadership attitude demonstrated by Jesus is challenging and seeking reformation of negative social tendencies such as abusive, demeaning and discriminatory stereotypes and prejudices in the community. He defied human artificial barriers to act for the good of fellow humans. He showed leadership when he moved beyond the lures of cultural partiality and delivered fair, equal and just judgement in all matters.

### **6.1.15 Leadership is Advancing and Increasing Territorial Influence**

Jesus shows that leadership involves taking territories and making incursion into uncharted areas. He made strategic moves to reach out to unchartered territories in his leadership and religious influence. For instance, he projected a friendly disposition in a social setting deemed hostile by all for persons in that social setting to respond to him positively. Jesus can be said to be a conqueror-leader in a non-violent way. Jesus expanded the scope of influence by reaching the unreached, and by touching the untouched.

### **6.1.16 Leadership is Humility**

Jesus demonstrated humble leadership when he demystified leadership by condescending to the level of the everyday people at the fringes of society. His unique ability to shuffle between the elite and the non-elite, in essence, positioned him as a leader who is no respecter of status or class. To him, leadership must touch all. He met everyone at his or her own level.

### **6.1.17 Leadership is Producing Great Results**

Jesus lived out a leadership which exuded confidence to his associate and follower, hence achieving legitimacy of leadership and leadership credibility not by means of law but by means of interactional results. He was received according to what the followers heard him say and saw him do. This created a sense of trust and acceptance in them. As a true leader, the followers believed in what he offered and could offer them.

Followers' faith in the leader is critical for the leadership success. Jesus got his followers to follow his lead with such overwhelming success, to the extent that associates and followers died for his cause then and will die even today. Jesus indeed was a captivating leader.

### **6.1.18 Leadership is Being Credible and Motivational**

In his social interactions, Jesus presents himself as a credible leader. He ensured his words and actions (character) connected to make his words trustworthy. His words did not only connect

actions, they were powerful, inspiring hope and delivering confidence to the followers. His words and declarations were realised according to the way he made them. Jesus acknowledged the efforts of his followers by using words of affirmation and commendation whenever they had acted appropriately. He was a motivational leader. Nyiawung (2010:392, unpublished dissertation) has rightly observed that effective leaders are those who know their mission and vision, and consequently supervise the motivation of their following in such a way that they are not lured into error by their enthusiasm or because of pressure.

#### **6.1.19 Leadership is Good People Management**

The leadership of Jesus is expressed further in great people management skills in his social interactions. He kept his eyes on his associates and followers, because close associates and family members have the penchant to exploit their relationship for personal gains and gain leverage over others. With vigilance he was able to pick up signs whenever associates or followers wanted to take advantage of him or the system for personal gains in whichever way possible.

Personal interests or agenda of associates and followers coded in requests to him received his critical examination. By so doing his associates and followers' true motives, often hidden, was unravelled and he was able to avoid hurried commitment to their proposals, or promise things without first clarifying to gain full understanding.

#### **6.1.20 Leadership as Right Use of Power and Authority**

Malina, in arguing against the view that Jesus is a charismatic leader, maintained that Jesus did not exercise power over people but over demons, and he had impassioned loyalties on the part of his followers. For example one betrayed him, another denied him and the others fled from him in time of need (see Ch. 1.6.3).

On the contrary, Jesus exercised authority and power over people (Mark 6:7-13; 1:41; 10:14; 10:35-45) but in a more humane way. For Jesus, leadership is about the right use of power and authority. In his social interactions he avoided both repressive and permissive use of power and authority. Though he had authority and power, known to associates and followers, to make things happen, he carried in himself a friendly but firm manner in the use of his power and authority such that his associates and followers could not take him for granted. He demonstrated the critical virtue of tolerance in the use of power and authority but avoided the temptation of using discretionary power and authority arbitrarily to favour one against the others. Perhaps, he was successful in this regard because of his deep institutional knowledge of the Kingdom of God.

Staying within the limits of his authority is another feature of the leadership performance of Jesus in his interactions. He maintained a high level of integrity with the application of rules and principles without allowing family ties and cronies to compromise his authority or go beyond his authority.

#### **6.1.21 Leadership is in Orientation and Culture**

Perhaps the most important of Jesus' leadership model portrayed in his interaction is his leadership orientation and culture. He established the core tenets of his leadership orientation as a leadership of service, self-renunciation and self-giving even to martyrdom in the realisation of his vision and mission. His leadership philosophy operates with a leadership culture of a servant-slave mindset, which is evinced in every day leadership actions.

The leadership of Jesus agrees with the African worldview, which focuses on people and their dignity as of the highest significance. The focus is on the collective brotherhood of mankind (see Ch. 1.7). In this sense, the leader becomes the embodiment of the values to which the body

is committed, and to summon a common dedication to such orientation (Starratt 1993:5). This leadership orientation and culture demand very high level of commitment to the extent of seeing himself sold out as a bond-servant for the good of the people he led.

The implication is that he always had to treat his personal interest as secondary to the interest of the people he led. Sincere and priceless service thus, was the destiny of Jesus as the leader. He capped his leadership with laying down his life for the people he led. This is contrary to the kind of ecclesial leadership adopted today in Ghana, which is a fusion of traditional sacralised chieftaincy and the contemporary Chief Executive Officer model associated with secular politics and business organisations. Such leadership culture defeats the real essence of leadership (see Ch. 1.1).

## **6.2 The implications of Jesus' Leadership Principles for Good Leadership Practice**

The Jesus-performed leadership principles have several implications within the context of this study. They directly impact the various leadership challenges, which confront the African (Ghanaian) community. The point is, proper understanding and adoption of Jesus' leadership principles may provide resources for African (Ghanaian) leaders in terms of performativity in leadership to enhance leadership delivery. The call to adopt a new leadership approach has been made by O'Malley: The affirmation is brought about by the need to allow Africans to apply and adopt and adapt different leadership practices or styles to circumstances that are uniquely African (see Ch. 1.7.1).

### **6.2.1 The Call for Transparency and Accountability**

As stated in Chapter One, Van Zyl (2009:32), on African leadership cultural value system, holds that 'subordinates expect their leaders to display a heightened sense of ethics, fairness, transparency and accountability. Unfortunately, many leaders today fail to uphold these values'

(see Ch. 1.7.1). The wish of the subordinates find expression in the leadership Jesus prescribes which, maintains a high standard of morality, expects from, and enforces same among followers. The sincerity and genuineness Jesus proffers is to be fundamental to leadership delivery.

### **6.2.2 The Challenge of Poverty and Underdevelopment**

Ayittey (2005:402) is even more harsh and emphatic that “Africa is a mess: economically, politically, and socially. Despite Africa’s vast natural resources, its people remain mired in the deadly grip of poverty, squalor and destitution while buffeted by environmental degradation and brutal tyranny. Most Africans are worse off today than they were at independence in the 1960s”. Jesus from his leadership experience, puts forward the view that leaders must defy the odds to provide the needs of their followers.

From Jesus’ standpoint, there is urgent call for confident and creative leadership whose ingenuity turns the few into many, scarcity into abundance for the common good. While Jesus advocates for the leader to draw on the limited available resources (like trained human capital) to make a difference and not wait for wishful plenty resources before acting, he also calls for judicious use and preservation of resources in cases of abundance.

### **6.2.3 The Challenge of Dysfunctional Leadership**

It has been said in Ch. 1.7.1 that “African leaders have failed Africa. African intellectuals have failed, too. The failure is monumental...dysfunctional continent by wretched institutions and execrable leadership”. Jesus’ performed-leadership principles prescribe a leadership which builds systems and a framework to carry out the vision and mission. From Jesus’ perspective, leaders must see themselves as the connecting factor between the present life of the people and

the better life they seek. They must be resourceful enough to answer their questions and find solutions to their problems.

#### **6.2.4 Corruption Laden Leadership**

Another challenge confronting leadership in Africa (Ghana) is the problem of external influence, which is a critical issue connected with weak leadership suffused with challenges of corruption and so on (see Ch. 1.7.1). In place of corruption-laden leadership, from his performed leadership, Jesus recommends high standard of morality in leadership. Leaders are to exhibit it, expect from and enforce it among followers. The corollary of such moral leadership orientation will be judicious use of resources.

Given the endemic nature of corruption in Africa, Jesus' preference for a leadership in which leaders see themselves as reformers is most appropriate for Ghana. They challenge the status quo with new moral standards, new insights and knowledge and re-orient the thinking of society toward the high standards required of everyone.

#### **6.2.5 Privilege Oriented Leadership**

A unique bane of leadership in Africa (Ghana) is the fact that African leaders think more about the privileges of being in high office" (see Ch. 1.7.1). Arguably, Africa (Ghana) has privilege-oriented leadership rather than server-oriented leadership. The privilege-oriented leadership that Africa (Ghana) experiences is countered by the leadership orientation Jesus champions (see Ch. 5.3). His orientation suggestions that leadership must be hinged on service, self-renunciation and self-giving even to the point of death. This leadership paradigm, if adopted, can help demystify leadership and make African leaders more responsible.

### **6.3 Raising Leaders with New Orientation**

Mosango (2002:708) rightly maintains that Africa is faced with a challenge of nurturing and shaping new models of leadership not neglecting our Africa heritage. Jesus' approach to leadership holds the key to resolving this challenge. Jesus advocates conscious and continuous instruction, equipping and empowering of associates and followers to attain the measure of knowledge and skill based on the vision and mission and the leadership philosophy of the body.

It is incumbent on current leaders as a matter of necessity to creatively instill the right leadership orientation, which can deliver the vision and mission in associates through consistent interactions and instructions. O'Malley (2009:3, see Ch. 1.7.1) has suggested that it is time for Africa to produce leaders with the requisite capacity for high performance and moral impact to ensure that the people of the continent secure their fair share of opportunities in the twenty-first century.

### **6.4 Challenging the Status Quo of African Leadership**

The status quo of African leadership, except for few instances, is one which performs below expectation and is unable to deliver on promises. Leadership is sacralised among the African (Ghanaian) people. In the Ghanaian context, it lends itself to lordship and hierarchical relationships where leaders have a fixation for titles and big seats. Their kind of leadership is defined by pomp and pageantry. In many instances, followers are cowered to accept and shy away from openly critiquing the viewpoints of leaders to avoid victimisation and embarrassment.

Though, the accepted leadership outcome is one where leaders care for all followers without discrimination, however, in practical terms there is an unfortunate norm that leaders care for themselves and their immediate family members. Though the status quo is deeply entrenched,

Jesus' notion that leadership must be dynamic enough to diversify itself from positions and orientation that is inhumane such as lording it over people can reform it and produce a more relevant leadership status. It may be argued that the status quo of leadership in Africa (Ghana) can undergo complete revision with the adoption of Jesus' leadership philosophy: Service, Self-renunciation and serve-giving even to the point of death.

In effect, adopting Jesus' leadership orientation to the African (Ghanaian) context holds the possibility of delivering a leadership anchored in personal integrity, reform and social transformation, compassion and shepherding, empowering and building up, and confronting and re-ordering for the collective good of the people. Nyiawung (2010:391, unpublished dissertation) expressed a similar view that Jesus' leadership approach demonstrates that the most effective change and reform in a system is that which comes from within, and not from without.

## **6.5 Conclusion**

So far it has been established that the Gospel of Mark comes to us from a setting, which settings have been examine from three dimensions: historical, literary and social. The social setting and corresponding social scientific method examines the text and its social context from which meaning is generated. The social setting led the study to establish the social world of the New Testament paying particular attention to interactional groups, interactional models and interactional value system, which occupied the first century ancient Mediterranean biblical world. Source, Form and Redaction criticisms as discussed, individually help postmodern readers to form at least a mental picture of the pre-history of the text in terms of the sources employed, the forms assumed by the pre-Markan tradition and the editorial action that took place.

The study has sought to make a contribution on how leadership is conveyed through interaction by observing Jesus' interaction as performed in Mark's Gospel. In answering the question, 'how did Jesus interact'? It was found that Jesus is an expert in social interaction; he employed diverse interactional strategies.

Social interactionism analytical tools from Goffman and Mead made it plausible to re-imagine and observe Jesus as performed in the Gospel of Mark. By employing tools like Ritual making, Frame making, Characterisation, Encounter processing, Stage making and Role-taking to analyse the four selected passages (Mark 6:30-44; 7:1-23; 7:24-30; 10:35-45), it has been established that Jesus demonstrated great leadership principles in his everyday interaction.

In the Ghanaian traditional notion of leadership Jesus can be characterised as '*nyimpa*' and '*opanyin*'. For him, leadership is not at the formal level but the informal everyday level that is where effective leaders make the greatest difference.

The study situated Jesus in his macro socio-cultural context. It has been established that his reception as the Son of God and Son of Man are not mere Christological titles but more significantly, leadership categories. It was noted that these titles carried sociological functions, which functions were leadership in nature in the Jewish context. Functioning as a leader at micro level through his daily interaction with ordinary people, women, Pharisees and the Scribes and his own disciples, offered a window to observe him in a thorough examination. The over 104 Jesus performed-interactional leadership principles form the foundation for a theoretical social interactional leadership model.

## **6.6 Recommendation**

From the discussions and conclusions drawn, the following recommendations are being made with the view to improving leadership practice in Ghana (Africa):

- Ghanaian leaders should imbibe Jesus' leadership orientation to ensure holistic development of the country.
- Christian leaders should take the lead in practising Jesus-performed leadership principles to influence the Church and Society positively.
- The true Ghanaian traditional leadership values need to be revisited and lived out in leadership today. The purpose of such recommendation should be to streamline and reduce the corrupt leadership practices we see in Ghana today.
- Social Interactional leadership model (SILM) should be adopted by all leaders to deliver leadership as way of life. Everyday social interactions should be understood as the most potent means for leadership delivery.
- Like Jesus, contemporary Ghanaian leadership should take interest in developing the next generation of leaders with a leadership culture which is humane and proactive (Social Interactional leadership model).
- Finally, Ghanaian leaders should embrace their task within Jesus' leadership orientation as social reformers and transformers of society and bring about positive change in the country.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Allison, D.C, 1987, "Eye is the Lamp of the body (Matthew 6:22-23= Luke 11:34-36)", *New Testament Studies*, 33, 61-83.
- Anderson, H., 1976, *The Gospel of Mark*, Marshall, Morgan & Scott, London.
- Asamoah-Gyadu, K., 2014, 'Not so Among You: Christian Heritage and Ecclesial Leadership in Contemporary Africa', *Journal of African Christian Thought* 17(2).
- Ayittey, G.B.N., 2005, *Africa Unchained: The Blue print for Africa's Future*, Palgrave Macmillan, New York.
- Baker, R., 1997, 'How Can We Train Leaders if We Do Not Know What Leadership Is?' *Human Relations* 50 (4).
- Banks R., and Ledbetter B.M., 2004, *Reviewing Leadership: A Christian Evaluation of Current Approaches*, Baker Academic, Grand Rapid.
- Barrett, C. K. 1961. *The New Testament background: selected documents edited, with introductions*, Harper and Row, New York.
- Beavis, M. A, 1989, *Mark's Audience: The Literary and Social Settings*, Sheffield Academic Press, Sheffield.
- Bechtel, L., 1991, 'Shame as a Sanction of Social Control in Biblical Israel: Judicial, Political, and Social Shaming', *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 16(49).
- Best, E. 1981. *Following Jesus: discipleship in the Gospel of Mark*, JSOT Press, Sheffield.
- Blumer, H., 1953, 'Psychological Import of the human Group', in Muzafer Sherif and M.O Wilson (eds.), *Group Relations at the Crossroads*, pp.185-201, Harper and Row, New York.
- Blumer, H. 1969, *Symbolic Interactionism: Perspective and Method*, Prentice-Hall Inc., Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey.
- Blumer, H., 1975, 'Comments on Parsons as a Symbolic Interactionist', *Sociological Inquiry* (45), 59-68.

- Berger, K., 1972, *Die Gesetzesauslegung Jesu*, 1. WMANT. Neukirchen-Vluyn:Neukirchener Verlag.
- Boer, H., 1989, *Who was Jesus? The Historical Jesus and the Synoptic Gospels*, Harper & Row Publishers Inc., New York.
- Bolden, R. and Kirk, P., 2009, 'African Leadership Surfacing New Understandings through Leadership Development', *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management* 9(1), 69-86.
- Booth, R.P., 1986, 'Jesus and the Laws of Purity: Tradition History and Legal History in Mark 7', *JSNTSup* 13, University of Sheffield Press, Sheffield.
- Boring, E. M., 2006, *Mark: A Commentary*, Westminster John Knox Press, Louisville.
- Brandon, S., 1961, 'The Date of the Markan Gospel', *New Testament Studies* 7(2), 126-141.
- Branscomb, B. H., 1937, "The Gospel of Mark" in Moffatt, J., ed, *The Moffatt New Testament Commentary*, Hodder and Stoughton, London.
- Brown, C. 1975, *The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology*, Zondervan, Grand Rapids.
- Browning, W.R.F., 2009, *A Dictionary of the Bible*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edn, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Bruce, F.F., 1988, *The International Commentary on the New Testament –Acts*, rev. (ed.), Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids.
- Bultmann, R. 1963, *The history of the Synoptic Tradition*, Oxford, Blackwell.
- Burkill, T. A, 1966, 'The Syrophoenician Woman: The Congruence of Mark 7:24–31', *ZNW* 57, 22-37.
- Burkill, T.A., 1967, 'Historical Development of the Story of the Syro-phoenician Woman', *NovT* 9,161-161-177.
- Camery-Hoggatt, J., 1992, *Irony in Mark's Gospel*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Carney, T.F., 1975, *The shape of the past: Models and antiquity*, Coronado Press, Coronado Press, California.

- Charon, J.M., 2010, *Symbolic Interactionism: An Introduction, an Interpretation, an Integration*, 9<sup>th</sup> edn., Pearson College Division, New Jersey.
- Ciulla, J. B., 2004, *Ethics, the heart of leadership*, Greenwood Publishing Group, Inc., Westport, CT.
- Clarke, A.D., 2000, *Serve the Community of the Church: Christians as Leaders and Ministers*, William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids.
- Cole, R. A., 1973, *The Gospel According to St. Mark: An Introduction and Commentary*, The Tyndale Press, London.
- Coleman, J.A., 1999, 'The Bible and sociology', *Sociology of Religion* 60(2), 125-148.
- Collins, R., 2010, 'The Micro-sociology of Religion: Religious Practices, Collective and Individual (ARDA Guiding Paper Series)', *State College, PA: The Association of Religion Data Archives*, The Pennsylvania State University, viewed 14 July 2017 from <http://www.thearda.com/rrh/papers/guidingpapers.asp>.
- Collins, R., 2015, 'Jesus in Interaction: The Microsociology of Charisma', *Interdisciplinary Journal of Research on Religion* 11(8), 1-29.
- Collins, R. and McConnell, M., 2016, *Napoleon Never Sept: Great Leaders Leverage Emotional Energy*, viewed 8 August 2017, from <http://maren.ink>.
- Cranfield, C. E. B., 1963, *The Gospel according to St. Mark*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Crossan, J.D., 1983, *In fragments: The Aphorism of Jesus*, Wipf & Stock, Oregon.
- Danker, F. W., Bauer, W. & Arndt, W. F. 2000, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other early Christian Literature*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Darity Jr, W. A., et al, (eds), 2008, *International Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., The Gale Group, Macmillan Reference, USA.

- Darteh-Baah, K., 2015, 'Political Leadership in Ghana: 1957-2010', *African Journal of Political Science and International Relations* 9 (2), 49-61.
- deSilva, D.A., 2000, *Honour, Patronage, Kinship and Purity: Unlocking New Testament Culture*, InterVarsity Press, Illinois.
- Dibelius, M., 1919, *From Tradition to Gospel*, transl., B. L. Woolf, James Clarke & Co., Cambridge.
- Donahue, J. R., and Harrington, D. J., 2002, (eds.), *The Gospel of Mark*, The Liturgical Press, Collegeville.
- Dubois, V., 2013, *Institutional Order, Interaction Order and Social Order: Administering Welfare, Disciplining the Poor*, viewed 20 July 2017 from <https://halshs.archives-ouvertes.fr/halshs-00837517>.
- Duff, J., 2005, *The Element of New Testament Greek*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Edward, J.R., 2002, *The Gospel According to Mark*, Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co, Grand Rapids.
- Edwards, J. R., 1994, 'The Authority of Jesus in the Gospel of Mark', *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 37(2), 217-233.
- Egger, W. 1976, *Frohbotschaft und Lehre* ,121-131.
- Elliott, J.H., 1981, *A Home for the Homeless: A Sociological Exegesis of 1 Peter, its Situation and Strategy*, SCM, London.
- Elliott, J.H., 1986, 'Social-Scientific Criticism of the New Testament: More on Method and Model', *Semeia* 35, 1-33.
- Elliott, J.H., 1991, *A home for the homeless: A sociological exegesis of 1 Peter, its situation and strategy*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edn., Fortress Press Minneapolis.
- Elliot, J. H., 1993, *What is Social Scientific Criticism?*, Fortress Press, Minneapolis.

- Elliott, J. H., 2001, 'On Wooing Crocodiles for Fun and Profit: Confessions of an Intact Admirer', in J. J. Pilch, (ed.), *Social scientific Model for Interpreting the Bible: Essays by the Context Group in Honour of Bruce J Malina*, Brill, Leiden.
- Elliott, J.H., 2011, 'Social-Scientific Criticism: Perspective, Process and Payoff. Evil Eye Accusation at Galatia as Illustration of the Method', *HTS Teologiese Studies/Theological Studies*, 67(1).
- Evan, C. A., 2001, *Word Biblical Commentary: Mark 8:27-16:20*, vol. 34b, Thomas Nelson Publishers, Nashville.
- Farmer, W.R., 1964, *The Synoptic Problem: A Critical Analysis*, New York: Macmillan, New York.
- Fiorenza, E. S., 1983, *In Memory of her: A Feminist Theological Reconstruction of Christian Origins*, Cross-Road, New York.
- Fitzmyer, J. A., 1959, 'The Aramaic Qorbān Inscription from Jebel Ḥallet Et-Ṭûri and Mark 7:11/Matt 15:5', *Journal of Biblical Literature* 78 (1), 60-65.
- Fitzmyer, J. A., 1971, *Essays on the Semitic background on the New Testament*, G. Chapman, London.
- Floss, J. P., 2006, 'Source, Form and Redaction Criticisms' in J. W. Rogerson, and Lieu, J. M., (eds), 2006, *Oxford Handbook for Biblical Studies*, Oxford University Press, New York.
- Focant, C., 2012, *The Gospel According to Mark: A Commentary*, transl., Leslie R. Keylock, Pickwick Publication, Eugene.
- France. T. R., 2002, *The Gospel of Mark: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, Grand Rapids, William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Rand Rapids.
- Gager, J. G., 1975, *Kingdom and Community: The Social World of Early Christianity*, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs.
- Geulich, R. A., 1989, *Word Biblical Commentary: Mark 1-8:26*, Word Books, Dallas.

- Gnilka, J., 1978, *Das Evangelium nach Markus*, vol. 1, Einsiedeln/Neukirchen, Zürich.
- Gnilka, J., 1979, *Das Evangelium nach Markus*, vol. 2, Einsiedeln/Neukirchen, Zürich.
- Goffman, E., 1959, *Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*, Anchor Books, New York.
- Goffman, E., 1967, *Interaction Ritual: Essays on Face-to-Face Behaviour*, Pantheon Books, New York.
- Goffman, E., 1986, *Frame Analysis: an Essay on the Organization of Experience*, Northeastern University Press edn., Boston.
- Goffman, E., 1983, 'The Interaction Order: American Sociological Association, 1982 presidential address', *American sociological review*, 48(1), 1-17.
- Gray, T.C., 2008, *The Temple in the Gospel of Mark*, Mohr Siebeck Tübingen, Germany.
- Greenleaf, R. K. 1977, *The servant as leader: A Journey into the Nature of Legitimate Power and Greatness*, Paulist Press, New Jersey.
- Grundy, M., 2007, *What's New in Church Leadership: Creative Responses to the Changing Pattern of Church Life*, Canterbury Press, Norwich.
- Gumede, V., 2017, 'Leadership for Africa's Development: Revisiting Indigenous African Leadership and Setting the Agenda for Political Leadership', *Journal of Black Studies* 48(1) 74–90.
- Gyekye, K., *African Cultural Values: An Introduction*, Sankofa Publishing Company, Accra.
- Hale, J., 2007, 'Exploring Servant Leadership across Cultures: A Study of Followers in Ghana and the USA', *Leadership* 3(4), 397-417.
- Harper, A.F., et al., 1964, (eds), *Beacon Bible commentary*, Beacon Hill Press, Kansas.
- Harris, W., 1989, *Ancient Literacy*, Harvard University Press, Massachusetts.
- Hay, L. S., 1970, 'The Son of Man in Mark 2:10 and 2:28', *Journal of Biblical Literature* 89 (1), 69-75.
- Healy, M., 2008, *The Gospel of Mark*, Baker Academic, Grand Rapids.

Heatherly, A.T. and Walcott V.A., 2009, *Handbook of Social Interactions in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century*, Nova Science Publishers Inc., New York.

Heising, A., 1964, "Exegese und Theologie der Alt-und Neutestamentlichen Speisewunder", *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche*, vol.86, 80-96.

Henaut, B. W. 1993, *Oral Tradition and the Gospels: The Problem of Mark 4*, Sheffield, Sheffield Academic Press Ltd, Sheffield.

Helmut, K., 1992, *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 111 (1), 3-15.

Hengel, M., 1985, *Studies in the Gospel of Mark*, transl., J. Bowden, Fortress Press, Philadelphia.

Hengel, M., 1981, Tr. Greig, J., *The Charismatic Leader and His Followers*, Crossroad Publishing Company, New York.

Hettinga, J. D., 1996, *Follow Me: Experience the loving Leadership of Jesus*, Navpress, Colorado.

Hooker, M. D., 1991, *The Gospel According to St. Mark*, Hendrickson Publishers, Massachusetts.

Houck, M. and Hoffman, M. V., 2010, *Exegetical Paper: Mark 7: 24—30*, viewed 30 June 2018, from

[http://gettysburgseminary.org/mhoffman/gospels/\\_exegeticalguide/houckm.exegetical%20paper.mark7.pdf](http://gettysburgseminary.org/mhoffman/gospels/_exegeticalguide/houckm.exegetical%20paper.mark7.pdf)

Hübner, H., 1973, *Das Gesetz in der synoptischen Tradition*, Luther, Witten.

Hunter, R. J., 1990, *Dictionary of Pastoral Care and Counselling*, Abingdon Press, Nashville.

Hutchison, J. C., 2009, 'Servanthood: Jesus: Counter Cultural Call to Christian Leadership', *Bibliotheca Sacra*, (166), 53-69.

Iersel, B. W. van, 1964, "Die wunderbare Speisung und das Abendmahl in der synoptischen Tradition (Mk VI. 35-44 par VIII. 1-20 par)", *Novum Testament*, 7, 167-194.

- Iverson, K. R., 2007, *Gentiles in the Gospel of Mark*, T & T Clark International, London.
- Iverson, K. R. and Skinner, S. W., 2011, (eds.) *Mark as a Story: Retrospect and Prospect*, Society of Biblical Literature, Atlanta.
- Iverson, K.R., 2011, 'A Centurion's "Confession": A Performance-Critical Analysis of Mark 15: 39', *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 130(2), 329-350.
- Johansson, D., 2010, 'The Identity of Jesus in the Gospel of Mark: Past and Present Proposals', *Currents in Biblical Research*, 9(3), 364–39.
- Johnson, S. E., 1960, *A Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Mark*, London, Adam & Charles Black, London.
- Juel, D.H., 2011, *The Gospel of Mark: Interpreting Biblical Texts Series*. Abingdon Press, Nashville.
- Rawlinson, A. E. J., 1949, *The Gospel according to St. Mark (Westminster Commentaries)*, 7th edn., Methuen & Company, London
- Kealy, S. P., 1982, *Mark's Gospel: A History of its Interpretation*, Paulist Press, New York.
- Keck, L. E., 1965, 'Mark 3:7-12 and Mark's Christology', *Journal of Biblical Literature* 84 (4), 341-358.
- Keck, L.E., 1995, et al, (eds.), *The New Interpreter's Bible*, vol. 12, Abingdon Press, Nashville.
- Kee, H. C., 1978, 'Mark's Gospel in Recent Research', *Interpretation*, 32 (4), 353-368.
- Keith, C., 2011, 'The Markan Portrayal of Jesus' Identity', *Leaven* 19 (1), viewed 10 May 2018, from <https://digitalcommons.pepperdine.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1102&context=leaven>.
- Kelber, W.H., 1979, *Mark's Story of Jesus*, Fortress Press, Philadelphia.
- Kelber, W. H., 1983, *The Oral and the Written Gospel: The Hermeneutic of Speaking and Writing in the Synoptic Tradition, Mark, Paul, and Q*, Fortress Press, Philadelphia.
- Kelber, W.H., 1974, *Kingdom in Mark: A Place and A new Time*, Fortress Press, Philadelphia.

- Kertelge, K. 1970. *Die Wunder Jesu im Markusevangelium*, Kösel.
- Khoza, R. J., 2005, *Let Africa Lead: African Transformational Leadership from 21<sup>st</sup> Century Business*, Vezubuntu Publish Ltd., Johannesburg.
- Kingsbury, J. D., 1981, *Jesus Christ in Matthew, Mark, and Luke*, Fortress Press, Philadelphia.
- Kingsbury, J. D., 1989, *Conflict in Mark: Jesus, Authorities Disciples*, Augsburg Fortress, USA.
- Klauck, H., 1978, *Allegorie und Allegorese in synoptischen Gleichnistexten (Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen)*, Aschendorff, Germany.
- Kline, L., 1967, 'Redaction Criticism of the Gospels', *Restoration Quarterly*, 10 (4), 177-184.
- Klostermann, E., 1950, *Das Markusevangelium (Handbuch zum Neuen Testament)*, 4th edn., Mohr (Siebeck), Tiibingen.
- Koch, D. A., 1975, *Die Bedeutung der Wundererzählungen für die Christologie des Markusevangeliums*, Walter de Gruyter.
- Koenig, J., 2007, 'Hierarchy Transfigured: Perspectives on Leadership', *The New Testament. Word & World*, 13(1), 26-33.
- Krallmann, G. 2002, *Mentoring for Mission: A Handbook on Leadership Principles Exemplified by Jesus Christ*, Authentic Media, Colombia.
- Kümmel, W. G, 1973, 'Assere und innere Reinheit bei Jesus' In *Das Wort und die Wörter*, pp33-46, FS G. Friedrich, ed. H. Balz and S. Schullz, Kohlhammer, Stuttgart.
- Kümmel, W. G., 1978, *Heilgeschen und Geschichte*, II, pp117-129, MTS 16, N. G. Elwert, Marburg.
- Lambrecht, J. 1977, 'Jesus and the Law: An Investigation of Mark 7:1-23' *ETL* 53, 24-82.
- Lane, W. L., 1974, *The Gospel According To Mark*, William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids.

- Lawrence, M. and Spear, L.C., 2004, (eds.), *Practicing Servant Leadership: Succeeding through Trust, Bravery, and Forgiveness*, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.
- Levine, A., Allison, D. C., and Crossan, J. D., (eds.), 2006, *The Historical Jesus in Context*, Princeton University Press, Princeton.
- Lohmeyer, E., 1967, *Das Evangelium des Markus*, 17<sup>th</sup> edn, Meyerk, Göttingen.
- Lohse, E., 1953, *Martyr and Servant: Investigations into the primitive Christian Annunciation of the Atonement of Jesus Christ*, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, University of Minnesota.
- Lohse, E. & Lohmeyer, E. 1953, *Märtyrer und Gottesknecht: Untersuchungen zur urchristlichen Verkündigung vom Sühntod Jesu Christi*, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen
- Love, S.L., 2015, *Jesus and Marginal Women: The Gospel of Matthew in Social-Scientific Perspective*, James Clarke & Co., Cambridge.
- Lührmann, D., 1981, "Womit er alle Speisen für rein erklärte (Mk. 7:19)", *Wort und Dienst*, vol.16, 81-91.
- Lührmann, D., 1981, "Die Pharisäer und de Schriftgelehrten im Makusevangelium", *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, vol 68, 169-185.
- Mahlangu, E., 2001, 'The Ancient Mediterranean Values of Honour And Shame as A Hermeneutical Procedure: A Social- Scientific Criticism in an African Perspective', *Verum et Ecclesia*, vol. 22 (1), 85-101.
- Malbon, E. S., 1989, 'The Jewish Leaders in the Gospel of Mark: A Literary Study of Markan Characterization', *Journal of Biblical Literature* 108 (2), 259-281.
- Malina, B. J. 1984, 'Jesus as Charismatic leader?' *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 14 (2), 55-62.
- Malina, B. J. & Rohrbaugh, R. L., 1992 *Social Science Commentary on the Synoptic Gospels*, Fortress Press, Minneapolis.
- Malina, B.J. 1993, *New Testament World: Insights from Cultural Anthropology*, Westminster/John Knox Press, Louisville.

- Malina, B. J. 1996, *The Social World of Jesus and the Gospels*, Routledge, New York.
- Malina B. J. 2001, 'Social-Scientific Methods in Historical Jesus Research', in Stegemann, W, Malina, J. B. & Theissen, G (eds), *The Social Setting of Jesus and the Gospels*, pp.3-6, Fortress Press, Minneapolis.
- Malina, B. J., 2001, *The New Testament world: Insights from Cultural Anthropology*, rev. edn., Westminster John Knox Press, Louisville.
- Malina, B. J., 2008, 'Rhetorical Criticism and Social Scientific Criticism: Why Won't Romanticism Leave us Alone?' in J. H. Neyrey and Stewart E.C., 2008, *The Social World of the New Testament: Insights and Models*, Hendrickson Publishers inc., Peabody.
- Malina, B. J., 2009, 'Social Scientific Criticism' in Paula Gooder, (ed.), *Searching for Meaning: An Introduction to Interpreting the New Testament*, pp.13-20, Westminster John Knox Press, Louisville.
- Manz, C.C., 2005, *The Leadership Wisdom of Jesus: Practical Lessons for Today*, Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Inc., San Francisco.
- Marr, R.R., 2017, 'Leadership Jesus Style: 3 Narratives from the Gospel Accounts of Jesus' Life', *Graziadio Business Review* 20 (3), 1-6.
- Marxsen, W., 1969, *Mark the Evangelist: Studies on the Redaction History of the Gospel*, transl., J. Boyce, et al, Abingdon Press, New York.
- Marzaferri F. D., 1989, *The Genre of the Book of Revelation from a Source-Critical Perspective*, Walter de Gruyter, Berlin.
- Matera, F. J. 1987, *What are they Saying about Mark?* Paulist Press, New Jersey.
- Masango, M., 2002, 'Leadership in the African Context: Words on Leadership', *Verbum et Ecclesia*, vol.23, 3, 707-718.
- Mead, G. H., 1934, *Mind, Self and Society*: University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

- McClure, J.M., 2016, 'Introducing Jesus's Social Network: Support, Conflict, and Compassion' *Interdisciplinary Journal of Research on Religion*, (12).
- Meagher, J.C., 1979, *Clumsy Construction in Mark's Gospel: A Critique of Form and Redaktionsgeschichte*, Edwin Mellen Press, New York.
- Moloney, F. J., 2002, *The Gospel of Mark: A Commentary*, Baker Academic, Grand Rapids.
- Moxnes, H., 1997, 'What is Family?: Problems Constructing Early Christian Families' in H. Moxnes, (ed.), *Constructing Early Christian Families: Family as Social Reality and Metaphor*, Routledge, London.
- Moxnes, H., 1996, "Honor and Shame" in *The Social Sciences and New Testament Interpretation*, pp 20-40, Rohrbaugh, R. L., (ed.), Hendrikson, Peabody.
- Moxnes, H., 2003, *Putting Jesus in His Place: A Radical Vision of Household and Kingdom*, Westminster John Knox Press, Louisville.
- Moyise, S., 1999, *Introduction to Biblical Studies*, Cassell, London.
- Myers, Ched, 1988, *Binding the Strong Man: a Political Reading of Mark's Story of Jesus*, Orbis Books, New York.
- Neusner, J. 1976. 'First Cleanse the Inside' *New Testament Studies* 22(4), 486-495.
- Naluparayil, J. C., 2000, 'Jesus of the Gospel of Mark: Present State of Research', *CBR* 8, 191-226.
- Nel, M., 2017, 'Son of Man' in the Gospel of Mark', *In die Skriflig* 51(3) viewed 4 October 2018, from, [http://www.scielo.org.za/scielo.php?script=sci\\_arttext&pid=S2305-08532017000300004](http://www.scielo.org.za/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S2305-08532017000300004).
- Neufeld, D. and Demaris, R. E., 2010, *Understanding the Social World of the New Testament*, Routledge, New York.

Neyrey, J. H and Stewarts E.C., 2008, *The Social World of the New Testament: Insights and Models*, Hendrickson Publishers inc., Peabody.

Nineham, D.E., 1964, *The Gospel of St Mark*, Pelican Gospel Commentary, Penguin, Harmondsworth.

Nyiauwung, M. D., 2010, 'Who is the Christ? Leadership and Conflict In Luke 9:18-22: A Social Scientific and Narratological Analysis from an African Perspective', PhD Thesis, Department of New Testament Studies, University of Pretoria.

Niederwimmer, K., 1967, "Johannes Markus and die Frage nach dem Verfasser des zweiten Evangeliums", ZNW 58, 172-188.

Nouwen, H. J. M., 1989, *In the Name of Jesus: Reflections on Christian Leadership*, Crossroad Publishing Company, New York.

Oakman, D. E., 2008, *Was Jesus a Peasant? Implications for Reading the Jesus Tradition (Luke 10:30-35)* in Neyrey, J. H and Stewarts E.C., 2008, *The Social World of the New Testament: Insights and Models*, Hendrickson Publishers inc., Peabody.

Oduro, G., and MacBeath, J., 2003, "Traditions and Tensions in Leadership: the Ghanaian experience", *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 33 (3), 441-455.

O'Malley P., 2009, 'The African Leadership Experience', Nelson Mandela Centre of Memory, viewed 7 August 2018, from

<https://omalley.nelsonmandela.org/omalley/index.php/site/q/031v03445/041v04015/051v04154/061v04196/071v04199.htm>

Perrin, N., 1969, *What Is Redaction Criticism?* Fortress Press, Philadelphia.

Pesch, R., 1976, *Das Markusevangelium*, vol. 1, Freiburg.

Pesch, R., 1977, *Das Markusevangelium*, vol. 2, Freiburg.

Petersen, N. R., 1978, *Literary criticism for New Testament critics*, Fortress Press, Philadelphia.

- Pilch, J. J., 1991, *Sickness and healing in Luke-Acts*, in J. H. Neyrey, (ed.), *The Social World of Luke-Acts: Models for Interpretation*, pp. 181-209, Hendrickson Publishers, Peabody.
- Pilch, J. J., and Malina, B. J., 1993, *Biblical Social Values and Their Meaning A Handbook*, Hendrickson Publishers, Inc., Peabody.
- Piovanelli, P., 2005, 'Jesus' Charismatic Authority: On the Historical Applicability of a Sociological Model', *Journal of American Academy of Religion* 73 (2), 395-427.
- Puplampu, B. B., 2010, 'Leadership as Engagement, Leadership as System Development: A Contextualised Ghanaian Study', *European Business Review*; 22 (6), 624-651.
- Qusenell, Q., 1969, 'The Mind of Mark: Interpretation and Method through the Exegesis of Mark 6, 52' *Analecta Biblica* 38.
- Rawlinson, A. E. J., 1949, *The Gospel according to St. Mark* (Westminster Commentaries), 7th edn., Methuen & Company, London.
- Rhoads, D., 1982, 'Narrative Criticism and the Gospel of Mark', *Journal of the American Academy of Religion*, 50(3), 411-434.
- Rhoads, D., et al 2012, (eds.), *Mark as Story: An Introduction to the Narrative of a Gospel*, Fortress Press, Minneapolis.
- Robertson, T. A., 1930, *Word Pictures in the New Testament*, MI: Christian Classics Ethereal Library, Grand Rapids, from <https://stnoufer.files.wordpress.com/2015/01/word-pictures-in-the-new-testament.pdf>
- Rodd, C. S., 1981, 'On Applying a Sociological Theory to Biblical Studies', *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* (19), 95-106.
- Rogerson, J. W. and Lieu, J. M., (eds.), 2006, *Oxford Handbook for Biblical Studies*, Oxford University Press, New York.
- Rohrbaugh, R L 1996, 'Introduction', in R. L. Rohrbaugh, (ed.), *The Social Scientific and New Testament Interpretation*, pp.1-15, Hendrickson Publishers, Peabody.

- Rohrbaugh, R. L, 2008, 'The Location of the Markan Audience' in J. H. Neyrey, and Stewart E.C., 2008, *The Social World of the New Testament: Insights and Models*, Hendrickson Publishers inc., Peabody.
- Rohrbaugh, R. L, 2010, 'Honour Core Value in the Biblical World' in Neufeld, D. and Demaris, R. E, 2010, *Understanding the Social World of the New Testament*, Routledge, New York.
- Roloff, J., 1970, *Das Kerygma und der irdische Jesus*, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen.
- Rotberg, R. I., 2004, 'Strengthening African Leadership: There is another Way', *Foreign Affairs* 83 (4), 14-18.
- Saldarini, A. J., 1988, "The Social Class of the Pharisees in Mark", p69-77 in Neusner, J., et al, 1988, eds, *The Social World of Formative Christianity and Judaism*, Fortress Press, Philadelphia.
- Saller, R. P., 1982, *Personal Patronage under the Early Empire*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Sanders, E.P., 1969, *The Tendencies of the Synoptic Tradition*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Sanders, O.J. 1994, *Spiritual Leadership*, Moody Press, Chicago.
- Schenke, L., 1974, *Wundererzählungen des Markusevangeliums*, 217-221.
- Schmid, J., 1958, *Das Evangelium nach Markus*, 4<sup>th</sup> edn, Regensburg.
- Schnackenburg, R., 1995, *Jesus in the Gospels: A Biblical Christology*, trans., Westminster John Knox Press, Louisville.
- Schweizer, E., 1964, "Mark's Contribution to the Quest for the Historical Jesus", *New Testament Studies*, 10, 421-432.
- Schweizer, E.. 1967, *Das Evangelium nach Markus*, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen

- Self, C., 2008, 'The Leadership of Jesus: A Literature Review and Research Proposal', *Journal of Biblical Research*, 1-14, viewed 19 July 2018, from [https://www.regent.edu/acad/global/publications/bpc\\_proceedings/2008/selfJesusleadership.pdf](https://www.regent.edu/acad/global/publications/bpc_proceedings/2008/selfJesusleadership.pdf)
- Schillebeeckx, E. 1981, *Ministry: Leadership in the Community of Jesus Christ*, Crossroad Publish Company, New York.
- Scheff, T.J., 1990, *Microsociology: Discourse, Emotion, and Social Structure*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Shonhiwa, S., 2006, *The Effective Cross-Cultural Manager: A guide for Business Leaders in Africa*, Struik Publishers, Cape Town.
- Smothers, T., 1985, A superior model: Hebrews 1:1-4:13, *Review & Expositor*, 82(3), 333-343.
- Snow, D.A. and Machalek, R., 1983, 'The Convert as a Social Type', *Sociological theory* 1, 259-289.
- Sparks, K. L., 2006, Gospel as Conquest: Mosaic Typology in Matthew 28:16-20, *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, 68(4), 651-663.
- Starratt, R. J., 1993. *Drama of Leadership*, London, The Falmer Press.
- Stein, R. H., 1971. "The Proper Methodology for Ascertaining a Markan Redaction History" *Novum Testamentum*, vol. 13, Fasc. 3, pp. 181-198.
- Steward, E.C., 2009, *Gathered Around Jesus: An Alternative Spatial Practice in the Gospel of Mark*, James Clarke & Co., Cambridge.
- Stuhlmacher, P., 1986, "Vicariously Giving His Life for many, Mark 10:45 (Matt. 20:28)", in *Reconciliation, Law and Righteousness: Essays in Biblical Theology*, pp 16-29, Fortress Press, Philadelphia.
- Taylor, V. 1966, *The Gospel According to St. Mark*, The Macmillan Press Ltd, London.

- Taylor, V., 1935, *The Formation of the Gospel Tradition: Eight Lectures*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edn., Macmillan, London.
- Telford, W., 1985, (ed.) *The Interpretation of Mark*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edn., Fortress Press, Philadelphia.
- Telford, W. R., 1995, *Mark*, Sheffield Academic Press, Sheffield.
- Telford, W.R., 1999, *Theology of the Gospel of Mark*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Thompson, B., 2015, 'Servant, Leader, or Both? A Fresh Look at Mark 10:35-45', *The Journal of Applied Christian Leadership* 9 (2), 54-65.
- Travis, S. H., 1985, 'Form Criticism', in I. Howard Marshall, ed., *New Testament Interpretation: Essays on Principles and Methods*, pp.153-164, The Paternoster Press, Crilisle.
- Trocme, E. 1975, *Formation of the Gospel According to Mark*, SPCK, London.
- Turner, J., 1988, *A Theory of Social Interaction*, Stanford, Stanford University Press, Stanford.
- Turner, V.W., 1967, *The forest of symbols: Aspects of Ndembu ritual*, Cornell University Press, Cornell.
- Van Aarde, A.G., 1991, 'Narrative Criticism: Narrative Criticism Applied to John 4:43-54', in P. J. Hartin, and J. H. Petzer, (eds.), *Test and Interpretation: New Approaches in the Criticism of the New Testament*, pp101-128. Leiden: E. J. Brill, Leiden.
- Van Eck, E., 1995, *Galilee and Jerusalem in Mark's story of Jesus: a Narratological and Social Scientific Reading*. Periodicle Section of the Nederduitsch Hervormde Kerk van Afrika.
- Van Eck, E., 2007, 'The Tenants in the Vineyard (G.Thom 65/Mark 12: 1-12): A Realistic and Social-Scientific Reading'. *HTS: Theological Studies*, 63(3), 909-936.
- Van Eck, E., 1995, *Galilee and Jerusalem in Mark's Story of Jesus: A Narratological and Social Scientific Reading*, Hervormde Teologiese Studies, University of Pretoria, Pretoria.
- Van Eck, E., 2013 'Mission, Identity and Ethics in Mark: Jesus, the Patron for Outsiders', *Hervormde Teologiese Studies* Volume: 69 (1).

Van Eck, E., 2013, 'Introduction to the New Testament: Synoptic Problem and Introduction to an Exegesis and Theology of Mark', *Lecture Note*, Department of New Testament Studies, University of Pretoria.

Van Zyl, E., (ed.), 2009, *Leadership in the African Context*, Juta & Co, Cape Town.

Wallace, D. B., 2000, *The Basics of New Testament Syntax: An Intermediate Greek Grammar.*, Zondervan, Grand Rapids, Michigan

Weber, M., 1922, '*Economy and Society*', (1922), trans. G. Roth and C. Wittich (1968), California Press, Berkeley.

Weiss, J., 1903, *The oldest gospel: a contribution to the understanding of the Gospel of Mark and the oldest evangelical tradition*, Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, Gottingen.

Wellhausen, J., 1909, *Das Evangelium Marci*, 2nd edn., Georg Reimer, Berlin.

Wendling, E., 1905, *Ur-Marcus: Versuch einer Wiederherstellung der ältesten Mitteilungen über das Leben Jesu*, Mohr-Siebeck, Tübingen.

Wigram, G. V. and Winter, R. D., 1978, *The Word Study Concordance: A Modern, Improved, and Enlarged Version of both the Englishman's Greek Concordance and the New Englishman's Greek Concordance*, Wheaton, Ill.: Tyndale House.

Williams, 1975, *Jesus' Death as a Saving Event: The Background and Origin of a Concept*, HDR 2, MT: School Pres, Missoula.

Williamson, L., 1983, *Mark Interpretation: A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching*, John Knox Press, Atlanta.

Willner, A. R., 1984, R. A., *The Spellbinders: Charismatic Political Leadership*, Yale University Press, New Haven.

Wire, A. C., 1991, Gender Roles in a Scribal Community, in D. L. Balch, (ed), *Social History of the Matthean Community: Cross-Disciplinary Approaches*, 87-121, Minneapolis: Fortress Press, Minneapolis.

Zeitlin, S., 1962, "Korban", *The Jewish Quarterly Review*, 53 (2), 160-163.

Zeitlin, S., 1968, "Korban: A Gift", *The Jewish Quarterly Review*, 59 (2), 133-135.