1996

The Relationship of Wisdom to Transformational Leadership: Illustrated by the Historical Jesus

MaryKate Morse
George Fox University, mkmorse@georgefox.edu

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.georgefox.edu/gfes

Part of the Religion Commons

Recommended Citation
Morse, MaryKate, "The Relationship of Wisdom to Transformational Leadership: Illustrated by the Historical Jesus" (1996). Faculty Publications - George Fox Evangelical Seminary. Paper 48.
http://digitalcommons.georgefox.edu/gfes/48

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the George Fox Evangelical Seminary at Digital Commons @ George Fox University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Publications - George Fox Evangelical Seminary by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ George Fox University. For more information, please contact arolfe@georgefox.edu.
THE RELATIONSHIP OF WISDOM TO TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP:
ILLUSTRATED BY THE HISTORICAL JESUS

A Dissertation
submitted to the Faculty of the School of Education and the Graduate School of Gonzaga University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

by
Mary Katherine Palmore Morse

February, 1996
I certify that I have read this manuscript and that, in my judgment, it is fully adequate in scope and quality as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy:

Sandra M. Wilson, Ph.D.
Committee Chairperson
February, 1996

Helen Doohan, Ph.D.
Committee Member
February, 1996

Jeannette Abi-Nader, Ph.D.
Committee Member
February, 1996
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer acknowledges the invaluable support and care given by her husband, Randy, her children, Sarah, Susanna, and Jesse, and her encouraging friends, Susie, Caryl, Sue, Glenda, and Ellie.

Special thanks are due to those who read the dissertation and gave pertinent suggestions for its improvement: committee members, particularly Dr. Helen Doohan, Susie Crandall, and Priscilla Roberts. The writer acknowledges sincere appreciation for the research support of her research assistant, Signe Brunner, and for the chart in Appendix A made by Ted Gillette.

This dissertation is dedicated to my father and mother, Vaughan and Lorraine Palmore, whose unwavering love and wisdom inspires me.
THE RELATIONSHIP OF WISDOM TO TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP:
ILLUSTRATED BY THE HISTORICAL JESUS

ABSTRACT

by

Mary Katherine Palmore Morse
Gonzaga University, February, 1996

The shifting context of Western social structures and global inter-relatedness
demands leaders who can effectively navigate systems through chaos. This study
hypothesized that wisdom is the construct that enables leaders to "see" and thus interpret
a beneficial path of action. The purpose of the study was to explore how psychological
wisdom theory relates to transformational leadership.

The historical Jesus served as the model for this relationship. Using Biblical
historical criticism, an analysis was done of Jesus' wisdom in the Jewish wisdom
tradition. Jesus' wisdom was then compared to the features of psychological wisdom.
Both deal with contradictions and change, exhibit exceptional judgment and
understanding, and demonstrate communication and relationship skills. Jesus' wisdom
further clarified that wisdom functions best in conflict situations and that wisdom has an
individual voice.

Using Biblical social-scientific criticism, those sayings and parables recognized
by historical Jesus scholars as authentic were used to analyze Jesus' leadership in first-
century Palestine. A comparison of Jesus' leadership to transformational leadership
revealed a close affinity. Jesus "saw" the limitations of his social system, and he had a
comprehensive vision and a focused passion for its renewal. Jesus' leadership further
suggested that effective transformational leaders find the source of their identity and security in a spiritual relationship.

Conclusions were drawn by comparing the wisdom features and the transformational leadership features illustrated in the historical Jesus. First, wisdom and transformational leadership share certain factors. They both deal with ambiguity and change, are most beneficial during chaos, have effective communication and relationship skills, consider individual needs, and stimulate maturation in others. Second, the study found that wisdom clarifies "how" transformational leadership functions during chaos and change. The wisdom leadership of Jesus suggests that wise, transformational leaders have these additional features: (1) a paradoxical view of reality, allowing them to see limitations and new perspectives; (2) an individual voice able to give guidance for change; (3) a vision for renewal that is aware of moral impact and sourced in a spiritual identity; and (4) a comprehensive vision, impacting the renewal of many aspects of a social system.

Sandra M. Wilson, Ph.D.
Committee Chair

Leonard Doohan, Ph.D.
Dean of the Graduate School
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

In April, 1995, Robert Strange McNamara released a new book to the public entitled, In Retrospect: The Tragedy and Lessons of Vietnam. For several days, newspapers, radio and television news stations, and major news magazines reported on his confession that the United States "could and should have withdrawn from South Vietnam" in late 1963. Robert McNamara, who was a "whiz kid" at Ford Motor Company from 1946-1961, Secretary of Defense for Presidents Kennedy and Johnson from 1961-1968, and President of the World Bank from 1968-1981, admitted to eleven major errors in Vietnam. Some of these errors included misjudging the capacity of North Vietnam, underrating the power of nationalism, failing to recognize the limitations of high-tech equipment, and failing to level with Congress and the American people. These were errors not of ignorance, but of judgment. He himself said, "I truly believe that we made an error not of values and intentions but of judgment and capabilities" (McNamara, 1995b, p. 45). The compelling question is, how did a capable leader use such poor judgment about a war that cost the lives of 58,000 Americans and perhaps a million South Vietnamese?

Halberstam (1992) in his book, The Best and the Brightest, described McNamara as "intelligent, forceful, courageous, decent, and everything, in fact, but wise" (pp. 213-214). McNamara was a gifted and qualified leader who, along with others, made poor decisions based on his own perception of the events. He took information, folded his own
experience into it, and viewed the Vietnam War from such a biased perspective that for a period of time the war was known as "McNamara's War." In an interview with Jonathan Alter of *Newsweek*, McNamara was asked why he did not write the book in 1968 when he began to have doubts about the war. McNamara replied, "I wasn't capable of it. I wasn't wise." Before 1968 he "saw" the war as McNamara's war, but in 1995 he "sees" it as McNamara's and others' mistake.

How is it that leadership "sees" events in order to choose directions that strengthen a nation or a business rather than demoralize them? How is it that wisdom is such a crucial factor in determining the course of action which an individual or group should take? These questions carry even more urgency today. In the last twenty years of this century, several "prophetic" books have appeared explicating the times and directing vision for effectiveness in the future (Bellah, 1985; Bridges, 1980; Capra, 1982; Harman, 1990; Naisbett, 1982; Naisbett & Aburdeen, 1990; Peters, 1987; Toeffler, 1981, 1990). Their message is the same: "The current crisis . . . is a transition of planetary dimensions. As individuals, as a society, as a civilization, and as a planetary ecosystem, we are reaching a turning point" (Capra, 1982, p. 33). Harman (1990) called the fundamental transformation a shift to a "transmodern" society. In that society, the "ultimate stuff" of the universe is consciousness and interrelatedness rather than matter-energy and objective connectedness. Such a radical shifting in the basic assumptions of reality will impact the entire structure of Western social systems. Rost (1991) wrote:

While there have been paradigmatic shifts since the 1930s in sciences and technology that have ushered in the atomic age, the space age, and the
computer age, none of these shifts has been massive enough or deeply antithetical enough to the values of the industrial age to cause a societal paradigm shift . . . The people in this generation may be the first in history who can reflect upon a societal paradigm shift, who can watch themselves go through the transition from an industrial era to a postindustrial era. (p. 186)

Therefore, a crucial problem is a need for leadership capable of meeting the challenges and complexities of change in today's global age (Bleedorn, 1988). Kets de Vries (1993) wrote, "All community-dwelling creatures need leaders . . . When people are deprived of leaders . . . they will search for them, particularly in times of crisis and rapid change" (p. 1). Postmodern leadership will, by necessity, be highly situational, requiring new leadership by persons who can master the unexpected and can tolerate ambiguity (Bergquist, 1993).

The shifting context of the Western social structure demands a leadership cadre of individuals and communities who can navigate through chaos to a place of effectiveness. De Pree (1989) stated that "Leaders are responsible for effectiveness" (p. 19). According to Bass (1990a), leadership is "the single most critical factor in the success or failure of an institution" (p. 8). In the case of Robert McNamara, his leadership had a significant impact on the failure of a country to foresee the outcome of judgments made in the Vietnam War. Therefore, the questions that beg to be answered are: What kinds of leaders are needed, and how do these leaders navigate through rapidly-changing situations which have conflicting solutions?
The purpose of this study is to suggest an integrating and interpreting framework for leadership. The study hypothesizes that wisdom is the construct which enables a leader to "see" and thus interpret more beneficially a path of action. Leaders who rely on their own knowledge and common sense judgments in a rapidly-changing context are more likely to "see through a glass darkly" (I Cor. 13: 12). Leaders who have a vision for managing change, and who are wise, are able to navigate more effectively. The rest of this chapter will present the transformational leadership model as a leadership theory comfortable with positive change, the nature of wisdom and common sense, and the leader Jesus as a historical person for the analysis of the relationship between wisdom and leadership. Following that is a summary purpose statement, the definitions and variables that will be used for the study, and a brief concluding paragraph.

Leadership

Effectiveness in a chaotic and rapidly-changing environment necessitates a leadership that is comfortable with change. Bennis and Nanus (1985) wrote ten years ago, "Survival in this seeming madness calls for great flexibility and awareness on the part of leaders and followers alike" (p. 14). Tichy and Devanna (1990) added, in the updated preface of The Transformational Leader, "More than ever the key to global competitiveness will be the widespread capability of institutions around the world to continuously transform" (p. iv).

A leadership theory built on the premise of a leader as a change agent is the transformational leader model (Bass & Avolio, 1994). Rosenbach and Taylor (1993)
wrote: "We are now convinced that the research and literature confirm the transformational leadership paradigm as most meaningful in today's diverse and complex world" (p. xi). Transformational leadership makes a significant, positive impact on an organization's culture, decision-making process at all levels, members' behavior, and organizational effectiveness (Bass & Avolio, 1994; Deluga, 1988, 1991b; McElroy & Stark, 1992; Singer & Singer, 1986). Van Fleet and Yukl (1986) described transformational leadership as a special branch of leadership which deals with organizational transition from one culture to another. The promotion of innovative thinking leads to change and new choice possibilities for organizations competing in a diverse, rapidly-changing environment.

Transformational leadership has the added benefit of being recognized as a school. In his book, Leadership for the Twenty-first Century (1991), Rost criticized the failure of scholars and practitioners to develop a recognizable school of leadership which integrates leadership theory. He suggested that the transformational leadership model of Burns had the most potential for being a school of leadership in the post-industrial paradigm. Other theories such as great man, group, trait, behaviorist, contingency/situational, and excellence reflect the industrial paradigm. All these theories are individualistic, oriented towards goal-achievements, technocratic, and linear in their structure. Rost called this type of leadership "good management." Transformational leadership, on the other hand, is concerned with stimulating change in leaders and followers "to higher levels of motivation and morality" (Burns, 1978, p.20).
Transformational leadership is a process of evolving inter-relationships between leaders and followers (Burns, 1978).

Beginning with Burn's (1978) seminal work, *Leadership*, transformational leadership is a model which differentiates between leadership and management. Since then, hundreds of research studies and popular books have studied these differences (Bass, 1990a). Burns (1978) wrote, "Ultimately the effectiveness of leaders as leaders will be tested by the achievement of purpose in the form of real and intended social change" (p. 251). For Burns, transforming leadership is represented by the intellectual leader, the moral reformer, the revolutionary who raises the social and political consciousness of both leaders and followers, and the heroic or charismatic leader.

Transactional leadership, on the other hand, is an exchange between leader and follower in order to accomplish individual interests.

Transforming leadership is a collective process. Transforming leaders "shape and alter and elevate the motives and values and goals of followers through the vital teaching role of leadership" (Burns, 1978, p. 425). Transformational leaders raise the consciousness of followers, appealing to higher values and humanitarianism. According to Maslow's hierarchy of needs, followers are elevated from ordinary selves to better selves: "The vital aspect of this hierarchy for Maslow and for students of leadership is its dynamic quality: as lower needs are satisfied, higher needs come into play" (Burns, 1978, p. 70).

Tichy and Devanna (1990) further impacted the discussion of transformational leadership with their book, *The Transformational Leader*. According to them,
transformational leadership initiates change by struggling with paradox. The paradox of change is a struggle between the forces of stability and change and between the manager and the leader. Transformational leaders empower and enable others to manage change and to be excited about renewal. Tichy and Devanna (1990) described transformational leaders as: (1) change agents, (2) courageous individuals, (3) empowering others, (4) value-driven, (5) life-long learners, (6) able to handle complexity, ambiguity, and uncertainty, and (7) visionaries. In contrast, transactional leadership mainly seeks to influence others to accomplish group goals and to do the "job" the business or institution names as its purpose.

A major theorist and researcher for the past ten years on transformational leadership is Bernard Bass. In his book, Leadership and Performance Beyond Expectation (1985a), he described transformational and transactional leaders as different but not inconsistent with each other. Transactional leaders are involved in the exchange of goods for services. Transformational leaders seek to arouse higher needs for growth and self-actualization. Such leaders have vision, self-confidence, and moral strength. Bass's model has been tested for over eight years and indicates the range of leadership activities from the active to the passive and from the transformer to the manager. Those factors are: (1) idealized influence, (2) inspirational motivation, (3) intellectual consideration, (4) individual consideration, (5) contingent reward, (6) management by exception, and (7) laissez-faire (Bass, 1993).

The first four factors distinguish transformational leadership from simple transactional leadership. Generally, transformational leadership factors augment
transactional leadership (Waldman, Bass, & Yammarino, 1988). Bass (1990a) suggested that further research is needed to answer the question, "Under what conditions do they [transformational and transactional leadership] conflict?" (p. 902). With change becoming a social norm, conflict between leadership styles will be inevitable (Bergquist, 1993; Drucker, 1993; Kanter, 1983). Understanding the psychological, as well as sociological and cultural, conditions which contribute to conflict will help institutions prepare for change.

How these transformational and transactional factors link together to produce a leader who is transformational is not clear (Bass, 1990a). Also, Bass and Avolio noted in Leadership Theory and Research (1993) that not all behaviors and characteristics of transformational leadership have been identified. Such a high-order construct needs linkages to other constructs, such as personality and moral development.

In order to investigate linking factors or other characteristics, other disciplines need to be brought into leadership research. Rost (1993) believed that the study of leadership should be interdisciplinary. Calling it his categorical imperative, he wrote, "Looking at leadership through the lens of a single discipline has not worked well in the past, and it will not work any better in the future" (p. 224). The behavioral sciences especially can provide lenses that help to understand human nature and behavior in leadership settings. Hersey and Blanchard (1993) commented, "Our survival may, in fact, be dependent on how well the behavioral sciences are able to resolve conflict through understanding and implementing change" (p. 4). A behavioral science with a possible
lens for explaining the integrative nature of transformational leadership is the science of developmental psychology in the field of wisdom theory.

Wisdom

Wisdom as a field of research has burgeoned since the 1980s (Sternberg, 1985; Taranto, 1989). Prior to then, wisdom study was "a fool's errand, best left to those in the business of penning messages for fortune cookies and compiling almanacs" (Holliday & Chandler, 1986). Holliday and Chandler (1986) attributed the eclipse of wisdom to psychology's quest to become a "pure" science. That quest precluded the study of anything that was not observable in outward behaviors. Holliday and Chandler (1986) wrote, "The impenetrability, unflappability, and cross-legged immobility of prototypically wise people make them all but opaque to a psychology whose attention continues to remain focused primarily upon moving targets" (p. 2). Several researchers (e.g., Baltes & Staudinger, 1993; Birren, 1985) also attributed wisdom's demise to the stereotyping of old age as a period of decline. However, with the increased greying of the American population and with new sciences equating the essence of reality to relationships rather than to objective phenomena, interest in wisdom has blossomed (e.g., Clayton & Birren, 1980; Dittmann-Kohli, 1984; Holliday & Chandler, 1986). Psychologists today are searching for positive aspects of aging, and developmental scholars are interested in human potential and high levels of performance (Sternberg, 1990). Wisdom research has begun to flourish.
Historically, wise persons are valued individuals in a culture. They are those whose judgments, insights, and counsel were sought. Deborah, in the Old Testament, "used to sit under the palm tree of Deborah . . . and the sons of Israel came up to her for judgment" (Judges 4:5). Parker Palmer, M. Scott Peck, Maya Angelou are all contemporary persons known for their insights and wisdom. Who can forget Maya Angelou's insights into the soul of America when she read her poem, "On the Pulse of Morning," at the inauguration of President Clinton on January 20, 1993?

The horizon leans forward,
Offering you space
To place new steps of change
Here, on the pulse of this fine day
You may have the courage
To look up and out and upon me,
The Rock, the River, the Tree, your country.

Wise persons, though subtle and unobtrusive (Holliday & Chandler, 1986), are known for their charisma, "or the power to stimulate others through their own intensity, based on their supposed contact with a 'vital layer' of reality" (Csikszentmihalyi & Rathunde, 1990, p. 47). Wise persons represent the capstone of maturity, autonomy, and personal development (Erikson, 1985). They are peak performers (Baltes & Smith, 1990), and are valued for their reflective and spiritual nature (Achenbaum & Orwell, 1991; Kramer, 1990). They have exceptional judgment, reflective and evaluative skills, and an experience-based pragmatic knowledge (Holliday & Chandler, 1986). They are
comfortable with ambiguity and doubt and know their limits (Meacham, 1982; Taranto, 1989). Using personal experience and cognitive processes, they make choices for a certain course of action (Kekes, 1983; Kramer, 1990; Labouvie-Vief, 1982). They acknowledge "the interrelatedness of all experience and the inevitability of change and transformation" (Csikszentmihalyi & Rathunde, 1990, p. 31).

Wise persons use common sense (Fletcher, 1984; Holliday & Chandler, 1986; Kekes, 1983; Taranto, 1989). Some scholars saw common sense as a type of wisdom (e.g., Carlston, 1980; Collins, 1980; Taranto, 1989). Marcel (1954) referred to it as "earthy" wisdom. Common sense is the conventional wisdom of a culture and represents the shared beliefs and values of how the physical, social, and spiritual worlds work (Taranto, 1989). For a wise person to be effective, she would need an understanding of the shared assumptions of a culture group. Common sense, then, is the practical social knowledge needed to thrive in a social group.

Marcel (1954) in his book, The Decline of Wisdom, lamented that "the disappearance of common sense is a phenomenon of immeasurable gravity and one which must inevitably bring about a radical change in the climate of the mind" (p. 46). His concern for the disappearance of common sense and the subsequent decline of wisdom compels scholars to take these constructs seriously and to research their impact and implications for a social group.

Though wisdom and common sense are areas of renewed interest in research, more study is still needed (e.g., Sternberg, 1990). Kramer (1990) wrote, "Since the field of wisdom is in its infancy, it is premature to expect that the intricacies of wisdom's
developmental trajectory will have been worked out" (p. 307). Birren and Fisher (1990) commented on the potential of wisdom research:

> It is hoped that research on wisdom will help to develop useful tools to assist world and national leaders in the increasingly complex problems facing humanity. Many crucial decisions, from nuclear waste to water use, face leaders and policy makers each day. Thus, wisdom is not simply for wise people or curious psychologists; it is for all people and the future of the world. (p. 332)

The nature of wisdom, a construct comfortable with change, and transformational leadership, a model appropriate during times of change, suggests a possible integrating and interpreting relationship. Because Western society is experiencing a paradigm shift from an industrial age to an informational age and from a Cartesian view of reality to a systems view of reality, negotiating change is not simply a juggling act. Sampson (1989) wrote, "As world history changes, traditions that formerly presented suitable ways of conceptualizing reality may provide visions that are out of touch with newly emerging issues" (p. 917).

Leaders of the twenty-first century are those who can navigate through a multiplicity of perspectives by creating meaning, by applying relational problem-solving, and by stimulating development, whether individual or communal (e.g., Hall & Thompson, 1980; Rost, 1991; Senge, 1990; Suresh, Cooperrider, & Associates, 1990; Tichy & Devanna, 1990; Wheatley, 1992). A wise person knows how to navigate through ambiguity, how to resolve crises and dilemmas in an exceptional way, and how to
integrate the cognitive and affective in order to act creatively in interpersonal relationships (Achenbaum & Orwell, 1991; Kramer, 1990)

Birren (1985) suggested that the qualities of wisdom are sorely needed in leadership positions. Birren believed that wise leaders would bring balance and a greater capacity for dealing with long-range issues. Tuchman (1979) lamented at the unwisdom of government leaders which she said resulted in poor, even dangerous, decisions. Wisdom in leaders compels them to consider the human consequences of different courses of action (Clayton, 1982). Clayton (1982) commented, "Actions and judgments guided by wisdom will reflect basic needs and tendencies of a universal nature" (p. 319). Wisdom is geared toward social problem-solving, and is associated with managing and guiding institutions (Kramer, 1990).

Khandwalla (1985) noted that problem-solving in corporations is becoming an incredibly complex task. With the enormous uncertainties evolving in the developing world, today's leaders need more than rationality to do effective problem-solving. Khandwalla (1985) wrote, "While professional management and its array of analytical techniques may satisfy the need for greater rationality, it is not adequate for meeting the need for superior judgment" (p.238). For Khandwalla, wisdom is the construct needed by leaders to integrate ambiguous and multi-dimensional information.

In leadership theory, a common theme is the need for value-centered, healthy, collaborative, learning organizations in order to enter the future with enthusiasm and vision. Several of the authors took it a step further and called for leaders to attend to their own spirituality and the spirituality of organizational life (Conger, 1994; Covey, 1991;

Another link between wisdom and leadership is found with Maslow's hierarchy of needs. Johnson (1979) in his study of wise people concluded that the characteristics of a wise person are very similar to Maslow's self-actualized person. Burns (1978) suggested that self-actualization is a marked characteristic of transforming leaders: "Because leaders themselves are continually going through self-actualization processes, they are able to rise with their followers, usually one step ahead of them, to respond to their transformed needs and thus to help followers move into self-actualization processes" (p. 117).

Burns (1978) equated leadership with Erikson's stage theory of human development. In Erikson's (1985) theory, the final stage is a conflict between integrity and despair, and the resulting strength is wisdom. Burns (1978) wrote:

A congruence between the need and value hierarchies would produce a powerful potential for the exercise of purposeful leadership. When these hierarchies are combined with stage theories -- for example, Erikson's eight psycho-social stages of man, with its emphasis on trust versus mistrust, autonomy versus shame, role experimentation versus negative identity -- leadership, with its capacity to exploit tension and conflict, finds an even more durable foundation. (p. 44)
A leader who has successfully resolved the internal conflicts of life's stages, incorporating the resulting strengths into her personality, is better able to negotiate conflicts common in leadership roles.

Transformational leadership and wisdom are also linked in their fundamental interest in moral development. Burns' transformational leadership model was revolutionary for its focus on values as an essential aspect of leadership (Rost, 1990). Burns (1978) used Kohlberg's model of moral development and Maslow's needs theory to illustrate the relationship of transforming leadership to changing values: "But the gratification of needs places an even greater burden on leadership -- above all, to raise its own goals as the needs of followers are transmuted into higher and higher searches for individual and social fulfillment" (p. 72). Values have a strong motivational function. Because values are internalized, they define personality and behavior (Burns, 1978).

Wisdom is a balanced dialogue between cognition and affect which results in positive chosen behaviors (Birren & Fisher, 1990). Wisdom acts as a guide for discerning the "supreme good," for understanding the consequences of behaviors in a systemic way (Csikszentmihalyi & Rathunde, 1990). Wisdom and transformational leadership have several natural bridges.

Recent research links theories of adult development to decision-making and leadership performance (Fisher, Merron, & Torbert, 1987; Kuhnert & Lewis, 1987), but no research specifically links wisdom theory to leadership theory. A few studies have looked at leaders as being wise (Achenbaum & Orwell, 1991; Barry & Elovitz, 1992;
Orwell & Achenbaum, 1993), but none specifically explored how leadership theory and wisdom theory are linked.

References to wisdom are made by researchers such as Hersey and Blanchard (1993). They concluded that diagnostic ability, an aspect of wisdom, is essential for leadership effectiveness. Leadership practitioners, Jaques and Clement (1991), suggested in their book, *Executive Leadership: A Practical Guide to Managing Complexity*, that a primary leadership competency is wisdom. Jaques and Clement defined wisdom as "the soundness of a person's judgment about the ways of the world, about what people are like and how they are likely to react" (p. 76).

Aubrey and Cohen (1995) in their book, *Working Wisdom*, promoted wisdom as "a management practice and a learning strategy" (p. xiii). Wisdom is necessary in learning organizations because wisdom allows an individual to make sense of information. For these authors, wisdom is the process of selecting knowledge, making it learnable, and putting it to work. The weakness of their book is its one-dimensional focus on wisdom as using knowledge to enhance learning. Wisdom is a much more complex phenomenon, and thus has a more multi-faceted impact on leadership. Since wisdom is related to peak performance (Baltes & Smith, 1990), it is a natural step to explore specifically the relationship of wisdom to leadership.

A way to explore the relationship of wisdom to transformational leadership would be to study a person who is known both for wisdom and leadership. Orwoll and Perlmutter (1990) wrote,

To really know what wise people are like, it is important to actually study
them. Studying wise people should help determine the veridicality of implicit ideas of wisdom, the universality of characteristics of wisdom, and the influence of the social environment in shaping wisdom. (p. 174)

Leadership theory has a long tradition of studying effective leaders (Bass, 1990a). A person who is widely known for his leadership and his wisdom is Jesus.

The Historical Jesus

One of the greatest spiritual and moral leaders of all time is Jesus. Pelikan (1985) wrote, "Regardless of what anyone may personally think or believe about him, Jesus of Nazareth has been the dominant figure in the history of Western culture for almost twenty centuries" (p. 1). More than 60,000 biographies alone have been written about Jesus (Charlesworth & Weaver, 1994). A renewed and vibrant interest in Jesus has emerged in the past decade. For example, the historical Jesus has been the feature story for U.S. News and World Report four times from 1992 to 1994. Within three months of its publication, J. D. Crossan's (1991) book, The Historical Jesus: The Life of a Mediterranean Jewish Peasant, became the top best-selling book on religion. When the Jesus Seminar published The Five Gospels: The Search for the Authentic Words of Jesus in 1993, it sold out in a few weeks. The spiritual hunger of modern times has created a new interest in the person who two thousand years ago redefined the times.

Jesus lived in a turbulent and diverse environment full of conflict. Borg (1984) wrote, "Conflict was endemic in first-century Palestine" (p. 2). In first-century Palestine, the Jewish people were in crisis, politically, socially, and economically. They were
subjugated to Roman rule, impoverished by taxes, divided between the elite ruling classes and the rural agrarian class, and struggling with Hellenistic-Roman influences (e.g., Borg, 1984; Crossan, 1991; Malina, 1993; Theissen, 1978).

The Jews' national consciousness of being God's covenant people constituted their enduring identity (Talmon, 1991). Therefore, several diverse Jewish groups attempted to give leadership in order to recover or guard their identity as God's beloved and chosen people (Fiorenza, 1984). These prophetic, resistance, or renewal movements had different strategies for "seeing" and solving the crisis (Borg, 1984; Theissen, 1977/1978). Out of all those voices, Jesus' was distinctive (Scott, 1990). His voice not only gathered a group of committed followers, it also has endured for over two thousand years.

Who Jesus was, and what his mission and message were, has engaged scholars ever since the first writing of the New Testament record. The popular image of Jesus portrays him as a divine figure who died for the sins of the world so that believers might have eternal life. However, beginning in the 19th century, interest grew in recovering the historical Jesus, the Jesus before the development of Christian theology. The first quest by German scholars climaxed with Albert Schweitzer's book, The Quest of the Historical Jesus (1906). Schweitzer (1906/1968) concluded that Jesus was a "thoroughgoing" eschatological prophet who in the whole of his public ministry expected God's final judgment and the imminent end of the world.

The second quest was heavily influenced by liberal existential scholars like Bultmann. Bultmann (1958) concluded, "I do indeed think that we can know almost
nothing concerning the life and personality of Jesus" (p. 14). However, Sanders (1985) presented the consensus of present day historical Jesus scholars with the words: The dominant view today seems to be that we can know pretty well what Jesus was out to accomplish, that we can know a lot about what he said, and that those two things make sense within the world of first-century Judaism. (p. 2)

In the last twenty-five years, a "renaissance in Jesus scholarship" is underway (Borg, 1994b). Neill and Wright (1988) called it the third quest for the historical Jesus. Meier (1994) wrote:

In the 1990s, the third quest has tried to be more sophisticated in its methodology, more self-aware and self-critical in dealing with a given author's preconceptions and biases, and more determined to write history rather than covert theology or christology. The third quest benefits from recent archaeological discoveries, a better knowledge of the Aramaic language and the cultural context in 1st-century Palestine, a more differentiated view of the Judaism(s) developing around the turn of the era, and new insights from sociological analysis and modern literary theory. (pp.1-2)

Interdisciplinary models and perspectives in historical Jesus research broadened the previous narrow focus on literary and historical methods (Borg, 1994d; Crenshaw, 1976; Fiorenza, 1984). The result was a new vision of Jesus, one which reveals a Jesus embedded in the social, economic, political, and religious climate of his time. A major aspect of his identity was as a sage.
Since early 1960, research about Jesus as a sage has blossomed (Barbour, 1976; Borg, 1984; Crossan, 1973, 1983; Dunn, 1980; Fiorenza, 1984; Kloppenborg, 1986; McKenzie, 1967; Perdue, 1994; Perkins, 1987; Piper, 1989; Reese, 1981; Scott, 1990; Williams, 1971; Witherington, 1994). Prior to that, wisdom was primarily an area of Old Testament studies. The early Hebrew family/clan preserved itself through its wisdom teaching. When the tribal system moved to a monarchy, wisdom moved from the clan as the source of knowledge into the courts. Wisdom in the courts became the tool for locating and legitimizing the new source of knowledge (Bruggemann, 1990).

The ancient Hebrews primarily concerned themselves with the knowledge needed to comprehend God's order and to understand the activity of humanity that would assure well-being in that order (Blenkinsopp, 1983; Crenshaw, 1981; Gammie & Perdue, 1990; Von Rad, 1972). Such wisdom gave the group the cohesiveness and direction necessary for survival and prevented chaos (Konkel, 1992). The Torah became the guide, with religious leaders such as the Scribes and Pharisees its interpreters and keepers. They strove for theodicy settlement, defined by Bruggemann (1990) as "a long-standing consensus about how life works, how society functions, how a system of benefits is allocated, what suffering must be tolerably and inescapably borne, and by whom it must be borne" (p. 130). Therefore, they maintained the conservative theology that sought to preserve and keep unchanged the group's understanding of truth (e.g., Bruggemann, 1990).

The Pharisees modeled the power of holiness through law-keeping to produce rightness and favor with God (Borg, 1984; Malina, 1993). God was the Guarantor, and
they were the guardians of a socio-theological construct. Conventional wisdom was the knowledge base and interpretive tradition that assured well-being (Borg, 1987; Collins, 1980; McKenzie, 1967; Scott, 1990). Such wisdom maintained existing power arrangements (Gray, 1986; Malchow, 1982; Perdue, 1990).

Jesus, on the other hand, challenged the knowledge of the ruling class and the status of the privileged (Borg, 1987; Deutsch, 1990). Jesus modeled that knowledge was an insufficient guide. He did not repudiate the conventional wisdom, but demonstrated its inadequacies (Perdue, 1986; Scott, 1990). For example, adultery was no longer just an act towards a woman, but an attitude in the mind. Jesus exposed the contradiction of seeing women as sexual objects, when God intended them to be co-heirs of the earth. Jesus continually raised to consciousness those voices which conventional wisdom had tuned out to assure either survival or power.

Jesus dealt with theodic crisis, defined by Bruggemann (1990) as a crisis which “occurs when the dominant social values, presuppositions, and policies no longer function meaningfully and claim assent, no longer are credited by public opinion as having meaningful authority” (p. 130). Theodic settlement was not Jesus’ purpose. He examined the status quo and called for the renewal of the Jewish faith and a bold reconstruction of the hearer’s view of reality (Borg, 1987; Carlston, 1980; Crossan, 1973, 1983).

Though scholars disagree on the finished portrait of the historical Jesus, many of them do agree that he was a sage, a wiseman, subverting the conventional wisdom of the day in order to renew Judaic faith (Borg, 1984, 1987; Carlston, 1980; Crossan, 1973,
Borg (1987) wrote, "[Jesus] was a teacher of a way or path, specifically a way of transformation. His teaching involved a radical criticism of the conventional wisdom that lay at the core of the first-century Jewish social world" (p. 97). The primary concern of conventional wisdom was a quest for security around identity issues such as family, wealth, honor, and religion (Collins, 1980; Crenshaw, 1974). In the Gospels, the Pharisees represented those leaders who preserved the conventional wisdom tradition. Jesus' wisdom was a challenge to find an identity in a new reality. He had a vision of security with an identity in a compassionate God (Borg, 1987; Fiorenza; 1984).

Though Jesus was a significant change agent, very few empirical studies have looked at him as a leader. Burns (1978) used him as an example of a miraculous, transcending leader. However, Burns noted that Jesus' charismatic leadership and vision were later "routinized and bureaucratized and authority was exercised through legal and 'rational' institutions and practices. This evolved into a traditionalist society in which authority was legitimated by usage, precedent, and custom" (p. 243). Much of today's understanding or misunderstanding of Jesus' ministry is based on perceptions of routinized practices and on the dogmas of the church.

Other studies of Jesus as a leader took place in the context of understanding Christian leadership, whether lay or professional (e.g., Smith, 1973; Moy, 1985; Jordan, 1990; Russell, 1993). Russell was the only researcher who studied Jesus as a transformational leader. He wrote, "Christ is the ultimate example of transformational
leadership" (p. 117). However, he evaluated Jesus' leadership as the divine Son of God. As a divine being, his leadership characteristics and behaviors would seem out of reach for most leaders. Therefore, evaluating the leadership of the historical Jesus as a transformational leader during chaotic times might give insight into understanding the context and behaviors of all types of transformational leaders. Jesus' enduring legacy suggests that, unlike McNamara, he "saw" clearly and was able to present a path of living and acting which continues to stir the imagination and hearts of thousands.

Purpose Statement

Since Jesus was a significant change agent and a sage, exploring the relationship between wisdom and leadership in the figure of the historical Jesus is a logical step. The purpose of this study is to propose a theory of leadership modeled after the transformational wisdom leadership of Jesus. More specifically, the study will explore how the construct of wisdom is linked with transformational leadership evident in Jesus. It is hypothesized that wisdom is the integrating and interpreting framework for transformational leadership and that common sense is the integrating and interpreting framework for transactional leadership. It is also hypothesized that effective transformational leadership operates from a foundation of positive transactional skills and common sense, and that wisdom brings balance and enables the leader to "see" through the complexities of conflicting events and interpersonal relationships. In other words, to avoid charismatic excess, over-idealized communication, exclusive individualized
consideration, and biased intellectual stimulation, the effective transformational leader understands and uses transactional skills and common sense.

The historical Jesus is understood as a renewal movement leader and a wise person. The Jesus Seminar, organized by historical Jesus specialists in 1985, took up the challenge to renew the quest for the historical Jesus. In 1993, their discussions and study resulted in the book, *The Five Gospels: The Search for the Authentic Words of Jesus*. In that book, the sayings and parables are color-coded, indicating the value of words attributed to Jesus. The words colored "red" are considered the most authentic. This study will use the sayings and parables of Jesus which are coded "red." These "red" sayings are used to explore the relationship of leadership style to common sense and wisdom. The questions to be explored are:

1. How does Jesus' wisdom mode cohere with modern psychological wisdom theories and common sense theories?

2. How does Jesus' leadership style cohere with transformational leadership theory?

3. How do transformational leadership theory and wisdom cohere together in the historical Jesus?

The first question involves an analysis of Jesus' sayings and parables in the wisdom tradition of first-century Palestine. From that analysis, a comparison is made to wisdom and common sense theory. The second question requires an analysis of the meaning of Jesus' words in the context and culture of his time. The impact and intent of his words are used as the basis for understanding his leadership style. From that
understanding, a comparison is made to transformational leadership theory. The third question is explored by bringing together the information and looking for new insights and relationships.

**Definitions and Variables**

**Transformational leadership**: Transformational leadership is a leadership process which influences positive systemic change in a social environment and creates a relationship with followers that elevates their consciousness to higher levels. The four factors of transformational leadership identified by Bass and Avolio (1994) are

- **Idealized Influence**: The leader provides vision and a sense of mission and excitement, gains respect and trust, has referent power and high moral values, and sets challenging goals. Followers identify with and emulate the leader.

- **Inspirational Motivation**: The leader communicates high expectations and vision, uses symbols and images to focus efforts, and uses emotional appeals in simple ways to express important purposes and to increase understanding of mutually desired goals.

- **Intellectual Stimulation**: The leader provides a flow of new ideas, encourages followers in careful problem-solving, and promotes intelligence and rationality. Followers are supported for thinking on their own and questioning their own values and beliefs as well as those of the leader and organization.

- **Individualized Consideration**: The leader gives personal attention, treats each one as an individual, coaches and advises. Followers feel they are treated differently, but
equitably. The awareness of their need to mature is raised, and the means for more effectively addressing goals and challenges is encouraged.

**Transactional Leadership:** Bass and Avolio (1994) define transactional leadership as an exchange between leader and follower in order to accomplish individual and organizational interests. Bass and Avolio (1994) identify the factors as:

- **Contingent Reward:** The leader contracts an exchange of rewards for effort and good performance and recognizes accomplishments. Emphasis is on facilitating the agreed-upon objectives. The followers' needs are identified and linked to what the leader expects to accomplish and to rewards the followers receive if the objectives are met.

- **Management by Exception:** The leader watches for deviations from rules and standards and takes corrective action. Leaders may arrange active ways to monitor performances, or they may remain passive until standards are not met. The models of reinforcement are generally correction criticism, negative feedback, or negative contingent reinforcement. Punishment and discipline are evidence of management by exception.

- **Laissez-faire:** The "leader" is absent, abdicates responsibility, and avoids decision-making. Generally, transactions with followers do not exist. Feedback, rewards, and involvement are absent. There is no attempt to motivate followers or to satisfy their needs.

**Wisdom:** "Wisdom is the integration of the affective, conative, and cognitive aspects of human abilities in response to life's tasks and problems. Wisdom is a balance between the opposing valences of intense emotion and detachment, action and inaction,
and knowledge and doubts" (Birren & Fisher, 1990, p. 326). Using personal experience and cognitive processes, wise persons make choices for a certain course of action (Kekes, 1983; Kramer, 1990; Labouvie-Vief, 1982). Features of wisdom are:

- **Recognition of and response to human limitation**: Wise persons have a capacity for and comfort with divergent thinking. They know what they don't know, and are comfortable with doubt and ambiguity. They are willing to deflate conventional ideas with searching questions. They are able to change views on the basis of interactions with others. Wise persons understand change and growth (Achenbaum & Orwell, 1991; Birren, 1985; Holliday & Chandler, 1986; Meacham, 1982; Taranto, 1989).

- **Judgment and communication skills**: Wise persons have an ability to bring balance. They have a greater capacity for dealing with long-range issues. They show exceptional judgment and are creative problem-solvers and advisors. Wise persons deal with life's paradoxes, contradictions, and change. They have an ability to evaluate and communicate about life, and are perceptive (Birren, 1985; Clayton, 1982; Dittman-Kohli, 1984; Kramer, 1990).

- **Exceptional understanding of ordinary experience**: Wise persons have the ability to see essences and the interrelatedness of experience. They have experience-based pragmatic knowledge, and understand things in a larger context. They are in touch with the self and understand human nature. Wise persons use common sense, are reflective and intuitive, and show discernment (Holliday & Chandler, 1986).

- **Personal, interpersonal, and transpersonal skills**: Wise persons have the ability to interact effectively. They are empathetic and understanding, moral, patient, and
unselfish. Wise persons are socially unobtrusive and even-tempered. They have a sense of humor. They demonstrate integrity, are spiritual and introspective (Achenbaum & Orwell, 1991; Birren, 1985; Clayton & Birren, 1980; Holliday & Chandler, 1986; Kramer, 1980).

Common Sense: "Common sense is the accumulated shared beliefs of a culture and has been termed conventional wisdom" (Taranto, 1989, p.12). "Common sense may . . . be defined as the system of implications shared by the competent users of a language" (Smedslund, 1982, p. 79). Every culture has a set of shared assumptions about the nature of the physical and social world, and a set of cultural maxims. Features of common sense as defined by Schwieso (1984) are:

- **Common sensation:** a linking of the five senses, ordinary perception, primary truths formed through experience;

- **Ordinary intelligence:** distinguishing ordinary persons from mentally-challenged persons or persons of poor emotional health;

- **Good sense:** tactful judgment, practical understanding exhibited in everyday behavior;

- **Common opinion:** judgments and ready-made opinions ranging from moral imperatives to adages and proverbs, beliefs common to a community, the collective good.
Summary

The hypothesis of this study suggests that wisdom is an essential and natural component of effective transformational leadership. Wisdom encourages the interpretation and integration of information, intuition, and intelligence in order to inform the leader of the best course of action. Wisdom functions are interrelated for problem-solving, advising others, spiritual introspection, and management of social institutions (Kramer, 1990). These functions are essential for effective leadership. Understanding the differences between the perspective and activity of the transactional common sense leader and the transformational wisdom leader would enhance the understanding of leadership processes and characteristics for both practitioners and researchers.

As Bass and Avolio wrote in Leadership Theory and Research (1993), not all the characteristics of transformational leadership are known. Linking leadership theory to other constructs is an on-going research need. Wisdom is the capstone of maturity and personal development and is embedded in its service to the community. Therefore, linking wisdom theory to transformational leadership would contribute to understanding effective leadership.

Using the historical Jesus to study the relationships of the constructs is a natural choice. The historical Jesus was a significant leader who, as a prophetic sage, sought to renew the Jewish social and spiritual system. Studying him against modern leadership and psychological wisdom theories might help clarify the nature or intent of his behaviors. Meier (1991b) wrote:

What is beyond dispute is that Jesus of Nazareth is one of those perennial
question marks in history with which humankind is never quite done. With a ministry of two or three years he attracted and infuriated his contemporaries, mesmerized and alienated the ancient world, unleashed a movement that has done the same ever since, and thus changed the course of history forever.

(p. 107)

This study begins in Chapter Two with a literature review of transformational leadership theory, psychological wisdom theory, and historical Jesus studies. Chapter Three explains the research methodology. Chapter Four explores the nature of Jesus' wisdom in the Biblical wisdom tradition. Chapter Five explores the nature of Jesus' leadership in first-century Palestine. Conclusions are drawn in Chapter Six.

According to Bass (1990a), "leadership is the single most critical factor in the success or failure of an institution" (p. 8). Within the context of escalating change in the Western world, effective leadership in businesses, educational institutions, governing bodies, or ministering bodies is urgent. Leaders are needed who can "see" by interpreting and integrating all the relational, cultural, political, and informational elements in a variety of situations. Then, they can act transformationally. McNamara, an outstanding leader in service to a large business, the United States government, and an international financial organization, confesses that a lack of wisdom led to a tragic escalation of the war in Vietnam. This study hopes to clarify the importance and relationship of leadership to wisdom, so that in the future a gifted leader such as McNamara might not have to confess twenty-seven years later that he made a terrible mistake.
CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

The fields of leadership studies, psychological wisdom studies, and Biblical literature are respected disciplines containing many eminent scholars and researchers. The purpose of this study is to pull together certain dominant theories in these three fields in order to propose an integrating/interpreting relationship among them. Therefore, the scope of this study precludes an in-depth analysis of all the issues and diverse thinking in these fields. This researcher will argue for the reliability and validity of the theories chosen, including a short history of their development, their primary interpreters and critics, and major studies of them. This chapter is divided in three sections, beginning with “Transformational Leadership,” developing the ideas in “Psychological Wisdom and Common Sense Theories,” and ending with “The Historical Jesus.”

Transformational Leadership

Leadership has fascinated people since the beginning of recorded history. Most of the earliest legends record the exploits of mythical leaders, such as Odysseus, Beowulf, and King Arthur. However, the empirical study of leadership as a social phenomenon did not begin in earnest until the early twentieth century (Bass, 1990a). Those who first studied leadership believed that eventually someone would produce a “GUT,” a “Grand Unifying Theory” of Leadership (Van Fleet & Yukl, 1986).
However, such a theory still does not exist, as illustrated by the much-reported lament of Bennis and Nanus (1985): “Thousands of empirical investigations of leadership have been conducted in the last seventy-five years alone, but no clear and unequivocal understanding exists as to what distinguishes leaders from nonleaders” (p. 4). The reason is not due to the lack of trying, but to the reality that leadership is an extraordinarily complex social phenomenon.

Today, leadership is seen as a complex social interchange that needs to be studied by skilled practitioners in multiple disciplines (Rost, 1991). Leadership involves not only the characteristics and behaviors of the leader, but also the characteristics and needs of followers, the culture and politics of the organization, and the situational factors of the “leadership event,” to name a few (Bass, 1990a; Van Fleet & Yukl, 1986). Yukl (1989b) described the trends in leadership studies today as returning to a balanced theoretical perspective of leadership and focusing on leadership as a shared process embedded in social systems.

**The Development of Leadership Theory**

In the early stages of the empirical study of leadership, most thinking on leadership was founded on the assumption that leaders were born, not made (Bass, 1990a; Hollander & Offermann, 1990). The “Great Man” theory attributed leadership to a genetic disposition that compels an individual to lead no matter what the circumstances. Therefore, early researchers from 1900 until the 1940s explored trait theories, studying leadership traits in an effort to understand what distinguished leaders from followers.
Trait theories fell into disfavor largely because theorists found that leadership could not be separated from situational factors. No one list of traits could be produced for every possible situation. Also, with the rise of Social Darwinism, researchers could no longer believe that leaders were simply born. Leaders apparently evolved from their environment in the same way that biological life was believed by scientists to evolve by its survival instincts in a changing environment.

The pendulum swung from "traits" compelling a leader to lead to "situational factors" that would compel an individual to step into leadership roles. Pure situationalists purported that leaders resulted from a combination of time, place, and circumstance. Crises would present opportunities for leaders to emerge; otherwise, they would remain obscure.

An important situational element that emerged was the followers' roles, particularly the followers' attributions to the leader. Follower attribution is how a follower perceives a leader, how a follower enables a leader to lead, and how a follower interacts with a leader to determine the leader's effectiveness. Being a follower is an active role, and effective leadership depends on good followership (Hollander, 1992; Kouzes & Posner, 1987; Rost, 1992).

Today, most theorists conclude that leadership has elements of trait theory and situational theory (Bass, 1990a). Leader traits and situational elements both impact leadership. However, researchers and practitioners have discovered that leader behaviors are better predictors of leadership than leader traits (Clark & Clark, 1992; Gibb, 1969;
Van Fleet & Yukl, 1986). Leader traits varied considerably from individual to individual, but leader behaviors began to emerge as more measurable and consistent.

The Ohio State Studies (Stogdill & Coons, 1957) confirmed that two general behaviors, consideration and initiating structure, were particular to leadership. Consideration is those activities that provide encouragement and support to followers. Initiating structure is those activities that clarify tasks: the steps and the required behaviors. From the Ohio State studies, a popular leadership scale was developed called the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ).

Fiedler (1967) took the general behaviors of consideration and initiating structure and added situational factors involving followers. He developed the contingency models of leadership, considering leadership effectiveness to be a joint function of situational demands and leader behaviors. Fiedler distinguished between two leadership styles, task-oriented and relationship-oriented, and studied their effectiveness in three situational contingencies. He developed the Least Preferred Co-worker (LPC) scale to measure whether the leaders were task-oriented or relationship-oriented according to the way they judged their least preferred co-workers. He found that, as the situational contingencies changed, the leadership style perceived as effective would change. House’s (1971) path-goal model and Vroom and Yetton’s (1973) normative model are other contingency models that developed out of Fiedler’s research.

**Transformational and Transactional Leadership Theory**

However, Bass (1985a) empirically and Burns (1978) historically presented a theory of leadership with universal leadership behaviors for every situation. Many leader
practitioners, such as Gardner in his book On Leadership (1990) and Kouzes & Posner (1988) in their book, The Leadership Challenge, implied that essential patterns of leadership are appropriate for leaders in all situations. The leadership style using these behaviors is called transformational leadership.

These patterns have been identified in effective leadership in the military (Boyd, 1988; Deluga, 1991a; Roush & Atwater, 1992; Yammarino & Bass, 1990), the ministry (Hicks, 1990; Luther, 1991; Russell, 1993), business (Howell & Avolio, 1993; Singer, 1985), and education (Kirby & Paradise, 1992; Tucker, Bass, & Daniel, 1992), to name a few. The patterns have been identified quantitatively with Bass and Avolio’s Multi-Factor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ), Kouzes & Posner’s Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI), and Sashkin’s Leadership Behavior Questionnaire (LBQ).

The researchers developed the leader behavior scales independently with different methodologies. However, their outcomes are remarkably similar. This suggests that transformational leaders have common behaviors. Therefore, transformational leadership research has demonstrated that certain behaviors are found universally among effective leaders in a variety of leadership positions and in a range of leadership places (Chemers, 1993). The transformational leadership patterns are a combination of behaviors and some traits and are dependent on follower attribution and interaction. These qualities are exhibited at all levels in an organization and in varying degrees, depending on the situation and the capabilities of the leader (Clark & Clark, 1992; Maccoby, 1981; Yukl, 1989a).
The behaviors, as defined by Burns (1978), distinguished between the transactional and the transformational leader. He was the first to provide a comprehensive theory distinguishing between the two leadership styles. The transactional leader’s behaviors are part of an exchange system between the leader and the follower. The transaction is based on the economic needs of the individual and the institution. In contrast, transformational leadership raises followers’ moral vision and ideals to a higher plane.

Burns (1978) wrote, “The transforming leader looks for potential motives in followers, seeks to satisfy higher needs, and engages the full person of the follower. The result of transforming leadership is a relationship of mutual stimulation and elevation that converts followers into leaders and may convert leaders into moral agents” (p. 4). Burns believed that transformational and transactional leadership were two extremes of a leadership continuum. Transactional leaders were motivated by their self-interests, while transforming leaders sought to raise consciousness of followers by appealing to higher motives and humanitarianism.

Tichy and Devanna (1990) wrote of transformational dramas occurring around three themes: (1) recognizing the need for revitalization, (2) creating a new vision, and (3) institutionalizing change. For them, the leadership process is systemic and consists of purposeful organized search for change in the political, cultural, and technical arenas of an organization. Most of their book deals with the “how to's” of changing an organization through transformational leadership behaviors. However, in the final chapter they list the traits of transformational leaders. Transformational leaders are change agents, are
courageous, believe in people, are value-driven, are life-long learners, have the ability to deal with complexity, ambiguity, and uncertainty, and are visionaries.

Kouzes and Posner (1988) studied transformational leadership by having people describe their greatest leaders. From the descriptions they prepared the LPI questionnaire. Their five scales are all behaviorally oriented: (1) challenging the process, (2) inspiring a shared vision, (3) enabling others to act, (4) modeling the way, and (5) encouraging the heart.

Sashkin (1992) identified several common leader behaviors. He used the qualitative research of Bennis and Nanus (1985) who conducted in-depth interviews with 60 private and 30 public leaders known for their outstanding organizational performances. From Bennis and Nanus (1985), Sashkin took four leadership strategies and developed his own categories. Bennis and Nanus had: (1) attention through vision, (2) meaning through communication, (3) trust through positioning, and (4) the deployment of self through positive self-regard and focused persistence. Sashkin created five categories and named them: (1) clarity, (2) communication, (3) consistency, (4) caring, and (5) creating opportunities. Sashkin's leadership practices are strikingly similar to Kouzes and Posner's. However, Sashkin concluded that transformational leadership must be more than behaviors. He identified three personal characteristics that separated the exceptional leader from the manager, the transformational leader from the transactional. Sashkin called them traits, but he believed them to be learnable and changeable. These characteristics are self-confidence, power, and vision.
The most important researcher to clarify and study Burns' transformational leadership was Bass (1985a). Bass noted a flaw in Burns' model. Like Fiedler, Bass did not see task and relationship as mutually exclusive. In other words, Bass (1985a) described transformational and transactional leadership as different but not inconsistent with each other. A leader might exhibit one or both styles. Bass verified this with his measuring scale, the Multi-Factor Leadership Questionnaire, which is filled out by the leader and the followers. Bass developed the MLQ after asking hundreds of people to describe a leader by identifying actions and characteristics. Bass then translated the descriptions into specific questions. With the MLQ, Bass clarified four factors of transformational leadership and three of transactional. The factors of transformational leadership include charismatic leadership, inspirational leadership, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration. The transactional factors include management by exception, contingent reward, and laissez-faire.

Criticisms of Transformational and Transactional Leadership Theory

Three main criticisms are leveled against transformational leadership theory. They are: (1) the theory is similar to the behaviors identified by the Ohio State Studies; (2) charisma is an elusive factor; and (3) transformational leadership is an industrial model of leadership. This section discusses these three criticisms. The theory is similar to consideration and initiation of structure. Some critics concluded that transformational and transactional leadership were not any different than Stogdill and Coons' (1957) consideration and initiation of structure (Seltzer & Bass, 1990). Seltzer and Bass (1990) demonstrated that initiation of structure and consideration
might equate with transactional leadership, but it was transformational leadership that accounted for additional variances in effectiveness. Transformational leadership theory goes beyond initiation and consideration.

Specifically, Hunt (1991) concluded that individualized consideration and the LBDQ’s consideration were synonymous. Bass and Avolio (1993) defended the distinction: “Individualized consideration conceptually builds on two aspects of behavior, individualization among followers (e.g. “gives personal attention to those who seem neglected”) and development of followers (e.g. “gets me to look at problems as learning opportunities”)” (p. 63). They commented that the LBDQ consideration is concerned with the leader being friendly and approachable, while individualized consideration is more complex and concerned with the leader and follower exchange. Bass’s factors of transactional and transformational leadership identify specific types of behaviors. From their research, they concluded that transformational leadership is an observable phenomena with distinctive and salient features” (Bass & Avolio, 1993, p. 58).

Charisma is not a behavior and is an elusive factor. Bass (1985a) incorporated charisma as one of the key factors of transformational leadership, but he is continually criticized for that choice. Researchers claim that charisma is not a behavior. Charisma, the initial name for idealized influence, is basically an attribution since it represents how followers identify with the leader. Sashkin and Rosenbach (1993) explained, “charisma is the result of transformational leadership rather than its cause” (p. 91). Charisma is attributed by followers, and some scholars believe that it is more an aspect of personality than behavior.
Furthermore, the ambiguity of the term and the historical reality that charismatic leadership can also be very negative and dangerous inhibits clear use of the concept. Hitler is an example of a charismatic leader who used his charisma to control and manipulate people. Yukl (1989a) wrote:

A major controversy is whether charisma is primarily a result of leader attributes, situational conditions, or an interactive influence process between leader and followers. This controversy resembles the divergent perspectives of the trait, situational, and reciprocal influence approaches within mainstream leadership literature. (p. 205)

Charisma is an elusive factor that produces exceptional leadership through its extraordinary effect on followers (House & Shamir, 1993). Such leaders transform the aspirations, needs, and values of followers to make sacrifices for a cause and to perform beyond expectation. The distinction between visionary, transformational, and charismatic leadership is not always clearly delineated (House & Shamir, 1993).

For Bass (1985b), “Charisma is the most important component in the larger concept of transformational leadership” (p. 34). If charisma is the most important component of transformational leadership, a criticism of its reliability is a serious matter. Also, Bass (1985a) wrote that transformational leaders will change a group’s identity, the use of authority and power, the work-group norms, and the group’s beliefs about values and human nature. Therefore, confusion about the benefit and nature of charisma, especially in the context of the leadership model’s substantive impact on an organization, demands a serious evaluation of the charge.
Conger (1989) believed that the problem with the term charisma stemmed from two elements. One problem is the history of the word. Charisma is a Greek word meaning “gift,” especially a gift from the gods. In the early Christian church, gifts from God in the form of strange languages, healings, prophecy, and wisdom were called charismata.

In the field of leadership, the term charisma was first used by Weber (1924/1947) when he distinguished between economic and non-economic sources of authority. Weber’s study of charisma and charismatic leadership led to his conclusion that some types of leadership were much more than political or economic power structure. Weber (1946) wrote,

> The charismatic hero does not deduce his authority from codes and statutes, as in the case with the jurisdiction of office, nor does he deduce his authority from traditional custom or feudal vows of faith, as is the case with patrimonial power. The charismatic leader gains and maintains authority solely by proving his strength in life. (p. 248)

Later, House (1977) proposed a theory of charismatic leadership based on observable processes rather than on stories. He combined traits, situational elements, and behaviors to distinguish charismatic leadership from other types of leadership. However, Burns (1978), writing a year later, chose to call it heroic leadership, “... belief in leaders because of their personage alone” (p. 244). He believed that the term “charisma” was too ambiguous and easily misunderstood. Some researchers do not make a distinction between charismatic and transformational leadership (Howell & Frost, 1989).
Today, major thinkers and researchers on transformational leadership, such as Tichy and Devanna (1990) usually opt to use the word visionary rather than charismatic. In their book, they alluded to Drucker's (1993) discomfort with charismatic leadership by writing, "We agree with Drucker that these are not the province of lonely, half-mad individuals with flashes of genius. Rather, this brand of leadership is a behavioral process capable of being learned and managed" (p. xii). For them, visionaries are people who can dream and then translate the dream into reality. They avoided the ambiguity of using the word charisma by calling it visionary leadership.

Kouzes and Posner (1988) did not use the term charisma, but when describing transformational leadership, they did name charismatic behaviors such as "inspiring a shared vision" and "modeling the way." Sashkin and Burke (1990) called their transformational leader a visionary leader, again avoiding the problem with the term charisma. However, his character traits of self-confidence, power, and vision are also descriptors of charisma. Though he did not name the behaviors as charismatic, a charismatic individual would exhibit all three.

The second problem with charisma is its direct link to attribution: charismatic behavior will be perceived differently by different persons. Therefore, the interpretation of it will vary. Charisma is relational in nature (Pierce & Newstrom, 1995). Howell and Frost (1989) explained, "A fundamental aspect of charisma is the extraordinary, intensely personal relationship between charismatic leaders, and their followers" (p. 244). However, what intensely attracts some people to an individual might repel others. Some
might say, for instance, that Hillary Clinton has charisma, while others would vehemently deny it.

A charismatic leader is described as "someone who by the sheer force of personality is capable of having profound effects upon followers. Charismatic leaders generate extremely intense loyalty, passion, and devotion" (Pierce & Newstrom, 1995). This emotional devotion sometimes turns into blind obedience. According to Conger and Kanungo (1988), charismatic leaders have expressive behavior, self-confidence, self-determination, insight, freedom from internal conflicts, eloquence, and a high level of energy. Other features include extremity of vision, high personal risk, use of unconventional strategies, communication of self-confidence, and use of personal power.

All these characteristics are value-neutral, which can be dangerous. Kets de Vries (1993), using a clinical approach to leadership, recognized the role of unconscious motivation, intrapsychic reality, and the limits of rationality in leadership. A charismatic leader, exhibiting all the characteristics of charisma, could also be a full-blown narcissist with personal power drives. Napoleon suffered from such delusions. Graham (1991) warned that charismatic leadership has no moral safeguards. She suggested that moral charismatic leadership needs to be dedicated to service and to influencing others to moral autonomy.

Conger (1989) wrote in *The Charismatic Leader* that charismatic leaders are change agents who can have a dark side. Because charismatic leaders are impatient with the status quo, they can be intolerant and critical. However, Conger believed (1989) that because of "their creativity, inspiration, unconventionality, and vision, charismatic
leaders are potential sources of enormous transformation for organization” (p. 18). But the question is: what is the price to be paid for change? Drucker (1993) claimed that “charisma becomes the undoing of a leader” (p. 120). He noted that charisma does not guarantee effectiveness nor does effectiveness depend on charisma.

Bass and Avolio (1993) wrestled with the ethical dilemma of charismatic leadership. In his early writings, Bass (1985a) did not exclude leaders who influenced people transformationally but with negative effects. Burns (1978) disagreed, and believed that true leadership appealed to positive moral values and respect for human dignity and equal rights. Later, Bass (1993) did clarify that moral transformational leadership would better serve an organization in the long run. For him, the factor of personalized individualized consideration would act as a balance to excessive charisma that can lead to an absorption in self-interests.

Hall and Thompson (1980), after studying the importance of maturity and values in leadership, concluded that the highest level of leadership requires the ability not only to embrace paradox, but to also express active compassion. True transformational leadership contributes to positive systemic change, not just systemic change. Charismatic leadership alone, or transformational leadership without values, does not necessarily have a moral foundation.

Maccoby (1981) wrote that the ideal leader “must bring out the best in people, the constructive ideals of a social character, the values that express its most positive traits” (p. 16). Through in-depth interviews with six very different leaders, he isolated three qualities which corresponded to positive social character: “a caring, respectful and
responsible attitude; flexibility about people and organizational structure; and a participative approach to management, the willingness to share power” (p. 221).

Charismatic leadership run amok would not evidence these qualities.

Even though Bass in his later writings moved away from the term charisma, he and others continued to believe that charismatic behaviors are essential for transformation. All of the theorists and practitioners of transformational leadership concur that such leadership transforms organizations by “infusing into them ideological values and moral purpose” (House & Shamir, 1993, p. 83). Kuhnert and Lewis (1987) emphasized the responsibility of the transformational leader to help mature individuals to higher levels of values and moral obligations. The highest level of values endorses justice, the equality of human rights, and respect for each person’s dignity.

According to Bass, charisma is only one of four factors of transformational leadership. Bass (1985a) wrote, “Charisma is a necessary ingredient of transformational leadership, but by itself it is not sufficient to account for the transformational process” (p. 31). Bass himself noted in a 1993 article that charisma is “generally defined with respect to follower reactions to the leader as well as to the leader’s behavior” (p. 51). In the same article, he began calling charisma “idealized influence.” He listed behavioral indicators for idealized influence. They are observable behaviors such as “expresses dedication to followers,” “eases group tension in critical times,” and “transmits a sense of joint mission and ownership.” Howell and Frost (1989) empirically isolated and identified charismatic leadership, and concluded that “charisma is not as elusive as some scholars have thought it to be” (p. 265).
In this study, because of the ongoing debate over the use of the term charisma and its possible negative effects, the label of “idealized influence” will be used. Bass’s recent labeling of charisma as “idealized influence” better accomplishes the purpose of naming a leadership behavior that invites trust and confidence. Bass and Avolio (1994) described idealized influence in 1994 by writing, “He or she can be counted on to do the right thing, demonstrating high standards of ethical and moral conduct” (p. 3). With this new terminology and behavior designations, Bass has addressed the criticisms leveled against charisma.

Transformational leadership is an industrial model of leadership. Another major, and serious, criticism of the transformational theory is that it is an industrial model of leadership rather than a systems model. Rost (1991) discovered, in his research about leadership, that since 1930 there is a consistent view of leadership in the literature. He called it the industrial school of leadership, and it is based on leadership as good management. He described the school as: “(1) structural-functionalist, (2) management-oriented, (3) personalistic in focusing on the leader, (4) goal-achievement-dominated, (5) self-interested and individualistic in outlook, (6) male-oriented, (7) utilitarian and materialistic in ethical perspective, and (8) rationalistic, technocratic, linear, quantitative, and scientific in language and methodology” (p. 27).

Rost (1991) noted that “leadership scholars in the future are going to have to think new thoughts about leadership using postindustrial assumptions about human beings, organizations, societies, and the planet Earth” (p. 183). The postindustrial paradigm of leadership takes into consideration the new evolving systems paradigm.
Capra (1982) believed that Western civilization is experiencing a paradigm shift, a new vision of reality. The era is shifting from the scientific views of Descartes and Newton, that perceived the organic world as a large machine or giant clock, to the scientific views of quantum physics, chaos theory, and self-organizing theory. These sciences perceive the universe as an interconnected web of relationships that are intrinsically dynamic. The materialism and reductionism of the Newtonian model is changing to a systems model based on relationships and dynamic processes (Wheatley, 1992).

The changing view of reality leads to changing values and changing lifestyles. Naisbitt’s popular books Megatrends (1982) and Megatrends 2000 (1990), co-authored with Aburdene, uncovered large-scale global changes, including a global economy, women in leadership, the age of biology, the emergence of free-market socialism, and a shift from an industrial society to an information society. These vast changes in science, economics, politics, and culture have impacted, and will continue to impact leadership studies.

Kanter (1989) proposed that, because of the rapidity of changes in the environment, leadership needs to create a post-entrepreneurial revolution by marrying entrepreneurial creativity with corporate discipline, cooperation, and teamwork. Senge (1990) encouraged leaders to see wholes, interrelationships, and patterns that are partly accomplished through building shared vision and learning as a team. Bergquist (1993) noted the transition from the management philosophy of leadership dependent on policies and procedures to postmodern leadership that is highly situational and able to master the
unexpected and handle ambiguity. All the popular practitioners believe that today's
effective leaders must be comfortable with change. Transformational leadership is exactly
a theory of leadership that is comfortable with change.

Rost (1991) believed that Burns was trying to build a new school of leadership.
However, Rost concluded that Burns was not successful and that instead he reconstructed
the concept of leadership. Bass (1990a) would disagree:

Prior to the 1980s, behavioral research on leadership concentrated on the
transactional exchange between the leader and the led. The leader clarified
what needed to be done and the benefits to the self-interest of the followers
for compliance. In the new paradigm, the transformational leader moved
followers to transcend their own interests for the good of the group,
organization, or society. (pp. 901-902)

The problem does not seem to be the concept of transformational leadership, but
the measurement of its effectiveness. The practitioners and many of the researchers have
evaluated transformational leadership in its effectiveness toward increasing the survival
of financial institutions. Hollander and Offermann (1990) challenge researchers in
leadership studies to examine the issues of leadership toward what ends. Is the end of
leadership effectiveness more profit, or is it a team of individuals interacting with energy
and creativity towards accomplishing some mutually beneficial purpose?

Though there are elements of the industrial school in transformational leadership
outcomes, transformational leadership represents a pivotal movement toward a
postindustrial paradigm. Beginning with Burns (1978), transformational leadership theory
moved beyond traditional understandings of leadership as a transaction between leaders and followers. However, some of the literature and research spawned by this theory continues to base its analysis of leadership in an industrial paradigm.

Some practitioners interpreted transformational leadership to mean excellence in performance. Bass titled his 1985 book *Performance Beyond Expectation*. The goal, he concluded, is to increase the performance of a business, the efficiency of the military, or the numbers in a congregation. Kouzes and Posner (1988) and Peters and Waterman (1982) are others who have written popular, excellent books on the importance of the leader being an effective change agent, one who can continually transform the company to meet the vision for success. Their interest in leadership is marketplace advantage.

Clark, Clark, and Campbell (1992) defined leadership as “an activity—an influence process—in which an individual gains the trust and commitment of others and without recourse to formal position or authority moves the group to the accomplishment of one or more tasks” (p. 2). Managers, on the other hand, are those who supervise the accomplishment of the task. Drucker (1993) believed that a key to leadership effectiveness is working smarter, defining the task and performance. The goal is to increase productivity. These are utilitarian models of leadership: goal-directed and functionally oriented. Describing the “how to’s” of transformational leadership in order to be more competitive is an industrial paradigm goal.

Other theorists and practitioners of transformational leadership suggested that leadership is an intrinsically dynamic and interconnected web of relationships between leaders and followers. The purpose of this leadership is to influence the development of
the individual and the system. Burns (1978) revolutionized thinking about leadership by pointing to the abilities of leaders to satisfy higher needs of followers and to engage the full person. Leadership was much more than getting the job done or being financially or personally successful. Leadership involved morality and satisfying interrelationships.

Bleerdorn (1988) and Rost (1991) both suggested that Burns' model hinted at an understanding of the postindustrial paradigm. In this paradigm, the values, and therefore the goals and policies that support those values, are quite different from the industrial leadership paradigm. Rost named them as "collaboration, common good, global concern, diversity and pluralism in structures and participation, client orientation, civic virtues, freedom of expression in all organizations, critical dialogue, qualitative language and methodologies, substantive justice, and consensus-oriented policy-making process" (p. 181).

Bleerdorn (1988) believed that the transformational model is concerned with such values. Transformational leadership is a mutual relationship between leaders and followers. She noted that Burns exposed many of the myths of leadership. Burns saw leadership as collective, morally purposeful, and elevating rather than individualistic, amoral, and utilitarian. Gardner (1990), particularly in his prize-winning book, On Leadership, saw transformational leadership as affirming and regenerating values, being responsible for the common good, renewing the community and individual, and interacting between leaders, followers, and constituents. For him, effective leaders served as models symbolizing the group's unity and identity.
For Burns (1978), transformational leadership is a process “when one or more persons engage with others in such a way that leaders and followers raise one another to higher levels of motivation and morality” (p. 20). Therefore, the entire social system of the group is transformed. Fourteen years later, Schein (1992) wrote that the primary task of the leader is reconstructing culture by helping to define and inculcate shared values and beliefs. Organizational culture is the most important and fundamental aspect of a group’s identity. It involves customs and traditions, group norms, values, ideological principles, rules of the game, climate, skills, habits of thinking, shared meanings, and integrating symbols. If an organization is “frozen” and needs to change, then Schein recommended that transformational leaders are needed. Transformational leadership seems to be the leadership model that best addresses the changing needs of an organization in a postindustrial society.

Senge (1990) and Wheatley (1992) both believe in the importance of a learning organization that uses systems thinking. A primary factor of transformational leadership is its ability to intellectually stimulate a group and to motivate through values for the more difficult course of action. Rost’s (1991) understanding that transformational leadership is not fully a school because it is based on the industrial leadership paradigm does not do justice to Burns’ dream. As demonstrated, the problem seems to be the tendency of interpreters of the theory and practitioners to go for the utilitarian prize rather than to explore the implications of a transformational leadership philosophy. Bass and Avolio (1993) admitted that much needs to be learned about transformational leadership.
Podsakoff, et al. (1995) observed that most of the empirical research on transformational leadership has focused on its impact on performance, follower satisfaction, employee attitudes, and extra effort rather than on the substantive impact on the organization’s and individual’s values and beliefs. If the group member merely performs his or her job beyond expectation, that is an industrial goal; but if the person has psychologically developed to a healthier and more mature state, then one has a postindustrial leadership paradigm. Tichy & Devanna (1990) described true transformational leadership as systemic. It consists of a purposeful organized search for change in the political, cultural, and technical arenas of an organization. Adams (1986) believed that transforming leadership needed a systems perspective.

Transformational leaders do not just impact an organization’s productivity. When people are satisfied and stimulated, more energy and higher productivity are normal outcomes. However, transformational leadership primarily effects change within persons and a culture. The change is toward a more compelling vision for higher values. The best route out of chaos is personal meaning-making (Wheatley, 1992). Transformational leadership focuses on individual and organizational renewal (McElroy & Stark, 1992). Transformational leadership focuses on value development, perspective taking, and lifelong learning (Burns, 1978; Russell & Kuhnert, 1992). As Max DePree (1989) stated, “We must understand that reaching our potential is more important than reaching our goals” (p. 69). Transformational leadership affects both high-order and low-order change. Bass (1985a) described low-order change as satisfying a follower’s current needs and
maintaining organizational performance standards. High-order change challenges the individual to higher needs and values, and stimulates organizational growth.

The transformational leadership definition clarifies transformational leadership as a process “of influencing major changes in the attitudes and assumptions of organization members and building commitment for the organization’s mission and objectives” (Yukl, 1989a, p. 204). In a turbulent environment, survival depends on leaders who can master the unexpected and can tolerate ambiguity (Bergquist, 1993). Postindustrial leadership, by necessity, will be highly situational in order to influence change. Change is possible, if attitudes and perceptions are changed. Transformational leadership is the leadership style for change (Fisher, Merron, & Torbert, 1987). It focuses on communicating purpose and vision and on enabling personal and communal development. Thus, transformational leadership, though studied in its effectiveness as an industrial model, can be a systems model of leadership (Adams, 1986; Rosenbach & Taylor, 1993; Tichy & Devanna, 1990).

Transformational and Transactional Leadership Studies

Transformational leadership studies have confirmed the model’s effectiveness and versatility. Studies have indicated that transformational leadership results in positive perceptions of leader effectiveness by subordinates, in subordinate satisfaction with the leader, and in increased performance by subordinates (Bass & Avolio, 1994; Boyd, 1988; Deluga, 1991a; Hater & Bass, 1988; Kirby & Paradise, 1992; Seltzer & Bass, 1990; Singer & Singer, 1986).

Howell and Avolio (1993) and Yammarino, Sprangler, and Bass (1993) studied the impact of transformational leadership over an extended period of time. Both studies
found that transformational leadership continued to result in exceptional performance as a leader one to fourteen years after the initial testing. Avolio, Waldman, and Einstein (1988) measured the effectiveness of transformational leadership operationalized as financial success. Evidence supported the notion that transformational and active transactional leadership did significantly relate to financial organizational effectiveness.

Some studies have evaluated the universality of transformational leadership theory in explaining leadership that results in positive systemic change. Bass, Waldman, and Avolio (1987) investigated the cascading effect of transformational leadership. Some researchers call it the falling dominoes effect, the effect of strong leadership modeling of a higher level to encourage similar leadership behaviors on lower levels (Bass, 1990a). The study confirmed that transformational leadership at higher levels appears together with transformational leadership at lower levels.

For Collins, Ross, and Ross (1989), transformational leadership encouraged participative management. The results found that managers preferred participative systems, perceived a need for organizational change, and wanted to support such changes; however, few managers installed such systems. The primary missing ingredient was the lack of transformational leadership.

A 1992 study by Hackman and others investigated the relationship between gender role characteristics and transformational and transactional leadership. The results suggested that transformational leadership requires both masculine and feminine characteristics. The authors concluded that transformational leadership is proactive and gender balanced.
Levit (1992) studied the ability of leadership to clarify meaning and purpose for others. The results suggested that those who perceive themselves as transformational leaders have a greater sense of purpose than those who do not. Transformational leaders, then, use their skills to actualize their perception of meaning and purpose to their followers.

Other researchers, Setlzer, Numerof, and Bass (1989), evaluated the human costs or downside risks of transformational leadership. Specifically, the study investigated whether any relationship exists between a transformational style and a subordinate’s reporting of burnout and stress. Overall, the data indicated that the transformational style may help reduce burnout. One factor, intellectual stimulation, was positively associated with burnout and stress. Seltzer and Bass (1990) confirmed that intellectual stimulation decreases satisfaction. The researchers suggested that a leader induces stress when she pushes subordinates to use reason rather than unsupported opinions.

Deluga (1988) investigated the relationship of transformational and transactional leadership to employee-influencing strategies. The results indicated that transactional leadership promotes more destructive influencing activities, and that transformational leadership alters destructive influence networking. Deluga further confirmed this effect with business students (1990), with subordinate police officers (1991b), and with naval leaders and subordinates (1991b). Transformational leadership and the rational approach to upward influencing are most strongly associated with higher levels of leader effectiveness and subordinate satisfaction.
Podsakoff, Moorman, and Fetter (1995) examined the effect of transformational leadership behaviors on followers' trust and organizational citizenship behaviors. They wrote, “While the effects of transformational leader behaviors on employee in-role performance are interesting, they do not capture the most important effects of transformational leader behaviors” (p. 223). They suggested that the most important effects of transformational leaders are the extra-role or organizational citizenship behaviors. These are realized through the trust and loyalty that the individual places in the leader. They found that trust in the leader indirectly affects organizational citizenship behaviors such as conscientiousness, altruism, and satisfaction. Another interesting find was that intellectual stimulation had a negative impact on both trust and satisfaction. They conjectured that intellectual stimulation creates role ambiguity, conflict, and stress, and is by nature destabilizing.

Empirical results of testing transformational and transactional leadership verify the impact of transformational leadership on followers’ satisfaction, attitudes, and effort. Other benefits include the ability of transformational leadership to influence others to act transformationally, the long-term effect of transformational leadership, its ability to be inclusive and proactive, its ability to provide an environment where burnout and stress are less likely, its impact on clarifying meaning and purpose for others, its ability to deter unhealthy influencing practices, and its ability to encourage organizational citizenship behaviors.

Transformational leadership theory has a stable but dynamic history, as well as empirically established behaviors and benefits. Though most leadership theories focus
exclusively on industrial goals and performance standards, transformational leadership theory shows great promise for working in a transmodern world.

Psychological Wisdom and Common Sense Theories

Taranto (1989) observed, “Throughout history, wisdom remains one of the most cherished of human values, elevated even to the level of a virtue” (p. 1). From the beginning, wisdom referred to a special mastery of life that enabled an individual to find well-being. Holliday and Chandler (1986) described the earliest traditions as mundane and pragmatic, preoccupied with establishing social norms. Instruction in religious duties, moral behavior, and honor were the themes of the literature. As the wisdom tradition matured, or as conflict erupted in a social system, the emphasis shifted to religious and philosophical perspectives. Unjust suffering and the difficulty of keeping faith when confronted with the paradoxes of life, death, and evil were more frequent themes. Perdue (1990) described two types of wisdom as being either prudential or skeptical. He called one kind “traditional wisdom” and the other “critical wisdom.” The wisdom tradition has a rich long history of which only a flavor is presented here.

Wisdom Traditions Through History

Wisdom traditions have spanned the centuries from the oldest known wisdom literature in Egypt, dated before 2500 B.C.E., to present-day musings. Early Egyptian teachers, such as Imhotep (ca. 2650 B.C.E.) and Ptahhotpe (ca. 2400 B.C.E.), gave instruction in wisdom. Ptahhotpe’s instruction began with asking the king: “Let me tell him the words of those who took heed, the counsels of the ancients, those who once
listened to the gods.” And the king replied: “Do teach him about the words of the former
times . . . No one is born wise” (Williams, 1990, p. 20).

Ancient wisdom is found in literature in the form of instructions, proverbs, songs,
or stories. Judaic wisdom is the best documented and will be presented in Chapter Four.
Holliday and Chandler (1986) concluded from their historical reconstruction of the
ancient wisdom traditions that “wisdom is social and interpersonal in nature, and that
wise people exhibit exemplary understanding and behaviour [sic]” (pp. 12-13).

Besides finding wisdom traditions in the secular and religious traditions of the
Ancient Near East, wisdom was a central topic of the Greek philosophers. Pre-Socratic
philosophers, like Heraclitus, believed that wisdom was understanding how the world
works. Because people were bound to a context, wisdom was necessary for understanding
the arrangements of things. This understanding assured that change would not lead to
chaos (Kirk & Raven, 1960, p. ).

The earliest records of a Greek analysis of wisdom are found in the Platonic
dialogues. Written by Plato (428-347 B.C.E.) in a dialectical style, the earliest of these
dialogues communicated the philosophy of Socrates. Wisdom for the Socratics came in
three forms: (1) sophia, the wisdom of the philosopher who pursued a contemplative life;
(2) phronesis, the practical wisdom of the lawgivers and statespersons that enabled them
to discern the prudent course of action and to maintain control of their passions; and (3)
episteme, scientific knowledge of the behavior and principles of the natural world
(Robinson, 1990).
Wisdom was a cardinal virtue and was distinctive from special cognitive abilities and skills. It was an essential aspect of a person’s character. Robinson (1990) concluded that, in the Platonic dialogues, to be wise is “to be a certain kind of person, temperamentally and morally won over to a love of harmony, beauty, and truth” (p. 15). The wisdom-loving person is not distracted from the search for truth by empirical modes of inquiry. The material world changes, but truth is timeless. Therefore, to pursue truth through wisdom was the highest good.

Because of its superior nature, Socratic wisdom was to be the source of all political rule. The early philosophers understood the intimate relationship wisdom must have to leadership. They did not believe anyone should be given a leadership role without first demonstrating wisdom. Plato (trans. 1942) said that the unwise person “ought never to have any kind of authority entrusted to him: he must be stigmatized as ignorant, even though he be versed in calculation, and skilled in all sorts of accomplishment, and feats of mental dexterity” (Jowett, 1942, p. 689).

Aristotle (384-322 B.C.E.), Plato’s brilliant student, taught that to attain happiness, one must be ruled by wisdom. For him, wisdom had two qualities. The first was practical wisdom, *phronesis*, making rational choices for action with right dispositions. Robinson (1990) explained Aristotle’s view: “To be wise is, among other considerations, to have passions and desires that are rightly disposed, such that one’s deliberated choice is always that which promotes the flourishing of one’s human and humanizing attributes” (p. 17). Aristotle’s second type of wisdom was theoretical knowledge, *theoretikes*, which is devoted to truth. Robinson (1990) explained it this way:
"To be wise is to know thyself, to know the special sort of creature one is and to proceed to develop that unique power that sets one apart from all else that lives" (p. 17). This type of wisdom was the highest intellectual virtue and was devoted to understanding the fundamental questions of life. Theoretical wisdom comes from a life of contemplation. It is gleaned from observations and speculations, and is aware of its limitations. According to Aristotle, the wise person has public responsibilities to fill leadership roles.

Later Hellenistic philosophers, the Stoics and Skeptics, emphasized the practical wisdom tradition, the *phronesis* (Holliday & Chandler, 1986). For the Stoics, to be wise, one had to integrate ethical, physical, and logical knowledge into a coherent belief system. Wisdom allowed a person to reconcile herself to life's natural laws and inevitable vicissitudes. The Skeptics interpreted wisdom as correct judgment. Wisdom was "the habit of the mind that allowed a person to suspend judgment under conditions of uncertainty" (Holliday & Chandler, 1986, p. 15). In other words, wisdom was the ability to recognize one's limitations.

From the Platonic dialogues to the later Hellenistic philosophers, wisdom evolved from being the result of study and reflection, to being a seeking after truth, to being a surrender to fates imposed by the laws of nature and the gods. Early Christian teaching on wisdom was an amalgam of Hebraic, Hellenistic, and developing Christian thought. Early Christian theologians, such as Augustine (354-430 C.E.), taught that true wisdom was unattainable because of humanity's flawed nature, but that people should strive for wisdom through a religious life of prayer and sacrifice. Practical wisdom was unacceptable as it was rooted in an evil world. Robinson (1990) concluded, "From remote
antiquity until the dawn of what is taken to be modern philosophy, wisdom, like genius, was explicated in terms of providential gods, muses, astrological forces, a sixth sense, genetic bounty, or accidents of nature” (p. 21).

From the early Christian theologians during the Middle Ages, through the Renaissance, to modern Cartesian conceptions of wisdom, the philosophical understanding of wisdom has had a tortuous route (Holliday & Chandler, 1986). During the Renaissance and the rise of empiricism, wisdom shifted away from sophia and phronesis and focused on episteme, those things that can be observed and systematized (Meacham, 1982). Habermas (1965/1971) believed that throughout history, wisdom has exhibited different balances between these three knowledge interests. In the Platonic dialogues, wisdom was a blending of all three interests (Csikszentmihalyi & Rathunde, 1990).

**The Decline of Wisdom**

The shift toward a materialistic ontology resulted in wisdom as a technical knowledge (Marcel, 1954). With the advent of Scientism in the nineteenth-century, a barrier was erected between the phenomenal world of the senses and the metaphysical world of being (Collins, 1962). The issue was whether the essence of reality is sense experience, or whether there is also a nonempirical realm which transcends sense experience and strives for truth (Robinson, 1990).

Collins (1962) lamented, “It is difficult to be wise in the unrestricted sense in a world where only the limited and instrumental significance of men and things is permitted to attract our minds” (p. 138). Meacham (1982) called this the accumulation
model of science where the goal is to accumulate more and more knowledge through scientific pursuit. Therefore, “it is little wonder that the topic of wisdom has become something of a scientific embarrassment, poorly suited as a part of contemporary psychological talk about human functioning” (Holliday & Chandler, 1986, p. 19).

Collins (1962) concluded at the end of his historical study of wisdom that “the theory of wisdom is controlled by the rest of one’s philosophy” (p. 139). Meacham (1982) agreed, noting the relationship between theories of intelligence and wisdom and the social-historical context of the philosopher. Holliday and Chandler (1986) identified two historical trends that have influenced contemporary thought on wisdom:

First, by driving a wedge between mundane or practical wisdom and abstract or theoretically-oriented wisdom, and by giving precedence or exclusive priority to the latter, the combined effect of 2,000 years of philosophy had been to make being wise a very heady, formal, and impractical thing, far removed from common persons or common life. Second, by locating some or all of the sources of wisdom in divine inspiration, philosophers have made wisdom a gift rather than an achievement, and a mark of grace to which few could hope to lay claim. (pp. 18-19)

Two contemporary philosophers who recognized the shift towards an emphasis on technical thought and away from wisdom were Habermas and his predecessor, Marcel. In *The Decline of Wisdom*, Marcel (1954) proposed that the modern problem with wisdom’s decline is not because wisdom as a blend of knowledge interests is flawed, but
because “the matters on which it focuses cannot be accommodated within the narrow interests of technical thought and science” (Holliday & Chandler, 1986, p. 22).

Marcel (1954) described the modern world as a technical environment that prizes technical knowledge, “a specialised [sic] and rationally elaborated form of knowledge” (p. 7). Besides being specialized, Marcel described technical knowledge as also perfectible and transmissible. Technical knowledge is able to deal with particularized problems, but does not deal with essential issues such as happiness and the spiritual life. Marcel commented that, historically, wisdom dealt with value issues and moral behavior and protected against pride.

Wisdom respected the past. Marcel theorized that “a considerable amount of energy today is spent in consciously breaking away from what are perceived as old and outmoded forms and practices” (Holliday & Chandler, 1986, p. 20). The result has also been a heightened valuation for technical thought and a devaluation for non-technical, value-laden concepts such as wisdom: “the huge multiplication of means put at man’s disposal, and of recipes for their use, takes place at the cost of the values which man is called upon both to serve and to safeguard” (Marcel, 1954, p. 49).

Habermas (1965/1971) shared Marcel’s concerns and elaborated his thought with a “philosophy of emancipation.” The essence of his philosophy is “the idea that knowledge acquisition is best considered as a pluralistic undertaking, and that much of present interdisciplinary conflict could be resolved by recognizing that knowledge-related activities are guided by divergent, knowledge-constitutive interests that lead to non-identical but equally legitimate types of knowledge” (Holliday & Chandler, 1986, p.20).
Differences between science and the humanities are not due to differences in methodology, but to differences in knowledge-constitutive interests.

Habermas (1965/1971) recognized three types of knowledge: technical, practical, and emancipatory. Habermas (1965/1971) described them as "information that expands our power of technical control; interpretations that make possible the orientation of action within common traditions; and analyses that free consciousness from its dependence on hypostatized knowledge" (p. 313). In other words, technical knowledge is the cognitive interest in understanding the world through science. Practical knowledge, found in the liberal arts, is the cognitive interest in people, especially communication. Emancipatory knowledge protects from being trapped in either the technical or the practical knowledge perspective: “These emancipatory interests were seen as being concerned with freedom that is achieved by transcending both the pre-occupation with biological preservation that marks technical interests, and the dependency on social-historical configurations that mark practical interests” (Holliday & Chandler, 1986, p. 21). Emancipation is possible through critical self-reflection after jointly meeting the interests of technical and practical knowledge.

Addleson (1983) wrote, “In our century, scientific knowledge has often seemed to grow at the expense of wisdom” (p. 182). Meacham (1982) suggested that the problem is not with science, but with the neglect of certain important aspects of science: uncertainty and social transactions. In other words, practical knowledge and emancipatory knowledge are needed to assure the effectiveness of technical knowledge.
The Essence of Wisdom

To clarify the discrepancies between wisdom today and wisdom over the ages, Csikszentmihalyi and Rathunde (1990) traced the concept of wisdom over 25 centuries, using evolutionary hermeneutics. Evolutionary hermeneutics is a method similar to evolutionary epistemology which observes changes in knowledge systems. Evolutionary hermeneutics safeguards against the assumption that present knowledge is superior. One cannot ignore cultural adaptations of concepts.

Csikszentmihalyi and Rathunde (1990) found that wisdom had three main continuities of meaning. First, wisdom as a cognitive process refers to a way of knowing that pursues universal truths and the ultimate consequences of events, and that attempts to ascertain reality by integrating knowledge. Second, wisdom as virtue guides one toward the supreme good. Wisdom compels one to act righteously, following the dictum, “you shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free” (John 8:32). Third, wisdom as a personal good is the supreme part of happiness and brings intense joy. The authors explained that the pursuit of wisdom “is intrinsically rewarding based on the fact that the reflective dimension of wisdom belongs to a class of autonomy or growth-oriented behaviors that do not provide a direct and immediate benefit for the individual in any technical or practical way” (p. 39).

Therefore, the evolutionary hermeneutical approach to the study of wisdom “suggests that wisdom is a holistic cognitive process, a virtue or compelling guide for action, and a good, desirable state of being” (Birren & Fisher, 1990, p.325). These are very similar to the three types of wisdom first introduced in the Platonic dialogues. At the
end of their review, Csikszentmihalyi and Rathunde (1990) noted that most of today’s psychologists who study wisdom think of it as a cognitive process. They mentioned psychologists such as Clayton and Birren (1980), Holliday and Chandler (1986), Labouvie-Vief (1982), and Sternberg (1985). Empirical work on wisdom as a virtue and wisdom as a personal good are minimal (Csikszentmihalyi & Rathunde, 1990). The authors recommended research to correct this imbalance.

**Contemporary Psychological Wisdom Research**

In the arena of modern science, researchers in the field of psychology have studied wisdom. Early classical psychologists who theorized about wisdom were Jung and Erikson. Jung’s psychology had four main points (Campbell, 1971). First, he believed that there are archetypes common to humanity that are expressive of common human needs, instincts, and potentials. Second, the archetype themes are found in the folk myths of a culture. Third, if an individual departs from the culture’s norms in thought or behavior patterns, an imbalance ensues and is manifested in dreams and fantasies similar to folk myths. Fourth, the dreams should be interpreted by comparing them to mythic forms. By understanding the dreams, an individual can see a depersonal mirror of her spirit; then she can find a way to fulfillment.

For Jung, the archetype of the wise man represents one who is the storehouse of information and who has exceptional understanding. The myth emerged from the important part elders played in pre-literate societies. The wise man helped those in trouble find solutions for themselves, rather than giving guidance for any specific course of action (Csikszentmihali & Rathunde, 1990). According to the nature of archetype
themes, wisdom is timeless and universal. Holliday and Chandler (1986) explained Jung’s archetypal wise man as consistent with pragmatic wisdom found in ancient traditions.

Erikson’s wisdom differed because he understood it to evolve from intrapsychic and social forces that compel an individual to mature. For Erikson (1985), a human’s existence depended on three processes of organization: (1) the biological, constituting the body; (2) the psychic, organizing experience by ego synthesis; and (3) the communal, the cultural organization of the interdependence of persons. Personality development occurs in eight stages. Each stage represents a crisis and resolution in which a new ego strength emerges. The final stage, occurring in old age, involves the crisis of integrity versus despair. Old people are facing death and must choose between an attitude of integrity or despair. The resulting strength is wisdom, described as an “informed and detached concern with life itself in the face of death itself” (p. 61). Erikson explained that, in the past, mature elders known as wise knew how to die with dignity.

A major criticism of Erikson’s wisdom model is his suggestion that wisdom is triggered by facing death (Holliday & Chandler, 1986). Clayton (1975) challenged Erikson’s theoretical understanding of the nature of wisdom. She believed that old people are motivated by life, not by death. She suggested that perhaps individuals make it to healthy old age through successfully learning to compromise through life crises, perhaps never resolving each crisis completely. Clayton (1975) made her point by quoting Hesse:

Those who aren’t satisfied with life’s compromises and demand resolution, and whose aim in life is not directed toward perfecting and molding and
reinstating the self at each major stage, are the derelicts and rebels of society.

Their common bond and fate is that they see and accept death and not life
as the releaser. (p. 128)

Beyond the classical work of Jung and Erikson, contemporary studies of wisdom
have greatly increased. Taranto (1989) wrote, “In the past decade, the concept of wisdom
has captured the attention of leading psychologists in the field of adult psychology” (p. 1).
The earliest studies focused on wisdom as a special type of knowledge. Using
Habermas’ knowledge categories, these studies will herein be examined based on
technical, practical, or emancipatory knowledge interests. After these, a presentation of
the most contemporary theories will reveal a movement toward integrated theories of
wisdom that incorporate something of wisdom as a personal good and as a virtue, as well
as a cognitive process.

Technical Accounts of Wisdom

Technical studies of wisdom are indicated in the research of Brent and Watson
researchers equated wisdom with an age-related cognitive development. Brent and
Watson (1980) defined wisdom as adaptive intelligence which develops as an age-related
skill. Personal suffering plays an important role in developing wisdom characterized by a
sense of humor, compassion, and well-developed communication skills. Thorngate
(1981) assumed that wisdom is a body of knowledge containing a common set of truths.
Wisdom is age-related and refers to specific kinds of information and heuristic strategies.
Clayton was mentored by Dr. Birren, under whose direction she did her doctoral dissertation in 1975. The dissertation was designed to clarify the meaning of wisdom and to identify wisdom components in a cross sample of the population. In 1980, using much of Clayton’s doctoral dissertation, Clayton and Birren co-authored an article on the development of wisdom across the life span. A historical analysis of the concept of wisdom led to the conclusion that wisdom was a blend of cognitive, emotional, and intuitive qualities. All ancient traditions described wisdom as a type of knowledge reflected in moral behavior. The knowledge was a quest for understanding the meaning and the purpose of life. Clayton and Birren had moved beyond a purely technical account of wisdom.

In a later article, Clayton (1982) defined wisdom as “the ability that enables the individual to grasp human nature, which operates on the principles of contradiction, paradox, and change” (p. 316). A wise person understands that the only thing that is constant is change. Wisdom-related knowledge has its domains in social and interpersonal issues and it is expressed in a person’s actions and judgments.

Labouvie-Vief (1982) represented those developmental psychologists who imply that wisdom is a postformal operations stage of adult development. Previous to that, psychologists such as Inhelder and Piaget (1958) believed that formal operations was the peak cognitive skill attained during adolescence. Formal operations was the problem-solving stage, the fourth stage of thought structure development. Building on Gruber’s and Barrett’s (1973) research on creative adults, Arlin (1975) proposed a fifth stage: the problem-finding stage of creative thought.
Postformal thought, thought structure beyond the problem-solving stage, is characterized by cognitive functioning that is related to experience rather than to age-development (Kuhn, Pennington, & Leadbeater, 1983). The optimally-functioning adult is autonomous, reflective, and proactive. Autonomy comes from adopting a new level of logic where truth is created and propagated by the individual.

Most of the “postformal operations” theorists are critics of Piaget’s formal operations thinking in adolescents. Postformal theorists have demonstrated that cognitive development continues throughout adulthood, resulting in a multiple-systems framework rather than a single formal operational framework (Commons, Richards, & Armon, 1984). Such research does not usually name postformal operations as wisdom, but the descriptions of such operations fit traditional wisdom characteristics (Csikszentmihalyi & Rathunde, 1990).

**Pragmatic Accounts of Wisdom**

Technical accounts of wisdom are age-related and concerned primarily with the cognitive constructs of the developing adult which involve the selection and application of thinking strategies. Pragmatic accounts of wisdom, on the other hand, stress the use of wisdom to find meaningful solutions to practical human concerns (Holliday & Chandler, 1986). Wisdom in this framework is seen “as both an ability and a process involving well-developed ‘factual and procedural’ knowledge and is viewed as a prototypical instance of synthesized intelligence” (Holliday & Chandler, 1986, p. 31).

In 1984 Dittmann-Kohli, while studying intelligence in the elderly, proposed a new theory which is based on an action-psychological paradigm. The author called it
synthesized intelligence or problem-solving ability. Wisdom is a superior form of adult intelligence that uses historical, cultural, and social considerations when solving life's problems. This type of wisdom deals with fundamental questions which are, by nature, complex and ambiguous. Such questions need contextual thinking in order to be solved.

Baltes and Smith (1990) also fall into this category. They defined wisdom as expertise in the domain of fundamental life pragmatics. Fundamental life pragmatics are those concerns which involve important, but uncertain, matters about the meaning of life. Intelligence is characterized by basic information processing (the mechanics) and factual and procedural knowledge (the pragmatics). Information processing is "content free, universal and biological, and susceptible to genetic differences" (Sternberg, 1990, p. 5). Pragmatic knowledge is content-rich, culture-dependent, and experience-based. For Baltes and Smith, wisdom is found in the pragmatic domain.

The expert knowledge system of wisdom has five criteria: (1) rich factual knowledge about the conditions and variations of life, (2) rich procedural knowledge about strategies and judgments, (3) life-span contextualism about life's contexts and development, (4) relativism, knowledge about differences, and (5) uncertainty, the unpredictability of life.

**Emancipatory Accounts of Wisdom**

Emancipatory wisdom studies, on the other hand, are concerned with a broader framework that stresses how wisdom is distinct from intelligence and how social contexts impact meaning. Meacham (1982), Kitchener (1983), Taranto (1989), and Kitchener and Brenner (1990) represent wisdom research in this area.
Meacham (1982) began by demonstrating how knowledge constructs take on diverse meanings depending on one’s social context. Because knowledge contexts change, Meacham proposed a knowledge-context model that takes into consideration all potential knowledge (K), an individual’s acquired knowledge (k), and the individual’s perception of what she knows (p = ratio of k to K). An individual’s ratio of “k to K” indicates her confidence in knowing the potential knowledge. An inflated confidence in one’s knowledge is an indication that the individual is rigid and lacking in curiosity. A decrease in confidence indicates an individual who is overly cautious and unimaginative.

Meacham suggested that life’s developmental changes are illustrated by one’s knowledge-context perceptions. For example, what changes most for older persons is not k (the knowledge that they have) but rather K (the context within which that knowledge is experienced). He concluded, “The knowledge-context model provides a framework within which such diverse constructs as intelligence, rigidity, cautiousness, and curiosity may be related and changes in individuals across the life span and between generations may be described” (p. 128).

For Meacham (1982), then, wisdom is the balance between two extremes of rigidity and over-cautiousness. He defined wisdom as “continually considering what one knows within the context of what one does not know” (p. 126). From this understanding of wisdom, Meacham made several suggestions about the characteristics of wise people.

First, wise people will not differ from unwise people in the facts (k) that are known. Second, wise people will differ from unwise people in their application of the facts, in their actions, because they will perceive the knowledge-context differently.
Third, wise people will excel at asking questions, and will be comfortable with doubt and ambiguity. Fourth, wise people will deny being wise. Fifth, wise people keep a balance between knowledge and doubt, and are able to admit to not knowing. Holliday and Chandler (1986) described Meacham’s understanding of wisdom as “critical, reflective, and inherently emancipatory, in that it avoids bondage to accumulated facts and stands over and above one’s unexamined practical and motivated interests” (p. 30).

A year later, Kitchener (1983) extended Meacham’s study to include the ability to recognize the limits of knowledge (K) itself. In her article, she wanted to clarify the cognition process when persons are faced with ill-structured problems. Ill-structured problems require expert opinion, reason, and argument. She distinguished three levels of cognitive processing. The first level, common cognition, involves computing, memorizing, reading, and comprehending. The second level, metacognition, requires the individual to monitor her own progress as she is engaged in cognition. The third level, epistemic cognition, includes knowledge about the limits of knowing, the certainty of knowing, and the criteria of knowing. At this level, the individual interprets the nature of the problem and the limits of differing strategies needed to solve the problem. The epistemic knowledge involves knowing if a problem is even solvable. The first two levels emerge in childhood and the third in adulthood.

In 1990, Kitchener and Brenner directly related epistemic knowledge to wisdom, by concluding that wise persons are able to distinguish between well- and ill-structured problems. Wise persons use reflective judgment. In summary, Kitchener and Brenner (1990) wrote:
Although they [wise persons] recognize the uncertainty of knowing and the relativity of multiple perspectives, they can overcome this relativity, find the shared meaning, evaluate the alternative interpretations, and develop a synthetic view that offers, at least, a tentative solution for the difficult problem at hand. (p. 226)

Taranto (1989) reviewed the literature on wisdom and proposed a theoretical synthesis of the studies. She was excited by the thinking of Meacham and Kitchener: “What is exciting here is that the unknown is not simply an empty void but represents a direction for the growth of knowledge” (p. 9). She concluded that “wisdom involves a recognition of and response to human limitation” (p. 15). Such recognition usually comes with age, but she challenged the notion that wisdom comes only with age. The basis for this type of response to life events is not age, but experience, particularly negative experiences. Supporting the importance of experience over age for personality development, Neugarten (1973) reported that an adult’s personality was affected more by developmental processes than by age. Such things as work status, health, financial resources, and marital status are more influencing than age. Such studies might explain why so few older adults are perceived as wise.

**Integrative Accounts of Wisdom**

Beginning with Holliday and Chandler’s (1986) psychological analysis of wisdom, many of the more recent studies have tried to be more integrative. Holliday and Chandler consciously attempted to examine wisdom as an integration of technical, practical, and emancipatory knowledge constructs. Their impressive study of wisdom,
using a complex empirical analysis, was designed to illuminate the prototype associated with wise people. In the first phase of the study, they collected stories about wise people from 150 adults in three cohort age groupings: young, middle-aged, and senior. In the second phase, they generated a list of 79 descriptors from an analysis of these stories, and added 24 other descriptors from a study of the historical wisdom tradition. A second group of 150 adults in the same age cohort groupings rated the descriptors. The results were analyzed.

The results of the study indicated that wisdom is a well-defined concept that has psychological competencies. The study yielded five principal components of wisdom: (1) exceptional understanding, (2) judgment and communication skills, (3) basic competency, (4) interpersonal skills, and (5) social unobtrusiveness. The components of judgment and communication skills and social unobtrusiveness had no counterparts in other contemporary studies, though they were indicated in the wisdom literature. Therefore, “the present results are thought to present a more complete portrayal of the characteristics of wise people” (Holliday & Chandler, 1986, p. 84).

Holliday and Chandler (1986) concluded that wisdom is not technical expertise, but rather involves pragmatics and values. Like the ancient wisdom tradition, wisdom is “the art of living well, and is represented in qualities of the mind together with practical virtues that lead one to a well-adapted life” (p. 84). Wisdom has strong practical and emancipatory appeal that potentially grows with age. Holliday and Chandler consciously attempted to represent in their construct of wisdom all the knowledge categories that Habermas proposed. They concluded that “wise persons are well informed about
technical matters, focused upon the practical affairs of mutual human understanding, and self-reflective in ways that allow them to determine good ends and approximate the ideal of living a satisfying life” (p. 92).


Orwoll and Perlmutter (1990) incorporated personality prerequisites in their theory of wisdom: “Wisdom depends on an unusually integrated personality structure that enables people to transcend personalistic perspectives and embrace collective and universal concerns” (p. 160). Using Jung’s and Erikson’s personality theory, the authors suggested that self-knowledge and self-transcendence are necessary for wisdom, along with cognitive skills. Therefore, wisdom is a “multidimensional balance or integration of cognition with affect, affiliation, and social concerns” (Birren & Fisher, 1990, p. 325).

Achenbaum and Orwell (1991) proposed a synthetic model of wisdom. In the synthetic model, wisdom occurs in personality, cognition, and conation processes that transform intrapersonal, interpersonal, and transpersonal experience. The interaction of personality, cognition, and conation at various personal levels is evidenced by nine characteristics: self-development, self-knowledge, integrity, empathy, understanding, maturity in relationships, self-transcendence, recognition of limits, and philosophical and spiritual commitments. Using the Biblical character of Job, they demonstrated the
complex and dynamic, yet integrative, nature of wisdom. Growing wise depends on time and a personal maturation process: “[Since] the search for wisdom evolves synergistically and cumulatively in a highly contextualized, individualized pattern, there is no formula for growing wise” (p. 36).

Another model of wisdom that synthesized affect, cognition, and conation is Kramer’s (1990) organismic framework. An organismic framework is one that is dynamic, always moving: “In an organismic framework, psychological adaptation cannot be seen as separate from the functional contexts in which it occurs” (p. 281). In her model, affective development and cognitive development interact to create wisdom-related processes. She lists five wisdom-related processes: (1) recognition of individuality, (2) recognition of context, (3) ability to interact effectively, (4) understanding of change and growth, and (5) attention to affect and cognition. These wisdom-related processes lead to interrelated functions of wisdom. The result is resolution of tasks. Wisdom is effective only if it serves to foster resolution of life’s tasks. Kramer lists tasks such as choosing a career, developing an intimate relationship, adjusting to adult stressors, parenting, assuming complex social roles, dealing with conflicts, coping with illness and death, and several others.

Differing from Achenbaum and Orwell’s model, Kramer’s model incorporated the processes and functions of wisdom, and illustrated how the results feed back into impacting affective and cognitive development. This model is especially useful for studying leadership because it considers that one of the interrelated functions of wisdom is the management of social institutions. Other interrelated functions of wisdom are
problem-solving, advising others, life review, and spiritual introspection. The research has determined that wisdom is a broadly defined concept, dependent on highly developed personality, special cognitive skills, moral values, spiritual introspection, and a compunction to guide individuals and institutions. Wise people are reflective and unobtrusive, yet involved in human affairs as problem-solvers, problem-finders, and meaning-managers (Kramer, 1990).

Birren and Fisher (1990) did a content analysis of twelve different wisdom theories representing the thinking of seventeen scholars in the fields of human development, education, gerontology, and psychology. Many of the scholars had done empirical research in wisdom and had read extensively in ancient wisdom traditions and philosophy. They concluded:

Wisdom is the integration of the affective, conative, and cognitive aspects of human abilities in response to life's tasks and problems. Wisdom is a balance between opposing valences of intense emotion and detachment, action and inaction, and knowledge and doubts. It tends to increase with experience and therefore age but is not exclusively found in old age. (p. 326)

For this study, Birren and Fisher's definition will be used.

The Distinctive Nature of Psychological Wisdom Theories

Another important route for understanding the nature of wisdom is to specify its distinctive as well as its common characteristics. Up to this point, the focus has been on the common characteristics of wisdom. The distinctive attributes of wisdom come into
focus when wisdom is differentiated from intelligence, creativity, intuition, and common sense.

**Wisdom and Intelligence**

Clayton (1982) proposed that wisdom and intelligence differ in significant ways. Intelligence is the ability to think logically, to conceptualize, and to abstract from reality. Wisdom is the ability to understand human nature, which is paradoxical, contradictory, and subject to continual change. The domains of knowledge are basically nonsocial and impersonal. The domains of wisdom are intrapersonal and interpersonal. The operational tasks used to access intelligence would not access wisdom. Clayton also suggested that knowledge can become obsolete or be erroneous, but wisdom has a universal timeless quality.

The function of intelligence is adaptation to the environment. Intellectual ability allows the adult to know *how* to do necessary and life-supporting tasks. The function of wisdom is “that of guiding the individual in his own development and society in its own evolution towards the goal of considering the consequences of judgments and actions both to self and their effects on others” (Clayton, 1982, p. 319). Wisdom allows the adult to know what she *should* do.

An important aspect of Holliday and Chandler’s (1986) research was to ascertain whether wisdom differed significantly from intelligence. They felt that intelligence was necessary for wisdom, but were not sure whether wisdom differed significantly from intelligence. In their entire study, with its various phases, 458 adults participated. In the first phase of the study, involving 150 people in young, middle-aged, and senior age
groups, the subjects were asked to generate lists of characteristics of wise people, shrewd people, perceptive people, intelligent people, spiritual people, and foolish people.

Their was an implicit theory approach to understanding these various constructs. Implicit theories are constructions that are in the minds of people, their folk psychology. Such theories need to be discovered because they are not readily apparent to the individuals or to science (Sternberg, 1990).

The subjects described an intelligent person as someone who is quick-witted, learns quickly and easily, and is a good conversationalist. The perceptive individual is able to read between the lines, talks or remains silent as is appropriate, is warm, and is perfectionistic. Within the three age groups, there was substantial inter-rater agreement on the prototype descriptors. Analyses were done to ascertain the degree of overlap between the various categories. The highest overlap occurred between “wise” and “perceptive.” Some overlap occurred in the other categories, but, in general, people think of intelligence and perceptiveness as specific categories, and of wisdom as “a distinct, nonredundant competency” (Holliday & Chandler, 1986, p. 68).

Evans (1992) returned to wisdom’s ancient roots, while differentiating it from intelligence. He wrote that wisdom is a virtue and intelligence is a skill. Knowledge deals with empirical understanding and wisdom is insight and awareness of human nature. Many studies (e.g., Clayton, 1976; Johnson, 1979; Holliday & Chandler, 1986) indicated that intelligence is an aspect of wisdom, but that wisdom is more than knowing. Baltes and Smith (1990) see relativism, knowledge about differences in values, goals, and
priorities, and uncertainty as the criteria which emphasize wisdom's transcendence over intelligence and learning.

**Wisdom, Intelligence, and Creativity**

Sternberg (1985) also used implicit theory research to ascertain the nature of people's understanding of intelligence, creativity, and wisdom. In the first experiment, Sternberg asked 200 professors of art, business, philosophy, and physics to rate the characteristics of an ideally wise, intelligent, or creative person in their field. In a second experiment, 40 college students were asked to sort 40 behaviors into three piles. The behaviors were the top-rated wisdom, intelligence, and creativity behaviors from the first experiment.

For wisdom, six components emerged in order of their strength: (1) reasoning ability, (2) sagacity, (3) learning from ideas and environment, (4) judgment, (5) expeditious use of information, and (6) perspicacity. Intelligence, on the other hand, had components of: (1) practical problem-solving, (2) verbal ability, (3) intellectual balance and integration, (4) goal orientation and attainment, (5) contextual intelligence, and (6) fluid thought. Creativity had the components: (1) nonentrenchment, (2) integration and intellectuality, (3) aesthetic taste and imagination, (4) decisional skill and flexibility, (5) perspicacity, (6) drive for accomplishment and recognition, (7) inquisitiveness, and (8) intuition. Correlations between ratings indicated that intelligence and wisdom are believed to be the most similar, and creativity and wisdom the least.

In a 1990 article, Sternberg reported on his continuing study of the differences between intelligence and creativity with an explicit theory approach to wisdom. Explicit
theories are the constructions of empirical researchers, such as psychologists and scientists. The theories are based on data gathered from experiments. Sternberg (1990) suggested that explicit theories are in large part the implicit theories of the scientist.

Sternberg (1990) distinguished between wisdom, intelligence, and creativity in terms of six variables: knowledge, cognitive processing, intellectual style, personality, motivation, and environmental context. He found that wisdom is fundamentally geared towards understanding, intelligence is geared towards knowing, and creativity is geared towards going beyond knowing. Sternberg concluded that wisdom is unique, particularly in the function of sagacity. He described it as being as “much an attitude toward knowledge as knowledge itself” (p. 157). It is more than cognitive skill. He concluded that his account of wisdom is modest, and, in actuality, some of the distinctions between wisdom, intelligence, and creativity are contradicted in other studies. Particularly, several researchers (Meacham, 1982; Kitchener, 1990, et. al.) concluded that wise persons do not just understand ambiguity, but are comfortable with it. Neither does Sternberg take into account the affective dimensions of wisdom.

Wisdom, Knowledge, and Judgment

Kekes (1983) described wisdom as a special kind of interpretive knowledge that leads to good ends: “What a wise man knows, therefore, is how to construct a pattern that, given the human situation, is likely to lead to a good life” (p. 280). He called wisdom the intellectual cognition of eternal things. Kekes (1983) also distinguished wisdom from judgment. Wisdom is good judgment, but wisdom differs from judgment in that wisdom differentiates in hard cases with conflicting ideals. Schowalter (1991) wrote
that judgment, discernment, intelligence and knowledge are necessary for wisdom, but that wisdom is not any one of those qualities. Wisdom is "a willingness and an ability to be life as well as goal focussed [sic]" (Schowalter, 1991, p. 873).

**Wisdom, Knowledge, and Intuition**

Quick (1981) defined knowledge as concrete and factual information processed by rational thinking accessed through the senses. Wisdom, on the other hand, is a direct perception of reality accessed through intuition. Knowledge is acquired through the rational observer/observed paradigm of science. Intuition, on the other hand, is based on the duality of the observed and the observer. He noted that quantum physics describes reality with the same paradigm. Intuition's weakness is a tendency towards vagueness. Therefore, it must be developed with intelligent practice and self-discipline. Intuition and wisdom are related in that "the primary vehicle for tapping wisdom is not rational thinking but rather intuition" (Quick, 1981, p. 378).

For Quick (1981), knowledge tends toward complexity and wisdom towards simplicity. Knowledge exhibits a tendency to control, while wisdom shows a tendency to flow with and trust the processes. Like Quick, Khandwalla (1985) recognized the importance of intuition to wisdom. He defined wisdom as intuitive judgment. Making judgments of complex situations involves integrating ambiguous and multi-dimensional information. Wisdom is that process. Most psychologists agree that in order to have wisdom, one must have intuition (Johnson, 1979).
Another major area of distinction is the relationship of wisdom to common sense. Taranto (1989) called common sense a close relative of wisdom. Interest in common sense has escalated because of the science discussions over the value of implicit and explicit theory research. Implicit theories are the “common” understandings people have. Explicit theories are those developed from controlled research studies.

The issue of common sense had a particular impact in the field of psychology, since it is the study of human nature and relationships (Smedslund, 1980; Sternberg, 1985). Laypeople sometimes dismiss findings of psychologists as common sense, and psychologists sometimes reject the common-sense views of laypeople as muddled and contradictory (Fletcher, 1984; Furnham, 1983). The relationship of common-sense views held by ordinary people to the empirically-discovered views held by specialists became a hotly debated issue.

Smedslund (1978) initiated one of the formal debates through the article “Bandura’s Theory of Self-Efficacy: A Set of Common Sense Theorems.” In the article, Smedslund took the complicated theoretical theorems of Bandura and “translated” them into ordinary, non-technical language. Smedslund (1978) wanted to demonstrate that they were “logically necessary rather then empirically testable” (p. 1). The purpose was to present an alternative to the prevalent empirical view of psychology. The empirical view depended on theoretical statements being validated by empirical studies that have empirically testable consequences. The alternative viewpoint “is that valid theoretical statements in psychology are explications of conceptual relationships imbedded in
ordinary language (common sense)” (p. 1). The conceptual framework is anterior to the theorizing and actually organizes its process.

Smedslund (1978) concluded that common sense psychology is “the network of concepts pertaining to psychological phenomena, imbedded in ordinary language” (p. 10). The author conjectured that the systematic study of common sense started late because common sense is: (1) normally unreflected and unconscious, (2) shared by all ordinary persons, and (3) self-evident in compelling ways. Empirical work is important because it supports theoretical analysis.

Jones (1980) criticized Smedslund’s common sense psychology, believing that “a sharper descriptive tool than ordinary language will be required for an adequate characterization of mental phenomena” (p. 227). Smedslund agreed that sharper conceptual tools are evident in scientific language. However, Smedslund still concluded that the theoretical formulations are evident in ordinary language.

In a 1982 reply to criticism by Sjöberg, Smedslund further developed the nature of common sense. Common sense is a psychological reality built on a cultural order: “Common sense may . . . be defined as the system of implications shared by the competent users of a language” (p. 79). A proposition belongs to common sense if all the users agree that it is true in a given context and that its negation is senseless. Variations in common sense understandings are due to the fact that language functions in a complex domain.

Schweiso (1984) believed that part of the problem of psychologists who debunk common sense theories was a lack of clarification about the nature and definition of
common sense. The author believed there are four distinct qualities to the concept: (1) common sensation, a linking of the five senses for agreement in sense information, (2) ordinary intelligence, which involves rational accounts of one’s behavior, (3) good sense in the form of tact, judgment, practical understandings, and (4) common opinion, which comprises beliefs common to a community and “ready-made opinions and judgments ranging from moral imperatives to prudential adages and proverbs” (p. 44). He agreed with Furnham (1983) that if scientific method is “refined” good sense, then the discipline will not move far from its roots of ordinary intelligence and common sensation.

Psychology challenges and clarifies common opinion (Schweiso, 1984; Smedslund, 1982).

Fletcher (1984) continued the discussion in an article on “Psychology and Common Sense” by further clarifying the nature of common sense. Common sense is: (1) a set of shared fundamental assumptions about the nature of the social and physical world, (2) a set of cultural maxims or shared beliefs, and (3) a shared way of thinking. These fall into the category of Schweiso’s “good sense” and “common opinion.” Fletcher said the first category is common to all cultures and is rarely questioned. The second set is relativistic and explicitly known, often expressed in proverbs. The third is tacitly known. Since most researchers agree that wisdom utilizes timeless knowledge, common sense seems to be distinguishable from wisdom by its time-boundedness (Clayton, 1976; Kekes, 1983; Schweiso, 1984).

Taranto (1989) suggested that implicit theories of the social and psychological world (common sense) is evidence of conventional wisdom. She saw wisdom as referring
to a person’s philosophy of life and common sense as relating to a person’s conventional psychology. Common sense refers “to motivations and explanations of behavior that are context bound” (Taranto, 1989, p.13). Wisdom, on the other hand refers to “those explanations of social and physical nature that transcend time and place and yet can be contextualized by a given situation” (Taranto, 1989, p. 13).

It seems, therefore, that intelligence, judgment, intuition, and common sense all play a role in the process of wisdom, but that wisdom is distinct from them. Common sense clarifies the context. Intelligence and knowledge equip a person for wise decisions. Judgment-making is a primary behavior of a wise person. Intuition is a skill developed from sense experiences.

Wisdom Theory and Leadership Studies

Studies that have linked wisdom theory to leadership are few. Achenbaum and Orwell (1991) related their wisdom theory to Job. Job is described in the Bible as “the greatest of all the men of the east” (Job 1:3b). The authors took each of the nine traits from their synthetic model of wisdom and applied their evidence to Job. Their purpose was to illustrate the complex, dynamic and integrative way in which an individual grows old. Though Job was a leader in his time, the authors did not relate wisdom theory to his role as a leader in the community.

Barry III and Elovitz (1992) evaluated the leadership of Clinton, Perot, and Bush, using a psychobiographical approach. For the authors, an important leadership skill is wisdom, along with empathy and confidence. They indicated that wisdom relates to wise policy decisions. Barry and Elovitz described a wise leader as one who “thoughtfully
selects the most important goals that are feasible” (p. 198). They equated wisdom with broad knowledge and good judgment. The weakness of their study is that they did not use contemporary wisdom theory, but instead relied on a definition of wisdom that is not referenced or supported. Neither did they use leadership theory nor reference why they chose empathy, wisdom, and confidence as important leadership skills for a president or presidential candidate. The main purpose of their study was to illustrate the usefulness of psychobiography to offer insights into the personalities of presidential candidates.

Though no apparent studies have been done linking leadership theory to wisdom theory, research has been done relating leadership theory to adult development. Wisdom is part of the personality development theories of Erikson and Jung, and all wisdom theorists agree that wisdom requires maturity and a highly-developed personality (e.g., Achenbaum & Orwell, 1991; Birren, 1985; Clayton & Birren, 1980; Holliday & Chandler, 1986). Logically, then, studies that equate leadership to personality development have a backdoor view of the relationship of leadership to wisdom.

Kuhnert and Lewis (1987) related leadership to personality development in an article entitled “Transactional and Transformational Leadership: A Constructive/Developmental Analysis.” They noted that Burns (1978) and Bass (1985a) identified leaders according to their behaviors and the impact of their actions. What is missing from the theories of Bass and Burns is “an explanation of the internal processes which generate the actions of transactional or transformational leaders” (Kuhnert & Lewis, 1987, p. 648). What is needed is a framework for understanding the personalities and motivations that end up in differing leadership behaviors.
In this analysis, Kuhnert and Lewis (1987) related transactional and transformational leadership to the personality development model of Kegan. They began with an explanation of Kegan's constructive/developmental theory. Then the authors related the theory to the internal processes that generate transformational and transactional leadership. According to Kegan, at each stage of development the subject (the organizing process, the lens through which the world is viewed) and the object (the content of the organizing experience) produce the individual's behavior. The process of development requires the restructuring of the relationship between the subject and the object. In other words, people will vary in how they construct their experiences to give them meaning. In Kegan's model, what is the subject at one stage is the object at the higher level.

Stages 2-4 of Kegan's model are most characteristic of an adult's level of interpersonal understanding. Kuhnert and Lewis (1987) equated different leadership styles with different stages, since the leader will use one of the systems for construing reality. Stage 2, the Imperial stage, represents the lower-order transactional leader whose subject is personal goals and agendas and whose object is perceptions, immediate needs, and feelings. Stage 3, the Interpersonal stage, represents the higher-order transactional leader whose subject is interpersonal connections and mutual obligations and whose object is personal goals and agendas. Stage 4, the Institutional stage, represents the transformational leader whose subject is personal standards and value systems and whose object is interpersonal connections and mutual obligations. At the Institutional level, universal ethical principles of justice, respect for human dignity, and the equality of
human rights are endorsed. The process of development requires the restructuring of the relationship between the subject and the object. Leaders at different stages will use different systems for construing reality.

Contingency theory suggests that leadership effectiveness is not determined by personality, but by selecting the right behavior for a given situation (Hunt, 1984). Lord, DeVader, and Aliger (1986) took the opposite point of view, and argued that the personality of the leader makes a big impact on leadership. Kuhnert and Lewis (1987) suggested that the difference of opinion could be resolved by using Kegan’s model to consider how differently leaders process information about events. The difference is due to developmental structures in the personality of the individual. Kuhnert and Lewis (1987) wrote, “Applying constructive/developmental theory to transactional and transformational leadership liberates researchers from a static view of leadership; it emphasizes leaders’ development over the course of their lives” (p. 654).

Another study that looked at the values of the leader is Hall and Thompson’s (1980) Leadership Through Values. Transformational leadership originates in a person’s values and beliefs (Sashkin & Rosenbach, 1993). Transactional leadership originates out of an exchange relationship. Since wisdom is traditionally understood as a construct concerned with morals, right behaviors and attitudes, studies that link leadership to values could be helpful.

Hall and Thompson's (1980) study contributed to the relationship of wisdom to a leader’s internal structures. From an overview of prevalent leadership theories, the authors concluded that leadership/followership is related to maturity levels. Hall and
Thompson wrote, "Maturity appears to be a significant factor in differentiating appropriate leader behavior and in identifying potential leadership in individuals" (p. 31). Therefore, leaders need instrumental, interpersonal, imaginal, and systems skills. The category of systems skills is a blend of the others, and requires that the leaders develop a high level of consciousness and an awareness of the developmental needs of followers.

Hall and Thompson (1980) saw consciousness developing in four phases: (1) the world is a mystery over which I have no control; (2) the world is a problem with which I can cope; (3) the world is a project in which I can participate, and (4) the world is a mystery for which we must care. The authors located wisdom as a value found at the fourth level of consciousness in systems skills, but they did not define it. Different styles of leaders are found at different levels of consciousness, from the dictator in level one to the visionary in level four. Leadership at the fourth level is similar to the transformational model. Therefore, the authors indirectly linked wisdom to transformational leadership and directly linked maturity and high values to visionary leadership.

Schmidt (1993) used the Hall-Tonna Values Inventory developed by Hall to study transformational leaders. The inventory measures the levels of consciousness, values, and skills. Schmidt demonstrated that transformational leaders reflect a different world view, different values, and different skills than other leaders. The transformational leader reflected higher levels of consciousness, had different values, and used more imaginal and systems skills. Schmidt's study, following on the work of Hall and Thompson, further suggests that wisdom is a transformational leader skill.
A few other studies exist, but are related to Jesus so they will be introduced in the following section. This concludes the preview of wisdom’s history, its principal theorists and issues, the nature of common sense, and a look at the few studies which mention or allude to wisdom and leadership. It is clear that wisdom is a rich and complex construct that is important for effective leadership. The paucity of studies relating wisdom and leadership is obvious. Many of the studies are theory-based and not empirically-based. Therefore, a study of wisdom and leadership will contribute to the on-going research in both fields.

The Historical Jesus

Borg (1994b) began his book, Jesus in Contemporary Scholarship, with the phrase, “Jesus is in the news!” Interest, both popular and academic, in the historical Jesus has certainly increased in the past twenty-five years. However, it is important from the beginning to distinguish the difference between Jesus’ inner life, the Christ of faith, and the historical Jesus. Carlston (1994) wrote, “His [Jesus’] subjectivity, his ‘personality’ in the modern sense, is unknown and unknowable, as it is for any historical figure” (p. 1). Carlston remarked that one’s observable acts and one’s inner sense of self are not always congruent, and that an individual’s interior life is not accessible to outsiders. Therefore, study of the historical Jesus cannot claim to recreate the whole of the person Jesus.

The Christ of faith, on the other hand, is a marriage of an individual’s personal faith encounter with the resurrected Jesus. Christians understand their faith experience with Christ by studying how the first believers interpreted their encounters in the New
Testament and by continuing an attentiveness to the dynamic revelation of the Holy Spirit. Crossan (1994b) called this “credal interpretation” of the confessional Christ. In order to get “behind the screen of credal interpretation,” historical Jesus studies are necessary (Crossan, 1994b, p. xi).

Study of the historical Jesus is the art and science of historically approximating a description of Jesus and his message. This portion of the literature review will focus on the development of historical Jesus scholarship in the past twenty-five years, will present the major contemporary views of the historical Jesus, along with the issues and criticisms which they engage, and will close with a review of the studies which link Jesus with leadership theory and wisdom theory.

The Quest for the Historical Jesus

Tatum (1982) gave an excellent description of the various quests for the historical Jesus, which is cited by several other scholars (e.g, Borg, 1994b, Charlesworth & Weaver, 1994). He also observed the interrelatedness of each quest with the development of Biblical criticism. Biblical criticism is an objective analysis of Bible texts as historical documents (Chouinard, 1986). Tatum categorized them into four periods. The first period he called the "pre-quest," and dated it before 1778. Before that time, Biblical criticism did not exist. Bible scholars did not differentiate between the historical Jesus and the Christ of faith.

The second period, called the "old quest," went from 1778-1906 when source criticism developed. Source criticism is the discipline which seeks to identify the written sources behind the Gospels. Tatum (1982) dated the beginning of this quest with the 1778
publication of Reimarus' document entitled "On the Intention of Jesus and His Disciples."
From studying the Gospels, Reimarus believed that the "Kingdom of God" sayings used
by Jesus indicated Jesus' intention to establish an earthly kingdom. When Jesus said on
the cross, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?," Reimarus claimed Jesus
believed that he had not achieved his mission. Reimarus concluded that a discontinuity
existed between Christ and the historical Jesus.

Source criticism identified Mark as the earliest, and thus most trustworthy, of the
Gospels as a historical account of the life of Jesus. John, the last Gospel, was regarded as
the least reliable. Scholars began to study Jesus in his historical context as a first-century
Palestinian Jew. During the nineteenth century, the second period of the quest gave rise to
liberal theology which emphasized Jesus as teacher and example rather than savior.

Several theologians at the time, such as Ritschl and Harnack, identified Jesus' ethical teaching with cultural Protestantism. Riches (1993) described their view as
pointing to the reality, "the gracious relationship between God and the believer" (p. 18).
The kingdom of God was interpreted as a new society begun on earth in which each
person would be treated with dignity, and which would come to completion in an eternal
heavenly kingdom.

The beginning of the third period, often dubbed "no quest," was introduced by the 1906 publication of Schweitzer's The Quest of the Historical Jesus. Schweitzer criticized liberal theology's make-over of Jesus. He was influenced by the 1892 publication of Weiss' Jesus' Proclamation of the Kingdom of God. Weiss attempted to evaluate Jesus' kingdom of God sayings in relationship to the Jewish literature of the time. By comparing
rabbinic and apocalyptic material to Jesus' kingdom of God sayings, Weiss concluded that Jesus expected a cataclysmic end to the world brought on by God through Jesus' ministry and that Jesus' beliefs were shared by his contemporaries.

Schweitzer (1906/1968) also viewed Jesus as an eschatological prophet who thought he was chosen by God to bring an imminent restoration of the Kingdom to Israel and who deliberately tried to bring it about through his own suffering. Using Mark's Gospel as the most reliable historical account of Jesus, Schweitzer concluded that while Jesus publicly proclaimed the coming of the Kingdom, he privately believed that he would be revealed as the Messiah. Eventually, Jesus came to believe that he himself must suffer in order for God to initiate the Kingdom. When he was put to death and the Kingdom did not come, his disciples, nevertheless, continued Jesus' call to follow him and seek out a new world.

Because of this, Schweitzer believed that the historical figure of Jesus was insignificant and that little could be known about him. It was the Jesus “spiritually risen with men” who mattered (Schweitzer, 1906/1968, p. 401). It was methodologically impossible and theologically unnecessary to know the historical Jesus. Schweitzer contended, “The historical Jesus will be to our time a stranger and an enigma” (p. 399).

The development of form criticism, the discipline that seeks to understand the oral tradition behind the Gospels, brought skepticism into full flower. Emphasis on the creation of stories and sayings by early followers undermined the reliability of the Gospels to portray anything accurate about the life of Jesus. Bultmann used form criticism as a basis for his book *The History of the Synoptic Tradition* (1968). In his controversial book, he
concluded that many of the stories in the Synoptics were created by the early church. As an existentialist, Bultmann emphasized the individual's personal response to faith. He affirmed Weiss' and Schweitzer's eschatological Jesus and used their interpretation to de mythologize Jesus. Jesus' eschatology was reinterpreted for the individual. The saving knowledge of Jesus, "the knowledge that liberates and opens up the possibility of a truly authentic existence, is derived from the church's proclamation of Jesus as Lord" (Riches, 1993, p. 89). Historical details about Jesus were unnecessary props.

The beginning of the fourth period of historical Jesus research is dated in 1953 when Käsemann gave a lecture entitled “The Problem of the Historical Jesus.” This period is called the "new quest." Käsemann rejected the historical skepticism of the “no quest.” He felt that primitive Christians believed that the earthly and the exalted Lord were one and the same. Käsemann (1964) wrote, "My own concern is to show that, out of the obscurity of the life story of Jesus, certain characteristic traits in his preaching stand out in relatively sharp relief, and that primitive Christianity united its own message with these" (p. 213). In other words, there is continuity between the Christ of faith and the historical Jesus. Once again, as in the "old quest," historical Jesus research was methodologically possible and theologically necessary.

The most significant work published in the wake of Käsemann's lecture was the 1956 publication of Bornkamm's Jesus of Nazareth. Bornkamm (1956/1995) wrote, "The Gospels justify neither resignation nor skepticism. Rather they bring before our eyes ... the historical person of Jesus with the utmost vividness" (p. 24). Bornkamm believed that
the historical Jesus could be found in the Gospels by using historical critical methodology and by abandoning the rational biases towards a mythological Jesus.

Tatum (1982) listed three unifying characteristics of the "new quest." First, the "new quest" scholars recognized the faith nature of the Gospels. The development of redaction criticism assisted in understanding the unique interpretive perspective of each Gospel writer. Redaction criticism is the discipline that studies the ways Gospel writers edit source material for their individual theological purposes. Second, "new quest" scholars understood the limitations of historical research. Everything written about Jesus is an interpreted event rather than a sequence of facts. Third, "new quest" scholars accepted the responsibility of bearing the burden of proof about what is authentic and inauthentic in the Gospels. Therefore, they developed criteria, certain principles, for establishing the authenticity of Jesus' sayings.

These criteria are important for understanding the decision-making processes of modern day historical Jesus scholars. There are four main criteria. The foundational and beginning principle is the criterion of dissimilarity. The criterion of dissimilarity states "that sayings or emphases of Jesus in the Gospels may be considered authentic if they are dissimilar from sayings or emphases of the early church, on the one hand, and of ancient Judaism, on the other" (Tatum, 1982, p. 76). Therefore, only those sayings which are unique to Jesus are considered authentic. Traditionally, those included the "kingdom of God" statements, the parables, the use of Abba (Father) to address God, and his authoritative interpretation of the Torah.
After establishing authentic material with the criterion of dissimilarity, the criterion of coherence was applied. This criterion considers material if it agrees with other material which is considered authentic. The next criterion, the criterion of multiple attestations, considers material authentic if it appears in several Gospel sources: Mark, Q (the sayings source), material unique to Matthew, material unique to Luke, and John. The final criterion, the criterion of language and environment, considers material authentic if it is compatible with the language and culture of first-century Palestine.

Using the criteria, the dominant portrait of Jesus remained as an eschatological prophet who proclaimed the imminent end of the world. Borg (1994a) described the predominant elements which supported this portrait of Jesus. Borg (1994a) named four:

- The atmosphere of crisis in the gospels; the sayings which spoke of the imminent coming of the Son of Man; the kingdom of God sayings; and the fact that some within the early church expected the final eschatological events (second coming, end of the world, last judgement) in their lifetimes. (p. 8)

The coming "Son of Man" sayings were connected to the kingdom of God sayings and were the foundational elements of the eschatological portrait of Jesus. Jesus expected God would soon establish a new kingdom. After Jesus' death, the early believers, as evidenced in the New Testament writings from Paul, from the John who wrote Revelation, and from the authors of Matthew and Mark, had the same expectation (Borg, 1994a).
Tatum (1982) noted, "Because of its origin and development within Bultmannian scholarly and theological circles, the 'new quest' approach to Jesus does possess a kind of homogeneity lacking in that diverse movement known as the 'old quest'" (p. 76).

However, Borg (1994b) wrote, "Important as the new quest was, it continued to share the central characteristics of the 'no quest' period: a minimalist portrait of the message of Jesus conceived in eschatological terms, coupled with existentialist interpretation" (p. 5).

Borg (1994a) believed that this eschatological interpretation of Jesus had three consequences. First, it led to a belief in the theological irrelevance of the Jesus in history. Second, it created individualized interpretations of the message of Jesus. Third, it produced an apolitical reading of the message and mission of Jesus. Since the end of the world was near, political questions were unimportant. Questions about the foundational portrait of Jesus as an eschatological prophet has initiated a new wave in historical Jesus research.

Tatum (1982) concluded his history of historical Jesus studies with the "new quest" and the new criteria. However, many scholars believe that another quest has begun since the 1980s (Borg, 1994b; Charlesworth & Weaver, 1994; Telford, 1994). Some refer to it as a "renaissance" in Jesus studies. Neill and Wright (1988) called it the "third quest."

Telford (1994) noted an upsurge in publications on the historical Jesus. Books on Jesus were sparse in the sixties, but the early nineties saw several major studies every year. Borg (1994b) remarked on the creation of two new professional organizations. For the first time, the Society of Biblical Literature established a group in 1981 devoted to
historical Jesus research. In 1985, the Jesus Seminar, founded by Robert Funk, undertook a five-year project to ascertain the historical authenticity of Jesus' sayings. The Jesus Seminar is "the first collaborative systematic examination of the entire Jesus tradition ever undertaken, unprecedented in the history of scholarship" (Borg, 1994b, p. 6).

Like the other quests, the renaissance in historical Jesus studies emerged as a result of new methodologies which engendered new questions. Methods in the past were primarily literary and historical in a narrow sense (Borg, 1994b). Earlier in the twentieth-century, dominant models of historical Jesus studies were theological and anthropological. Now, toward the end of this century, scholars using other models "have provided a wealth of information about the social, political, and economic conditions of the times" (Riches, 1993, p. 94). Jesus scholars now use models and insights from the social sciences, cultural anthropology, and the history of religions (e.g., Crossan, 1991; Fiorenza, 1984; Mack, 1988; Malina, 1993; Malina & Neyrey, 1988). Neill and Wright (1988) referred to this interdisciplinary approach as New Testament study "in the round" (p. 368).

Archaeological discoveries also have had a major impact on historical Jesus studies. Charlesworth (1991a) wrote:

It began about 1980 because of the convergence of numerous events:
the publication of the Temple Scroll (the largest of the Dead Sea Scrolls),
the completion of the new edition of the Old Testament Pseudepigrapha,
the growing recognition that first-century synagogues had been identified
in what was ancient Palestine (including Galilee), the discovery of an apparently
unedited version of Josephus' reference to Jesus, a renewed interest in ancient
documents (thanks to the discovery of hundreds of early manuscripts, especially
near Qumran and Nag Hammadi), and the growing awareness that first-century
Palestinian life is now amazingly visible, and palpable, thanks to the indefatigable
archaeological labor of many. (p. 82)

Because of these interdisciplinary methods used along with the traditional Biblical
criticism methods, new trends in historical Jesus scholarship have emerged. Charlesworth
(1991b) summarized the journey of the historical Jesus scholars:

The search for the historical Jesus over the last two hundred years has been a
rocky road with many dead ends and detours. Many Jewish and Christians
[sic] scholars have served us well; and it is now obvious the journey is both
possible and necessary. (p. 195)

Scholars agree in many areas of historical Jesus research. However, some of the
new models for reconstructing the life of Jesus are mutually exclusive (Charlesworth,
1994b). Therefore, an analysis of the areas of consensus and areas of continuing conflict
is necessary.

Consensus and Conflict in Contemporary Jesus Scholarship

Charlesworth (1994b) compiled a list of several areas that he believed represented
consensus among Jesus scholars. First, Jesus was a Jew who obeyed the Torah and the
Jewish law, and followed Temple practices. Vermes (1991) concluded, "It is now
possible not simply to place Jesus in relief against this setting [the culture of first-century
Jews]... but to insert him foursquare within first-century Jewish life itself" (p. 110). Not only was Jesus a Jew, he was a devout Jew (Sanders, 1985).

Scholars have also come to realize that there was a great variety of first-century Judaism (Neill & Wright, 1988). Types of Judaisms included the Pharisees, Sadducees, Zealots, Essene, and the "am ha-aretz," the people of the land. Some of these people were rich, some poor. Some were observant Jews, some were semi-observant. The problem arose, then, as to what held them together. Neill and Wright (1988) suggested that the unifying factor was their Jewish faith:

Monotheism was not an abstract article of belief only, but a national treasure to be guarded with one's life, and the election of Israel to be the people of this one Creator God was the basis, not just of 'religious' speculation, but of the hope that kept people alive in the dark days of oppression, and of the devotion to Torah that, in one form or another, characterized Israel as the grateful people of a living God. (p. 371)

Jesus was an integral part of the milieu and the passion expressed in Jewish faith.

Mack (1988) is one of the few prominent scholars who disagreed. His portrait of Jesus is an image of a Cynic teacher who emerged from a thoroughly Hellenized Galilee. He was influenced by Theissen's (1977/1978) earlier work, Sociology of Early Palestinian Christianity. Theissen characterized Jesus and his followers as wandering charismatics. Jesus called his followers to a radical lifestyle of homelessness lacking family and possessions. Since he did not find anything comparable in Palestinian society,
Theissen compared Jesus' teachings to Cynic philosophy which encouraged the same radical lifestyle.

Horsley (1994) refuted Theissen's theory by drawing attention to his poor methodology. He demonstrated how, in reality, Thiessen based his conclusions on primarily two passages: Mark 1:16 and Mark 1:20. Horsley (1994) also argued, "It should be pointed out that there are serious problems of evidence, dating, consistency, and interpretation with regard to our reconstruction of Cynic philosophy itself" (p. 73). He believed that the similarities between the two, Cynicism and Jesus' movement, are due to things shared in common across a broad section of society.

Mack (1988) came to his conclusion from studying the oldest layer of the Jesus tradition which is sapiential. While Theissen looked for a sociological model to compare to Jesus' lifestyle, Mack explored Jesus' use of the wisdom tradition. Mack characterized Jesus as a clever teacher of "world-mocking" wisdom marked by aphoristic speech (short subversive sayings) and a critical stance against social pretensions and cultural conventions. He compared these characteristics to Hellenistic Cynic material, concluding that Jesus was not involved with the Jewish social world.

Vermes' (1993) work, The Religion of Jesus the Jew, refuted Mack's portrait of Jesus. Vermes represents the predominant view among contemporary Jesus scholars. He treated the New Testament material as one sector of the map of general Jewish cultural history. Using common sources of written or oral Jewish material equally with the New Testament material, Vermes demonstrated that Jesus was an observant Jew regarding cultic law and the Torah as a whole. Jesus did not contradict the Law, but always referred
to the full extent of the precept of the Law in all areas of its scope from the Sabbath to food laws to filial piety.

Meier (1991b), reflecting on Jesus' relationship to Jewish culture, wrote, "Jesus the Jew fundamentally affirmed the Law as God's will, though with a radicalizing thrust seen also at Qumran" (p. 95). Witherington (1994) also refuted Mack's portrait of Jesus as a Cynic teacher:

On the one hand, the influence of the Cynic tradition on his teaching does not seem to have been pervasive or profound. On the other hand, most of the alleged parallels with the Cynic tradition are better explained in light of the Jewish sapiential material. (p. 141)

This study adopts the view of Vermes and the majority of Jesus scholars that Jesus was an observant Jew.

Second, historical Jesus scholars agree that though it is impossible to write a biography of Jesus, they have a significant amount of reliable knowledge about the message and mission of Jesus. Because of this, international authorities recognize that "in its broad outline the Gospels' account of Jesus is substantially reliable and true" (Charlesworth, 1994b, p. 7). With these first two points of consensus, scholars are trying to understand Jesus in first-century Palestine and within Judaism.

Third, most scholars believe that Jesus led a type of renewal movement. Scholars, such as Fiorenza (1984), saw the renewal movement of Jesus as a socio-political movement subverting the dominant patriarchal ethos. Borg (1984) believed Jesus initiated a "holiness" movement to revitalize Israel. Horsley (1987) concluded that Jesus was a
social, not a political, revolutionary, involved with the peasant population. Crossan (1991) saw Jesus as having an alternative social vision of religious and economic egalitarianism. Sanders (1985) concluded that Jesus led an apocalyptic restoration movement. Kaylor (1994) interpreted Jesus as a prophet who wanted to renew the social and political traditions of Israel by returning to the intent of the original covenant. All these scholars confirmed that Jesus intended to impact first-century Palestine with some sort of renewal movement.

Fourth, most scholars concur that Jesus' message was eschatological and was influenced by apocalyptic thought. Jesus' mission was to proclaim the kingdom of God. The most representative verse of this view is Mark 9:1: "And he was saying to them, 'Truly I say to you, there are some of those who are standing here who shall not taste of death until they see the kingdom of God after it has come with power'" (New American Standard Bible). Because Jesus' prediction was not fulfilled, the authors of Matthew and Luke edited Mark 9:1. The author of Luke wrote, "But I tell you truly, there are some of those standing here who shall not taste death, until they see the kingdom of God" (Lk. 9:27, New American Standard Bible). In Luke, the kingdom of God has changed from being apocalyptic to being predictive of his coming death and resurrection. Matthew's account is similar with the variation, "who shall not see death until they see the Son of Man coming in His kingdom" (Matt. 16: 28, New American Standard Bible), again referring to Jesus' resurrection. Many scholars believe that the "Son of Man" sayings indicate Jesus' understanding of his identity as an eschatological prophet.
This view has prevailed since Weiss's (1892/1971) *Jesus' Proclamation of the Kingdom of God*. Charlesworth (1994b) stated, "One of the strongest consensuses in New Testament research is that Jesus' mission was to proclaim the dawning of God's Rule, the Kingdom of God" (p. 10). However, not all scholars agree. In fact, the major area of ferment in historical Jesus scholarship is around the issue of whether Jesus was eschatological or noneschatological.

Borg (1994b) is convinced that one of the major trends is the disappearance of the old consensus that Jesus was an eschatological prophet proclaiming the imminent end of the world. His conviction is based on a mail poll he conducted in 1986 of thirty charter members of the Jesus Seminar and of forty-two participants of the Society of Biblical Literature's Historical Jesus section. Of those polled, fifty-nine percent did not think that Jesus expected the imminent end of the world.

Besides Borg's research, other scholars have come to varying degrees of the same conclusion (Borg, 1987; Crossan, 1991; Fiorenza, 1983; Horsley, 1985; Mack, 1988). According to Borg, Horsley and Fiorenza occupy a middle ground: "They do not have an 'other-worldly' or 'next-worldly' orientation, but express hope for a this-worldly transformation" (Borg, 1994a). Mack, as seen earlier, rejected Jesus as being eschatological. Crossan denied apocalyptic eschatology and argued for a here-and-now sapiential Kingdom. Borg described Jesus as an unconventional wisdom teacher, a social prophet, and a renewal movement founder.

Other scholars, such as Martin (1995), Meier (1994), Perrin (1967), Sanders (1985), and the moderating voices of Vorster (1991) and Williams (1989), continue to
believe Jesus was fundamentally eschatological. Sanders (1985) summed up the eschatological view:

Thus most of the securely attested facts about Jesus' career also agree closely with what happened afterwards, and what endured from his work is what his message had in common with Jewish restoration eschatology: the expectation that Israel would be restored. (p. 323)

Sanders (1985) is most representative of the contemporary eschatological portrait (Borg, 1994a). Sanders' work is interesting because, unlike most scholars, he did not begin with the sayings tradition or the titles attributed to Jesus, but with a list of eight indisputable facts about Jesus: (1) Jesus was baptized by John the Baptist, (2) Jesus was a Galilean who preached and healed, (3) Jesus called twelve disciples, (4) Jesus stayed in Israel, (5) Jesus engaged in controversy about the Temple, (6) Jesus was crucified by the Roman authorities, (7) Jesus' followers continued as a movement, and (8) some persecution of believers followed. Sanders began with the Temple controversy, believing that it met his two important criteria: situating Jesus in Judaism, and explaining why the movement broke with Judaism. Sanders concluded that Jesus was an eschatological prophet who believed that the restoration of Israel would occur soon. Jesus' action in cleansing the Temple and his sayings about the destruction of the Temple indicated Jesus' expectation that the Temple would be destroyed and miraculously rebuilt by God. A messianic age with a new social order would begin, ruled by the twelve disciples.

Another contribution of Sanders (1985) was countering the one-sided interpretation that Jesus' death was due to a fundamental opposition of Jesus to Judaism.
Quite the contrary, Jesus expected the restoration of Israel. Sanders worked to destroy the myth that first-century Judaism, and Pharisaism in particular, was a religion of legalism (rule-keeping or rules which led to salvation). Neill and Wright (1988) commented that mainline followers of Judaism saw the covenant as a gracious gift from God and "attempted to keep the Torah not in order to earn their membership in the people of God, but to express it" (p. 373).

Though Sanders wanted to move away from a legalistic interpretation of the Pharisees' interest in purity regulations, he did not offer an explanation of why first-and second-century Jewish scholars paid so much attention to the subject (Riches, 1993). Riches advised that contemporary Jewish scholars dismiss Sanders' book as irrelevant. Riches (1993) also pointed out that Sanders' methodology, though unique, has a major weakness: facts allow for differing modes of description. Some facts are described on the surface level and others within a thick cultural matrix. Riches (1993) wrote, "We can be pretty confident about certain facts about Jesus, thinly described, but this will not take us very far" (p. 117).

However, every historical Jesus scholar alludes to the value of Sander's *Jesus and Judaism* for its exegetical insight and innovations. Meier (1991b) wrote about the book:

> It is a classic because it brilliantly embodies a whole generation's desire to avoid exaggerations from right or left, to stop portraying Jesus as a predecessor of Heidegger or Ortega or Luther or Aquinas, and to try to understand what this Jew meant to say and accomplish in first-century Palestine. (p. 85)
For this study, the view taken will be the moderate one of Williams (1989) and Vorster (1991). As Sanders (1985) noted, simply seeing Jesus as a teacher does not explain his violent death: "It is difficult to make his teaching offensive enough to lead to execution or sectarian enough to lead to the formation of a group which eventually separated from the main body of Judaism" (p. 4).

Williams (1989) proposed a middle way between the extremes of Cynic philosophy and apocalyptic teaching. He demonstrated that the kingdom of God sayings are located in the earlier of the Jesus sayings tradition. The sayings encompass a range of meaning, from an inner sphere of order and freedom, to God's reign through the Law or Logos, to God's victory over evil powers. Williams concluded, "The core of the Kingdom sayings may be an imperfect commentary on the extreme alternatives. The Kingdom is neither 'here' nor 'there' - but somewhere in that 'midst' of what we are looking for and looking at" (p. 28). For him, Jesus was both a prophet and a sage, a teacher and a charismatic. Vorster (1991) came to the same conclusion.

The issue is important, because if Jesus were primarily eschatological, especially in the apocalyptic sense, then he would have expected the end of the present system and would not have concerned himself with its political, social, or economic reform. Charlesworth (1994a), who believes that Jesus was eschatological, warned against coming to that conclusion:

Jesus was not a dreamer about the future. He stressed the importance of the present and reached out to those in need around him, in words couched in simple phrases and pictorial stories and in acts of inclusion that broke down
social barriers. (p. 115)

Meier (1994), another advocate of the eschatological Jesus, confirmed the convergence of Jesus eschatology as both future and present which "gave Jesus his distinctiveness or 'uniqueness' within Palestinian Judaism in the early 1st century A. D." (p. 1045).

A fifth area of consensus among historical Jesus scholars is expressed by Charlesworth (1994b) himself, "Nothing is so clear as the fact that Jesus was recognized as unusual because of the power and authority he claimed" (p. 12). Hengel (1981) saw Jesus as first and foremost a teacher, but also a prophet. Hengel called him a visionary prophet who could expound with authority. Jesus was unique in that he appeared with "a charismatic authority which wholly transcended that of contemporary apocalyptic prophets" (p. 64).

Jesus expressed his authority with healing miracles. Most scholars today acknowledge these as authentic in the tradition of other Palestinian miracle workers (Crossan, 1991; Vermes, 1993; Blackburn, 1994). Meier (1994) called him a true charismatic because he located his authority to interpret, even change the Law, not in the traditional channels of authority, but rather "in his own ability to know directly and intuitively what was God's will for his people Israel in the last days" (p. 1046).

Sixth, Charlesworth (1994b) noted that scholars agree that Jesus clashed with all known Jewish groups. Jesus was in conflict with other renewal movements such as the Pharisees, the Zealots, and the Essenes (Borg, 1984; Malina & Neyrey, 1988). Jesus' use of offensive remarks and behaviors created many conflicts between Jesus and others in positions of authority and influence (e.g., Bruce, 1983; Charlesworth, 1988; Malina, 1993).
His offensiveness to the Pharisees, and the subsequent suspicion of the Roman rulers that he represented a threat to the stability of the political relationship between the Jews and the Romans, led to his crucifixion (Rivkin, 1991).

Horsley's (1987) *Jesus and the Spiral of Violence* particularly pointed to Jesus as a social revolutionary involved with the Palestinian peasant population. He avoided a theological approach by doing historical research with a sociologically sensitive examination of Jesus' life (Charlesworth, 1994b). He compared first-century Palestine with studies of preindustrial peasant societies, and concluded that the country was engaged in a conflict between the economically oppressive urban class and the economically repressed rural class. The situation generated a spiral of violence from institutional violence to actual revolt. Jesus' radical sayings were intended as guidelines for ordinary community people for a social revolution.

The Jews did not separate politics from religion (Borg, 1984; Horsley, 1987; Kaylor, 1994; Mendals, 1994). Their identity came from their relationship to God as a special covenantal people called to holiness. Sanders (1985) called it "covenantal nomism," the special status of election and covenant with God: "I am God Almighty; Walk before Me and be blameless. And I will establish My covenant between Me and you, and I will multiply you exceedingly" (Deut. 17: 1b-2, New American Standard Bible).

The quest for holiness provided "the dominant cultural dynamic of Israel's corporate life, consisting principally in an attempt to imitate God's holiness which put great emphasis on the need for Israel to separate from all that was alien" (Riches, 1993, p.
The Pharisees separated within society and the Essenes withdrew from society. Jesus replaced the exclusionary holiness movements of the Pharisees and the Essenes with an inclusive movement within society.

Jesus' conflicts, though political, social, and economic in their implications, related to issues of purity and holiness. Most conflicts arose around issues of table fellowship, laws about Sabbath observance, and the purpose of the Temple (Borg, 1984). Charlesworth (1994a) wrote, "Jesus clearly and certainly challenged boldly and openly his contemporaries' obsessive focus upon purity and the fear of being unclean or unholy, especially as demanded of all by the rich, powerful, and elite Jewish leaders based in Jerusalem" (p. 115).

Fredricksen (1995) disagreed, contending that the Jews did not equate purity with morality. Purity concerned everyone and impurity did not require forgiveness but purification. Sanders (1985) earlier proposed the same interpretation: "I have proposed that there is no evidence that the significance of Jesus' eating with sinners has to do primarily with purity, nor any that the ground of offence was his transgression of the purity code" (p. 210).

Fredricksen (1995) also demonstrated that purity did not correspond to a social class or a particular gender. Biblical purity laws designated conditions under which people might approach holy God. However, as true as these points are, impurity did involve separation from worship in the Temple and from social intercourse. Therefore, some stigma existed around those unable to comply with the purification laws, such as
lepers, ill persons, maimed persons, or persons who financially survived by living immorally.

Vermes (1991) believed that Jesus' consorting with sinners, his disregard for purity, and the conflict in the Temple led to an inevitable conflict with the Pharisees. The Pharisees' attention to myriads of details did not indicate obsession with trivialities, but rather indicated the religious significance of every small observance of holiness. Vermes suggested that conflict over these matters was less about purity and more about a fundamental clash: "the threat posed by the unrestrained authority of the charismatic to the upholders of the established religious order" (p. 80).

Jesus' message and behaviors had political ramifications (e.g., Borg, 1984; Oakman, 1986). Jesus had a liberal attitude towards purity, rejecting the rigid interpretation of compliances exhibited by the Essenes and the Pharisees. Though Jesus shared with them a complete dedication to God and the Torah, Jesus stressed love rather than separation or legalism. Most scholars agree that Jesus "conceived of God as a heavenly, loving, and intimate father, who was very near and not isolated in some distant heaven" (Charlesworth, 1988, p. 132). Sanders (1985) is one of the few who disagreed, believing that the Jesus of love and mercy was a later addition of the Gospel writers.

A final consensus, and significant for this study, is that Jesus was a teacher of unconventional wisdom. Even scholars who differ in many other respects agree on this point (e.g., Borg, 1987; Crossan, 1973, 1983; Fiorenza, 1984; Mack, 1988; Perdue, 1986; Riches, 1980; Witherington, 1994). Koester (1994) commented, "The presence of a large
number of wisdom sayings in the earliest collection of Jesus' words is remarkable" (p. 543).

Before the third quest, the wisdom nature of Jesus was neglected, primarily because Bultmann judged most of the wisdom sayings as inauthentic (Borg, 1994d). In contrast, a 1994 study of Jesus and wisdom by Witherington proposed that "one crucial dimension, perhaps the most comprehensive dimension of Jesus' teaching, is the Wisdom dimension, and that therefore the best overall categorization of the man is that he was a sage" (p. 141).

The journey from inauthenticity to authenticity occurred for several reasons. The primary one came from studies of the earliest layer of the Jesus tradition--sayings in Q. These earliest sayings attributed to the historical Jesus have a distinctive sapiential character (Crossan 1973, 1983; Kloppenborg, 1986, 1987; Witherington, 1994), as do other primary sources, such as the Gospel of Thomas, and the study of wisdom traditions in the Ancient Near East (Gammie & Perdue, 1990).

Another major reason came from growing disfavor with using the criterion of dissimilarity. Although Perrin (1967) used it as the backbone of his work, Rediscovering the Teaching of Jesus, Sanders (1985) and Crossan (1991) argued against using it as the foundation for decisions about authentic material. Sanders (1985) complained that the test rules out too much. Since Jesus was an observant Jew, withdrawing from consideration all elements similar to contemporary Jewish thought would leave a distorted view, "biased towards uniqueness" (p. 16). Charlesworth (1994a) wrote, "Jesus lived and was
influenced by his first-century environment. It is misleading to seek for his uniqueness by focusing on what separates him from his Jewish contemporaries" (p. 114).

Telford (1994), evaluating the present trends in historical Jesus research, noted four major trends: (1) the tendency to ask broader questions, (2) the attempt to set Jesus within the wider context of the Jewish and Hellenistic worlds, (3) the emphasis on Jesus' Jewishness, and (4) the adoption of a sociological perspective. Most of the present-day major portraits of Jesus examine him from a Biblical, historical, and sociological perspective. Today's scholars are more careful than past researchers to guard against theological motivations in their research, though historical Jesus research does lead to theological ramifications.

**Contemporary Portraits of the Historical Jesus as a Sage**

Several conflicting portraits of Jesus exist around the issues just mentioned. Because most scholars accept the sapiential interpretation of the historical Jesus and because Jesus as a sage is the focus of this study, this study will present the portraits of those who developed Jesus as a sage. There are other important historical Jesus scholars whose works have made significant contributions, but are regrettably left out because of the volume of material in this field. The portraits chosen represent those scholars whose views are currently being discussed by scholars and practitioners, and who are recommended by Borg (1994b) and Charlesworth (1994b) as representative of North American historical Jesus scholars. They include Fiorenza (1984, 1994), Crossan (1991, 1994b), Borg (1984, 1987), and Witherington (1994).
Two recent portraits in the developmental stages are those of Meier (1991a, 1994) and Wright (1992), an Oxford scholar. Meier is working on the third volume of his historical Jesus presentation and Wright is working on his second volume. Meier and Wright believed that Jesus saw himself as a messianic figure. They both use the canonical sources believing that noncanonical sources are less likely to be authentic.

Meier (1991a, 1994) portrayed Jesus as a marginal Jew who identified with the marginalized, who traveled around in a small area, and who challenged the traditional religious structures. For him, Jesus was an itinerant prophet and miracle-worker whom his contemporaries would equate with the prophet Elijah. Meier (1994) described Jesus as a true charismatic: "Jesus located his authority . . . not in recognized traditional channels of authority . . . but rather in his own ability to know directly and intuitively what was God's will for his people Israel in the last days" (p. 1046).

Wright's (1992) way to find the real Jesus is "by a pincer movement: forward from the picture of first century Judaism; backward from the Gospels" (p. 95). Wright's first volume is an introduction to the nature of first-century Judaism and of ancient biographies. He believed that the Gospel writers intended to convey reliable information about Jesus. Pertinent to this study is Wright's view that Jesus deliberately intended to redefine the Jewish worldview. Though this study did not include the possible messianic expectations of Jesus and his followers, the charismatic leadership of Jesus and his paradigm-shifting vision described by Meier and Wright is pertinent to this study.

Though not included, Mack also should be mentioned. Mack (1988) interpreted Jesus as a counter-order sage, but as stated previously, in the Hellenistic Cynic tradition.
His portrait is not included because the trend today is clearly away from seeing Jesus as being outside of his social and religious setting and uninvolved with it. Chilton (1994) bluntly wrote:

> Let us be clear: Mack is quite wrong, and his attempt to construe Jesus' preaching purely on the basis of hellenistic antecedents only succeeds to the extent that Judaic texts such as the Targums which have long been known and studied are willfully ignored by scholars who should know better than to engage in such special pleading. (p. 269)

Mack contributed to the portrait of Jesus as a subversive sage in the earliest layer of historical Jesus sayings. However, he failed to see the connection between Jesus' wisdom and the rich Jewish wisdom tradition within which Jesus developed and engaged himself.

Fiorenza (1984 & 1994), a feminist scholar, is included even though she has not produced a complete study of the historical Jesus. In her book, *In Memory of Her*, she does present a comprehensive sketch (Borg, 1994b). Fiorenza demonstrated that the Jesus movement, as a Sophia wisdom movement, was quite different in its understanding of God. The earliest understanding of Jesus was Jesus as Sophia's messenger and then later as Sophia herself. The violence and death of Jesus were the result of violence against all the envoys of Sophia who proclaimed God's unlimited goodness and acceptance.

In this model, Jesus was not called to Israel's righteous but to the social underdogs. Jesus' God is the God of graciousness and goodness who accepts everyone. Jesus' God is the Creator God who calls everyone to engage in the mission and power of the Kingdom. Sophia offered an alternative ethos, not an alternative lifestyle. The
prophetic tradition and the wisdom tradition come together in Jesus. The wisdom tradition celebrated God's goodness and saving acts in creation.

The Jesus renewal movement was a prophetic Jewish movement of liberation, and the central symbol was the kingdom of God. The kingdom of God meant freedom from domination. Fiorenza's (1984) eschatology affirmed the presentness of the kingdom: "Jesus' praxis and vision of the basileia [kingdom] is the mediation of God's future into the structures and experiences of his own time and people" (p. 121). Jesus was a wisdom prophet with a radical social vision. Jesus' Kingdom did not equate with holiness but with wholeness: "The power of God's basileia [kingdom] is realized in Jesus' table community with the poor, the sinners, the tax collectors, and prostitutes -- with all those who 'do not belong' to the 'holy people'" (p. 121).

Borg (1994b) believed that Fiorenza's view of Jesus contributed to historical Jesus research in three ways. First, Fiorenza (1984) shifted from a theological paradigm to a historical one: "After almost sixty years of focusing predominantly on theological-kerygmatic issues, scholarship in the last decade has resumed its search for the social context and matrix of early Christian traditions and teachings" (pp. 70-71). In other words, scholars in the past have focused on the theological meaning of Jesus' message without attending to the historical social context. Second, Fiorenza used an interdisciplinary approach using models from the sociology of religion on renewal movements. Third, she brought to scholars' attention the evolving and influencing androcentric perspective of the redactors living in a patriarchal culture. She called for a look behind the text at the actual social impact Jesus' message had on first-century
Palestinian Jews. Fiorenza's view, though not often discussed as a portrait of Jesus among scholars, had a big impact on de-androcentrizing the Christian tradition and on validating the foundational connection of Jesus with wisdom.

Crossan (1991, 1994b), a recent contributor to a comprehensive portrait of Jesus, had the most ambitious and methodologically complex approach to unraveling a description of the historical Jesus. He believed that the multiple and discordant conclusions about the historical Jesus were the direct result of inadequate research methodology. His goal was to be as objective and quantitative as possible. Crossan's (1991) methodology had "triple triadic processes" (p. xxvii). The first level was anthropological, the second historical, and the third literary.

Crossan put the relevant material into four layers from 30 C. E. to 150 C. E. He then counted the number of attestations of material attributed to Jesus at each level and numbered them according to their stratum and their number of occurrences. The material from the lowest stratum with the highest number of attestations was most likely authentic Jesus material. Crossan then focused on the interpretation of the material using multidisciplinary models. Borg called it "the most comprehensive use yet of the multidisciplinary approach that is characteristic of the present renaissance in Jesus scholarship" (p. 34).

For Crossan (1994b), Jesus was a Mediterranean Jewish Cynic peasant:

The differences as well as similarities between Jesus and the Cynic preachers are instructive even if not derivative. Both are populists, appealing to the ordinary people; both are life-style preachers, advocating their position
not only by words but by deed... both use dress and equipment to symbolize dramatically their message. But he is rural, they are urban; he is organizing a communal movement, they are following an individual philosophy; and their symbolism demands knapsack and staff, his no-knapsack and no-staff. Maybe Jesus is what Jewish Cynicism looked like. (p. 122)

Jesus, as a Jewish Cynic, taught and acted to shatter convention. Jesus' social vision revolved around free healing and common eating. Crossan believed that eating with whomever subverted the deepest social boundaries of honor and shame, patron and client, and male and female. Jesus' social vision was "a religious and economic egalitarianism that negated alike and at once the hierarchical and patronal normalcies of Jewish religion and Roman power" (Crossan, 1991, p. 422).

Witherington (1994, 1995) would disagree with Crossan's conclusion. Both scholars accepted Jesus as an observant Jew in the wisdom tradition. Witherington admitted that Palestinian Judaism in Jesus' time was Hellenized at all levels of society. Therefore, he evaluated Greek sources for their impact on Jesus' preaching and teaching. In other words, Witherington thoroughly examined whether Jesus presented himself in the Cynic tradition. Witherington (1994) concluded that if Jesus were influenced by Cynic philosophy, it was "slight in comparison to the profound impact that the Jewish wisdom material had on both the style and substance of his teaching" (p. 142). Boyd (1995) presented another critique Crossan's Cynic sage Jesus. He concluded like Witherington that Crossan's cynic Jesus was based on speculative assumptions.
Like Mack, Crossan (1991) denied an apocalyptic eschatology to Jesus' message. For him, the coming Son of Man sayings were the later additions of Jesus' followers. Jesus' Kingdom was a present sapiential Kingdom of nobodies and undesirables. However, Crossan's Cynic Jesus is very different from Mack's. Crossan's Jesus had a social vision to renew his culture. Borg described Crossan's Jesus as a world-subverting and world-shattering wisdom teacher. Jesus had a social dimension and an egalitarian vision similar to Fiorenza's.  

Borg's (1984, 1987) portrait of Jesus has attracted a great deal of attention not only from scholars but from the public. Neill and Wright (1988) wrote that the greatest achievement of Borg's Conflict, Holiness and Politics in the Teachings of Jesus was "to have shown that Jesus ministry and teaching were thoroughly 'political,' not because he was an anti-Roman revolutionary, but because he was perceived as a traitor to the nationalist Jewish cause" (p. 388). Borg's historical Jesus has almost all of the trends in contemporary Jesus scholarship: a Jewish Jesus embedded in Judaism and embroiled in conflict issues around holiness, a teacher of critical wisdom, and a renewal movement leader. Methodologically, Borg also represents third quest trends: the use of sociological perspectives, a wider use of first-century literature, and a distrust of the criterion of dissimilarity for having foundational qualifying import on the authenticity of Jesus' sayings. Borg differs from other scholars in his temperate case for a non-eschatological Jesus.  

Borg's (1984) dissertation research in the areas of conflicts, politics, and holiness of Jesus presented a non-eschatological portrait of Jesus. His dissertation challenged the
cornerstone of twentieth-century research regarding the eschatological interpretation of Jesus' sayings. He interpreted the sayings in a context of conflict, which he sees as endemic in first-century Palestine.

Borg (1984) developed the view that religion and politics were not separate issues during Jesus' time. The Torah was both divine revelation and the legal structure of the people. Therefore, Borg concluded that Jesus cannot be studied apart from the political climate and the political ramifications of his teachings and actions. Borg also integrated the social sciences in the concerns of Jesus scholarship, especially those of Theissen. He rejected the validity of the criterion of dissimilarity, because the final picture of Jesus was discontinuous with his origins.

Within first-century Palestine, Jewish conflicts with non-Jewish power, primarily the power of the Romans and their Jewish collaborators, created resistance movements around twin themes: the Torah and the Temple. The dominant cultural dynamic of Israel's corporate life in the midst of conflict was the quest for holiness. This quest put Israel on a collision course with Rome and created internal divisions. Jesus offered an alternative paradigm for holiness. His paradigm is most evident in his controversial table fellowship with sinners, his teaching and actions concerning Sabbath observance, and his view of the Temple. The conflict, then, was within Judaism and not between Judaism and Christianity.

Borg (1987) concluded that Jesus replaced holiness with inclusive mercy. Mercy was the *imitatio dei*. Holiness was the transforming power of the Spirit, and the way was peace. Borg described Jesus as a holy man who used the kingdom of God phrases to
symbolize his experience of God. For Borg, the kingdom of God sayings should not be considered central to Jesus' proclamation, because they remain subject to diverse interpretations. Borg interpreted the sayings as a symbol for the power or presence of the numinous to break into ordinary reality. Jesus used the kingdom of God phrase within a framework of eschatological mysticism, a mysticism using language associated with the end of the world. Borg (1984) explained:

Within that framework, Kingdom of God symbolized the experience of God, an experience known by Jesus himself. The Kingdom of God as an experience of God accounts for Jesus' teaching concerning the way of transformation and the course for Israel. Out of that experience flowed an awareness of a way other than the normative ways of other renewal movements, one open to the outcasts and not dependent on holiness, but on self-emptying and dying to self and world. Indeed, to enter the Kingdom of God requires the end-of-the world of which Jesus spoke as sage. (p. 261)

The Jesus who emerges from Borg's research is one who is deeply spiritual and deeply political. Borg (1987) organized the portrait of Jesus around four religious personality types which "are known cross-culturally as well as within the history of Israel" (p. 16). Borg called them charismatic healer, sage, prophet, and renewal movement founder. The charismatic healer is one in touch with the power of God who can channel that power into ordinary experience. The prophet knows the mind and will of God and proclaims it. The renewal movement founder renews or radicalizes a tradition in which he lives. The sage is one who teaches a way of life.
Borg (1987) concluded that, as a sage, Jesus' teaching was a radical criticism of the conventional wisdom of first-century Palestine. Jesus subverted the traditional wisdom use of proverbs and parables to teach a new way of seeing: "Common to all these forms of traditional wisdom as used by Jesus was an invitation to see differently" (p. 99). Jesus accomplished this by teaching a new reality which was ultimately Spirit and ultimately gracious and compassionate. Conventional wisdom imaged God as a judge whose standards had to be followed.

Since the Jewish religion culturally conferred a source of identity and security, "religion easily became a means of seeking both security and honorable identity" (p. 105). Within the framework of conventional wisdom, honor was qualified and identity shaped within a social context. Honor was a pivotal value, sustained through social recognition. Jesus challenged a preoccupation with honor and called instead for a radical trust in God. He used "the language of paradox and reversal to shatter the conventional wisdom of his time" (Borg, 1994c, p. 80). Borg placed the kingdom of God sayings in this category.

Neill and Wright (1988) credited Borg's (1984) work with three merits. First he took seriously the social and political context of Jesus' ministry. Second, Borg's portrait of Jesus as one who challenged Israel's political ambitions by calling Israel to imitate God in mercy rather than in separateness stressed the political nature of Jesus' ministry and identity. Third, Borg challenged the consensus on eschatology.

Scholars critical of Borg's portrait of the historical Jesus find fault with his understanding of the kingdom of God sayings and with his relating purity to morality.
The latter concerns were addressed in the section on consensus issues. Scholars are particularly uncomfortable with Borg's view of Jesus as non-eschatological. Chilton (1994) wrote, "Borg's proposal would make of Jesus a self-conscious symbolist who replaced temporal eschatology with his own view of his experience of God" (p. 266).

Chilton (1994) concluded that Borg's view lacked exegetical cohesion and was built on a non-Jewish understanding of eschatology. Chilton believed that Jesus adopted eschatological themes from his milieu. It was common and readily understood as "the way in which God rules -- today and tomorrow, with force and immanently, righteously and in judgment, gathering the pure and yet standing alone, in Zion and everywhere" (Chilton, 1994, p. 280).

Borg (1994d) defended his view, stating that part of the problem is a confusion with the meaning of "eschatology." For him, eschatology in a narrow sense refers to last things: resurrection of the dead, eternal life, and the last judgement. In first-century Palestine, the narrow sense of eschatology referred to the coming of the Messiah and the kingdom of God through a dramatic act of God. The result would be a radical change in the social system. He attributed this narrow interpretation of eschatology to Weiss and Schweitzer. Eschatology, in a broader sense, includes the full spectrum of eschatology from apocalyptic eschatology to his mystical eschatology. Thus, eschatology would include consideration of an internal subjective change and not just external cataclysmic events.

Chilton (1994) conceded that Jesus' kingdom of God was distinctive: 'Jesus' preaching concerning the kingdom appears to have been a conscious performance of fresh
meaning, a distinctive vision of the kingdom of God which also invited his hearers to the sort of activity he believed was consistent with that vision" (p. 264). Therefore, Borg is correct in interpreting Jesus' teaching as a new way of seeing. However, mysticizing the eschatology of Jesus is not an accepted view among scholars. Charlesworth (1994b) suggested that Borg was more concerned with reclaiming Jesus for modern understanding and that Borg's Jesus seemed "inoffensive and familiar" (p. 21). Charlesworth called such a view unwise.

Part of the problem is Borg's interpretation of Jesus' wisdom sayings. Koester (1994) suggested that the wisdom sayings of Jesus require more study to ascertain whether they are understood in the eschatological mode or in an early gnosticizing mode. Gnosticism was a movement whose adherents believed that secret knowledge insured immortality and that the physical universe was evil; therefore, the goal was to escape into the realm of light. Witherington answered Koester's concern and added more substance to Borg's view of Jesus as a subversive sage.

Witherington's (1994) *Jesus the Sage* is not a full portrait of the historical Jesus, but it is a thorough study of Jesus in the wisdom tradition. Witherington's objective was to illuminate the relationship of the wisdom tradition to Jesus and to the early Church. He argued that "Jesus was a Jewish prophetic sage whose teaching and style primarily reflected . . . the confluence of Hebrew sapiential and prophetic forms and ideas, and to a much lesser degree revealed traces of Hellenistic influence" (pp. x-xi).

Witherington (1994) noted that 70% of the Jesus tradition is in some sort of wisdom form such as aphorisms, riddles, or parables. The parables, called narrative
"meshalim," are particularly distinctive to Jesus. The narrative "meshalim" are not characteristic of previous Hebrew sages, but are rather part of the prophetic phenomenon: "In short, the narrative meshalim reflect the prophetic adaptation and expansion of a Wisdom and poetic form of speech, the simile, to serve prophetic narrative concerns" (p. 158). Therefore, Jesus presents himself as a Jewish prophetic sage who used prophetic, apocalyptic, and sapiential material.

Witherington (1994) confirmed Borg's portrait of Jesus as a counter-order sage. The major themes of conventional wisdom are almost totally absent from the Jesus tradition. Jesus used aphoristic language, rather than proverbial language, in both parables and sayings. Wirtherington (1994) explained, "An aphorist is seeking to assert a counter order to the current status quo, or to urge a better and ideal set of affairs, that while not yet fully realized, can or will come to pass" (p. 163).

Witherington (1994) demonstrated that Jesus believed God's eschatological reign was breaking into Israel through his ministry. Witherington also concluded, through his analysis of the parables and aphoristic sayings, that an essential characteristic of Jesus' ministry was controversy over holiness issues. For Jesus, compassion was a weightier matter than the law. He drove people back to the primary principles that governed God's relationship to the Jewish people. As an eschatological sage, Jesus believed that God's coming reign meant a remarkable outpouring of grace.

Even though Witherington does not propose a historical portrait of Jesus, his historical and textual study of the relationship of Jesus to the Wisdom tradition clarified
some important issues for Jesus scholars. Witherington (1994) confirmed the picture of Jesus as a Jewish prophetic sage who believed in the eschatological dominion of God:

> Jesus taught a Wisdom that entailed a counter order, and often it was a Wisdom from below, not one that propped up the *status quo* or supported the values of the wealthy few. Paradoxically enough, the source of the counter order was indeed from above -- the inbreaking eschatological dominion of God.

(p. 201)

The historical Jesus portrait of Borg and the confirming and qualifying additions of Witherington are congruent with the consensus areas of third quest historical Jesus scholarship.

The distinguishing mark of all third quest authors is that they write as historians. According to Neill and Wright (1988), the third quest has two major strengths: (1) The quest comes from a groundswell of historical research undertaken internationally, and driven by different questions and interdisciplinary models; and (2) the third quest is more conscious of what history is, and is asking the correct historical questions. Therefore, humble confidence is possible in presenting a reliable portrait of the historical Jesus as an illustration of a wise leader.

**Leadership Studies on Jesus**

Despite the enormous impact Jesus has had on Western civilization, few studies have evaluated his leadership in light of leadership theory. Thousands of books have been written using him as a model for ministerial leadership, but most are professionally designed, problem-solving oriented, or devotionally directed (e.g., Ford, 1991; Gangel,
1987; Hansen, 1994; Schillebeeckx, 1981). Many books are meant to inspire Christian ministers to follow the example of the Jesus as savior, servant, shepherd, and perfect model of minister/leader. These books are not based on the historical figure of Jesus, but rather on the composite New Testament figure of Christ.

A famous exception is Hengel's (1981) book on Jesus, *The Charismatic Leader and His Followers*. Hengel noted that, in the quest for the historical Jesus, the problem of what is meant by following Jesus has taken a back seat. The book's focus, then, is the problem of following Jesus. Hengel approached the problem by giving detailed individual analyses of all the relevant sayings such as "Follow me, and let the dead bury their dead" (Matt. 8: 22). The saying is an attack on the respect for parents demanded by the fourth commandment. Hengel (1981) commented, "There is hardly one logion [sayings group] of Jesus which more sharply runs counter to law, piety, and custom than does Mt. 8:22" (p. 14).

Hengel (1981) attributed Jesus’ strict discipleship to his unique authority as the proclaimer of the imminent kingdom of God. A survey of Judaism and Greek understanding of followership illustrated no such radical demands in the area of firmly established institutions. Rather, such demands occurred in contexts where traditional order and standards were broken down or rejected. Hengel related Jesus' actions and words to the charismatic personality model of Weber. Weber (1946) described charismatics as those who break through commonplace barriers.

Hengel (1981) also concluded that Jesus was first a teacher. Jesus had strong links with the wisdom tradition and its ethical admonitions. However, he was also a prophet,
who expected his followers to share in his wanderings and in his destiny and to prepare for the approaching kingdom of God. As a prophet, he was unique in that he appeared with "a charismatic authority which wholly transcended that of contemporary apocalyptic prophets" (p. 64).

A criticism of Hengel's book came from Malina (1984) in his article, "Jesus as Charismatic Leader?" Malina addressed the question, "Was Jesus a Weberian charismatic leader?" Charisma is a recognized quality which exists in an individual who disrupts existing social norms and who has a vision. Charisma is a quality of extraordinariness which Malina called "a collective illusion." Malina believed that the authority of the charismatic leader is illusionary because it is attributed by followers.

Malina (1984) suggested that Jesus was not a charismatic leader, but a reputational leader. The authority of the reputational leader is rooted in a person's ability to influence change within the norms of legitimate authority. He described the charismatic leader as one who thrives on power and is self-appointed, unattached to social institutions, radical and non-institutional. Reputational leadership, on the other hand, believes in mission, is institutional and traditional, and repudiates personal power. Malina concluded that Jesus' movement was a revivalist movement -- a conservative development intending to restore values, not create ones. Some scholars would disagree that Jesus was institutional and conservative. However, he was primarily concerned with renewal, not usurpation.

An earlier article by Milson (1968) defined charisma as a social authority based not on tradition but on the extraordinary impact of an individual leader. For him, Jesus
was an example of a leader who set himself against the established order through sayings such as "you have heard it said . . . but I say to you." Malina’s discomfort with the charismatic model reflects the confusion around its interpretation and its value-neutral quality. The transformational model is similar to Malina's reputational model, and has the added benefit of being widely recognized and empirically defined.

Ford (1991) used the transformational model to describe Jesus’ leadership as a model for ministers. Ford’s book is a wealth of inspirational stories. However, Ford characterized Jesus’ transformational leadership in the context of Jesus as the Christ of faith. Furthermore, he did not attempt to add or confirm anything empirically in the field of leadership research. Another book, Jones' (1995) *Jesus CEO: Using Ancient Wisdom for Visionary Leadership*, is also inspirational in nature. Despite its promising title, the book offers only implicit insights into leadership, nothing empirical.

Most of the studies on Jesus as a leader considered him as the Christ of the New Testament. Psalmonds (1958) compared Jesus' leadership with leadership techniques in 1958, without making a technical examination of the New Testament using Biblical criticism or explaining his methodology. He concluded from his study that Jesus' leadership was unique from all known models.

Smith (1973) observed Jesus as a leader through his development of the twelve disciples. He also did not use Biblical criticism. Relying primarily on commentaries, he examined the encounters of Jesus with the disciples and correlated them in a statistical format. He concluded that Jesus’ leadership demonstrated the importance of leadership ethics, intention, and the recruitment and development of leaders.
Jordan (1990) examined the major philosophies of leadership and the leadership philosophies of current Presbyterian pastors. He then compared them to the leadership style of Jesus Christ. He categorized leadership styles as Charismatic, Dictatorial, Participative, Democratic, or Laissez-faire. He concluded that Jesus used all five styles, but in his teaching he favored Participative style. As the other researchers, Jordan studied the Jesus of faith.

Several studies correlated transformational leadership theory with ministry settings. Hicks (1990) studied transformational leaders on a missions project. Bray (1991) operationalized the transformational and transactional leadership models for the ministry. The transformational model provided breadth of interest, demonstrated perseverance, and modeled the faith living. The transactional leader was more likely to conform. Faughn (1991) studied transformational leadership in a Christian college and identified four behaviors: attending to vision, attending to symbols, attending to people; and attending to change.

The only study to relate transformational leadership theory to Jesus was Russell's (1993) *Communicating Transformational Leadership in the Life of the Christian Laity*. Russell's research objective was to clarify the importance of transformational leadership for Christian lay leaders. He used Jesus Christ, Paul, and Peter as models. Russell accepted the New Testament as the Holy Spirit-inspired record of eye witnesses or historians who spoke to eyewitnesses. Russell did not use Biblical criticism, historical research methodology, or historical Jesus study insights. He always referred to Jesus as Jesus Christ, the divine Son of God. According to Russell (1993), Jesus Christ's mission
was to "transform human beings from captives of Satan into freed individuals enslaved to God" (p. 117). Though perhaps provocative as inspiration for Christian lay leaders, the study contributes nothing original to the study of Jesus or leadership.

The only study relating wisdom to Jesus' leadership was Epperly's (1981) *Guidelines for Creating a Wisdom Style of Ministry*. Epperly saw the wisdom mode of Jesus Christ as offering alternative insights into ministry rather than as the dominant salvation history tradition. The wisdom trajectory culminated in Jesus Christ. Epperly paralleled the wisdom tradition with the psychological perspectives of Jung's feminine consciousness, Ornstein's right brain theory, and Watzlwick's metaphoric mind theory.

Epperly concluded that the salvation history model is the product of predominant masculine, left brain mode of knowing. In order to enrich liberal Protestant understandings of ministry, the wisdom mode offers a balancing feminine right brain approach to knowing. Epperly attempted to relate the Judaic wisdom tradition to psychological theories. However, her study came before much of the development of psychological wisdom theory. Also, even though she used the historical figure of Jesus, her research is not historically-based, but rather theologically-driven. Hers is another example of a study based on the Jesus of faith.

As evidenced from these studies, there are no studies which relate transformational leadership theory to the historical Jesus. Nor are there any studies which look at the leadership of Jesus using historical research insights and Biblical criticism methodologies, besides Hengel's examination of Jesus' charismatic leadership. Neither are there any studies which relate the wisdom mode of Jesus to psychological wisdom
theories. Therefore, a study linking transformational leadership theory, psychological wisdom theory, and historical Jesus research would build bridges among the three fields. The study might serve to create new relationships and confirm data in order to enhance "seeing."
The purpose of this study is to propose a theory of leadership modeled after the transformational wisdom leadership of the historical Jesus. The study will explore the possible linkage of the construct of wisdom and the construct of common sense with transformational leadership theory. The historical Jesus, as understood through his sayings and the context of his sayings, will be the data for the study.

Because Jesus is a historical figure, historical research methods will be used. Historical research is defined as "the systematic search for facts relating to questions about the past, and the interpretation of these facts" (Borg & Gall, 1989, p. 806). Historical research is sometimes called "documentary research" (Hill & Kerber, 1967). As a scientific endeavor, historical research is an act of reconstruction where the researcher holistically attempts to explain the past (Cohen & Manion, 1994). Hill and Kerber (1967) listed the values of historical research:

(1) to inquire into the past for solutions to contemporary problems; (2) to shed light upon present and future trends; (3) to stress the relative importance and the effects of the various interactions that are to be found within all cultures; and (4) to re-evaluate data in the light of proving (or disproving) the hypotheses, theories, and/or generalizations that are presently held about the past. (p. 125)
Historical research is valuable for using the past to explain the present and for using the present to understand the complexities of the past. If one finds in Jesus an integrating and interpreting relationship between wisdom and transformational leadership, then the historical reality might offer solutions to a contemporary problem: How does the leader as a change agent function in an effective transformative manner when the environment is turbulent and conflicted?

Historical research can shed light on present and future trends. The destabilizing effect of conflict and change on first-century Palestine produced a number of renewal leaders. Jesus is the one who is remembered today and who continues to impact individuals and culture. The destabilizing effect of change on contemporary Western culture has also produced a number of "renewal leaders" such as Pat Buchanan, Newt Gingrich, and Dorothy Day. Which of these leaders will be remembered as the wise, effective, transformational leader?

This study looks at an ancient Middle Eastern culture and its leaders, and suggests that the interactions of leadership and wisdom in first-century Palestine are a valuable and important phenomenon for modern Western culture. If wisdom springs from the common-sense shared assumptions indigenous to a particular culture, then -- though the shared assumptions might differ from place to place -- wisdom may begin from that same source and its integrating function may be the same in the one culture as in the other.

Finally, using modern wisdom and leadership theory as a different lens to see Jesus may further validate and clarify the debate concerning the nature of the
historical Jesus among Biblical scholars. Doing an historical research project of this nature will offer several benefits to scholars in the diverse fields of psychological wisdom theory, leadership theory, and historical Jesus studies.

The difference between historical research and the work of historians is that historical research seeks "to discover common patterns that recur in different times and places" (Babbie, 1992, p. 312). This study seeks to discover common patterns between contemporary wisdom and leadership theory and the past leadership and wisdom of Jesus. Burns (1978) demonstrated that patterns of leadership in the past formed his understanding of transformational leadership in the present. Achenbaum and Orwell (1991) demonstrated a common pattern between Job and wisdom theory. This study will continue to confirm and develop their work, and additionally explore the relationship of leadership theory and wisdom theory in the same context.

Borg and Gall (1989) quoted Edson as claiming, "There is no single, definable method of historical inquiry" (p. 809). Each researcher interprets the past differently. However, Borg and Gall (1989) recommended four steps: "Define the problem or questions to be investigated; search for sources of historical facts; summarize and evaluate the historical sources; and present the facts within an interpretive framework" (p. 810). In Chapter One, the problem was defined and the questions identified. This chapter will present the methodology for addressing the next three steps.
The Sources of Historical Facts About Jesus

The sources of historical research are documents from the past. In this study, two types of sources will be used: (1) primary sources about the historical Jesus, and (2) secondary sources from the Jewish wisdom literature tradition. Primary sources "are those which directly reflect the views or the behavior of individuals or groups" (Lancy, 1992, p. 267). Borg and Gall (1989) described primary sources as "those documents in which the individual describing the event was present when it occurred" (p. 814). First-century documents about the historical Jesus include the New Testament Gospels, non-canonical books, such as the Gospel of Thomas, and brief references by a contemporary Jewish historian, Flavius Josephus. These are primary documents in that they represent the views of first-century Jews about Jesus and in that some of the documents were written by persons present when Jesus lived. Of these documents, none of the original autographs exist, and nothing exists which was written by Jesus.

This researcher recognizes that not all scholars would agree that the Gospels are primary sources. Traditions and sayings of Jesus began as oral history, then possibly were gathered into sayings documents, and finally were edited and shaped by the New Testament writers. The earliest fragments are copies of these documents from circa 200 C.E. Most of the early collections of documents are from the fourth and fifth century.

However, the recent work of the Jesus Seminar has done much to recover the sayings of Jesus which emerged from the oral tradition. The Jesus Seminar gathered
for the first time in 1985 under the leadership of Robert Funk. The purpose of the Seminar, in the words of Funk (1985) was "to inquire simply, rigorously, after the voice of Jesus, after what he really said" (p. 7). Over a six-year period, more than a hundred scholars met to "assess the degree of scholarly consensus about the historical authenticity of each of the sayings attributed to Jesus in the New Testament and other early Christian documents written before the year 300" (Borg, 1994a).

The Jesus Seminar had no precedent in contemporary New Testament scholarship (Borg, 1994a). The Seminar was not connected to a particular institution or church body. Scholars were Catholics, Protestants, non-religious, and a few Jews. The only group not represented were fundamentalist scholars who viewed the project as blasphemous and irrelevant. Fundamentalist scholars believe that the Bible was written through divine inspiration and, therefore, without error or contradiction. Very few women participated because few women work in the discipline. Participants, called Fellows, met twice a year to focus on different collections of sayings. Papers were read beforehand, so that the meetings could be devoted to discussion.

The Jesus Seminar inventoried and classified all the words attributed to Jesus from the first three centuries of the Common Era. A diagram illustrating the development of the Jesus tradition in the Gospels is located in the Appendix. The sayings were sorted as parables, aphorisms, dialogues, and stories. The Seminar used all the surviving material from the period. In sorting out the sayings, the Fellows adhered to one major axiom: "Only sayings and parables that can be traced back to the oral period, 30-50 C.E., can possibly have originated with Jesus" (Funk, et al.,
Four rules of attestation guided the Seminar in identifying those sayings which probably came from the oral tradition. These were: (1) sayings or parables attested in two or more independent sources are older than the sources where they are found; (2) sayings or parables attested in two different contexts probably circulated independently at an earlier time; (3) the same or similar content attested in two or more different forms probably come from an older tradition; and (4) material written late may preserve old memories (Funk, et al., 1993).

The earliest written Gospels were the Sayings Gospel and an early version of the Gospel of Thomas. The Sayings Gospel is commonly known as "Q." Q stands for the German word "Quelle" which means "source." Weiss' (1971) unexplained usage of the term in an 1890 essay on Luke 11:14-26 seems to be the first evidence of its use by a New Testament Biblical scholar (Havener, 1987). Q consists of sayings and parables found in both Matthew and Luke, but not in Mark.

The sayings common to Matthew and Luke, but not Mark, are often very similar in wording and word order, even though the authors sometimes placed the sayings in different parts of the story. The Q hypothesis states that such sayings could only have a common literary background. Therefore, a lost and very early sayings document must have been available to the Gospel writers of Matthew and Luke. Mack (1993) refers to Q as "the Lost Gospel." The Sayings Gospel consists of an ordered collection of Jesus' sayings and some of his miracles, but it contains no birth or crucifixion narratives. Q has a combination of wisdom sayings and apocalyptic
pronouncements. Q was probably composed by 50 C.E. in Galilee (Mack, 1993).

The acceptance of the Q hypothesis established the two-source theory in New Testament scholarship. The two-source theory states that Matthew and Luke used two written sources, Mark and Q, to write their Gospels. After extracting from Matthew and Luke the common material found in Mark and Q, scholars recognized other material peculiar to Matthew and peculiar to Luke. This material came either from other unknown written sources or from "stray fragments" from the oral tradition (Funk, et al., 1993). Scholars named Matthew's other source material "M," and Luke's, "L." The four-source theory is the view that four independent sources existed. Matthew used M, Mark, and Q. Luke used L, Mark, and Q.

Some scholars, though, refuted the existence of any kind of sayings document such as Q or other independent sources such as M or L, because there were no ancient parallels to a document about Jesus with only sayings and no passion narrative. However, that criticism was challenged by the discovery of the Gospel of Thomas, a sayings document with no passion narrative.

Early church fathers had referred to a document called the Gospel of Thomas and several Greek fragments later identified as fragments of the Gospel were the only previous clues to its existence. In 1945 at Nag Hammadi in Egypt, a Coptic version of the Gospel of Thomas was discovered. The Gospel of Thomas has no miracles, narrative section, or passion story. It consists only of several dialogues. These dialogues are similar to the wisdom sayings found in Q (Meyer, 1992).
The dating of the Gospel has inspired a great deal of controversy. The Jesus Seminar scholars believe the Gospel was composed in Jerusalem about the same time as Q. Meyer (1992) and others believe that it was composed in Syria during the latter part of the first century or during the second century. In *The Complete Gospels* (Miller, Ed., 1994), contributors suggest that an early Gospel of Thomas was written around 70 C.E., and church fathers later revived the Gospel.

The book is considered a Gnostic interpretation of the teachings of Jesus. Half of the sayings do not appear in the Bible, and one in three correspond to sayings found in the Synoptic tradition (Segerberger, 1987). Thomas has twelve parables and six of them appear in the Synoptics: the sower, the mustard seed, the lamp under a bushel, the new cloth/old garment, the new wine/old wineskins, and the vineyard and the householder. Funk and others (1993) referred to the sayings in the Gospel of Thomas as a "control group," a virtual wealth of comparative material and new information for discussion about the authenticity of Jesus' sayings and parables.

The Jesus Seminar scholars relied most heavily on five independent sources: (1) Q, Sayings Gospel; (2) Gospel of Thomas; (3) Gospel of Mark; (4) Special Matthew-M; and (5) Special Luke-L. These were considered primary sources. Sources such as the Gospel of Signs (a possible early source used by the writer of the Gospel of John), the letters of Paul, and early Christian documents, such as the Didache, are other secondary sources which are about Jesus. However, most of the present knowledge about the historical Jesus is based on evidence gleaned from the five independent sources.
After considerable study and discussion about the sayings and parables in the source materials, Jesus Seminar Fellows voted on the material attributable to Jesus. They used colored beads to indicate one of four choices: (1) red indicated "undoubtedly Jesus"; (2) pink indicated "possibly Jesus"; (3) gray indicated "possible material about Jesus"; and (4) black indicated "not Jesus." The votes were weighted. Red was given a value of three, pink was given two, and gray one. Each value was multiplied by the number of votes in each category, and then the sum of the votes was divided by the total number of votes. The weighted value assured that each vote counted.

Those sayings which averaged 76% confidence in their historical reliability are listed in the Appendix with their attestations and rank. They consist of the complete catalogue of those sayings graded red. They can be grouped into several categories: (1) Matthew 5: 39-42a, 44b: Turn the other cheek; When someone sues for your shirt give your coat; Go the second mile; Give to the beggar; and Love your enemies; (2) Lk. 6: 20, 21: Congratulations poor, hungry, and sad; (3) Kingdom of God/Heaven sayings and parable: Lk. 13: 20-21, Leaven; Mt. 20: 1-15, Vineyard laborers; Mt. 13: 31-32, Mustard seed; (4) Lk. 20:25: Give to the emperor and to God; (5) Lk. 10:30-35, The Samaritan; (6) Lk. 16:1-8a, The Shrewd manager; and (7) Mt. 6:9c Abba, Father. All of the sayings are attested one or more times in the Gospel of Q, Thomas, Mark, L, or M. For this study, these sayings and parables are the primary source material illustrating Jesus' as a sage and leader.
In this study, the translation used for the red sayings of Jesus is the Scholars Version put together by the scholars of the Jesus Seminar. The scholars, who graded the authenticity of Jesus' sayings, decided that a translation was needed which would "produce for the American reader an experience comparable to that of the first readers -- or listeners -- of the original" (Funk, et al., 1993, p.xiii). The translators wanted the aphorisms and parables to sound like the colloquialisms that they were in the original Greek language. Since the impact of Jesus' words is an important part of the study and the scholars involved are respected experts in the field, this study will use their translation.

Not all of today's Biblical scholars accept the results of the Jesus Seminar. Several scholars believe that the canonical Gospels reflect an accurate picture of what the historical Jesus did and say. Wilkins and Moreland (1995) wrote, "Jesus of Nazareth is under fire . . . some declare that Jesus never said most of what is recorded of him in the Bible" (p. 1). Johnson (1996) noted that the Jesus Seminar scholars based their research on the assumption that the Gospels are not historical documents but rather theological and literary narratives. Another bias noted by Witherington (1995) was that "the Jesus Seminar had as one of its major agendas the presentation of a 'critical' portrait of Jesus that must be necessarily distinguished from the fundamentalist and traditional portraits" (p. 44).

These are serious charges. However, for this study the use of the red sayings is suitable for several reasons. First, the red sayings would be accepted by all scholars (whether they be "liberal" revisionists or "conservative" traditionalists) as authentic
and reliable. Second, these sayings are not used to construct a complete portrait of Jesus, but rather they are used as representative of Jesus' leadership. Third, the use of the sayings does not reflect the bias of this scholar who is Christian and who accepts the historical reliability of the New Testament. Therefore, though there are limitations to choosing a sampling of Jesus' sayings, for the purposes of this study the objections should not deter from the conclusions drawn. To protect from bias, the interpretations used of historical Jesus scholars represent a wide variety of views.

The problem with historical documents is that they are themselves interpretations of lived experiences. They cannot be relied upon as truly accurate records of historical events. Hammersley and Atkinson (1983) wrote about documents: "They are partial, and reflect the interests and perspectives of their authors" (p. 135). Each New Testament writer had a different perspective and purpose for writing. Particularly, the Gospels present different slants on Jesus. There are slight differences in the selection of materials, in their chronological order, and in the presentation and interpretation of chosen materials. Therefore, there are differences in the text and in the final composite picture of Jesus.

Babbie (1992) suggested that protection against distortion lies in corroboration. He wrote, "If several resources point to the same set of 'facts,' your confidence in them might reasonably increase" (p. 340). Therefore, the benefit of using the primary sources used by the Jesus Seminar and the secondary sources of the Jewish wisdom tradition is to assure the corroboration of the data gathered.
Secondary sources are those materials which do not have a *direct physical* relationship to the events being studied (Cohen & Manion, 1989). Secondary source material in this study refers to the documents which make up the background for understanding the Jewish wisdom tradition in the ancient Near East and the impact and influence it had on the historical Jesus. This material allows for an accurate interpretation of the sayings and parables attributed to the historical Jesus.

Before any interpretation of Jesus' sayings can be done, an analysis of the Jewish wisdom literature tradition must be done. There exists a great wealth of research on the Jewish wisdom tradition on a trajectory from Proverbs through Jesus. All scholars in this field agree that two types of wisdom emerged: a conventional wisdom and a critical wisdom. Conventional wisdom teaches the art of living long, well, and upright (Witherington, 1994). Critical wisdom teaches the art of steering through life's difficulties (Witherington, 1994). The Jewish wisdom literature greatly enhances historians' understanding of the wisdom tradition, its development and description, and Jesus' use of that tradition.

The evaluation of the wisdom literature tradition behind Jesus' designation as a sage will use the evaluation process accepted among Biblical scholars: Biblical historical criticism. Biblical historical criticism answers the classical research questions establishing the context and intent of each document investigated:

1. Who composed the document and why was it written?
2. What are some of the biases of the document?
3. What are the key themes used by the writer to organize the document?
4. What is the context of the documents? To whom were they written and what events were impacting their lives? (Babbie, 1992)

The primary historical critical scholars in the field of Biblical scholarship will be used to glean their consensual answers to the above questions. The wisdom literature tradition is described by Biblical historical scholars such as Blenkinsopp (1983), Bruggemann (1990), Carlston (1980), Collins (1962), Crenshaw (1981), Crossan (1991), Murphy (1990b), Perdue (1994), Robinson (1990), Scott (1971), Suggs (1970), Von Rad (1972), Williams (1971), Witherington (1994), and many others. Their insights give full understanding to the meaning of the texts and will establish the background necessary for understanding Jesus as a sage. An overview analysis of the wisdom literature tradition, beginning in Proverbs and culminating in Jesus, reveals factors about conventional wisdom that will correspond to common sense theory and about critical wisdom that will correspond to psychological wisdom theory.

Evaluation of the Wisdom Tradition: Biblical Historical Criticism

Brown (1989) simply defined Biblical historical criticism as having a primary concern for "what the Biblical author conveyed to his readers in the text that he wrote" (p. 24). Biblical historical critics study a document against its proper historical background, which involves an analysis of the place, time, circumstances, and prevailing worldview (Berkhof, 1950).
Historical critical scholars use several methods: textual criticism, source criticism, form criticism, grammatical criticism, literary criticism, and redaction criticism. Textual criticism seeks to establish the original wording of the document. Textual critics look at variations among documents in their original languages, variations among early translations, variations between original language manuscripts and their translations, and variant quotations in early Christian and Jewish writing (Hayes & Holladay, 1982).

Source criticism is the discipline which seeks to identify the written sources behind the Gospels. Source critics study the literary relationship between the Gospels and asks questions about the differences and similarities (Tatum, 1982). Source criticism led to the Q hypothesis and the two-source and four-source theories already discussed.

Form critics look for the pre-literary stages of Biblical texts. Form critics attempt to discover the forms in which the oral tradition of Jesus was passed down (Tatum, 1982). These scholars attempt to explicate the origins of the traditions about Jesus. They assume that an oral tradition existed behind the texts and that some of these sayings were written down and were circulated in collections.

Grammatical criticism evaluates the communication of the literary text through the meaning of the words and through their connections in sense units (Berkhof, 1950; Thiselton, 1980). "Grammatical criticism may be thought of as the set of skills and disciplines through which the exegete seeks to re-create and enter the
original thought world and linguistic frame of reference of the text" (Hayes & Holladay, 1982, p. 54).

The contemporary usage of the term "literary criticism" refers to an analysis of Scripture as literature (Soulen, 1981). It evaluates the manuscript as literary genre, especially in relationship to other literature of the same period. Literary criticism "reflects an interest in questions such as the relationship of content to form, the significance of structure or form for meaning, and the capacity of language to direct thought and to mold existence" (Beardslee, 1970, p. 76).

Redaction criticism completes the critical analysis by examining the editorial process of each text and evaluating its transmission history. The author of a text frequently adapts the material to fit his or her theological perspective and the community's needs. Redaction critics seek to discover the theology of the Gospel writer and the writer's situation by studying how the author edited his sources (Tatum, 1982).

Scholars studying the Jewish wisdom tradition and Jesus as an historical figure in that tradition base their insights and conclusions on the above historical-critical methodology. Therefore, though disagreements do exist among scholars on the final portrait of the historical Jesus, the disagreements are based on the weight given to certain elements of the text and on the interpretive perspective of the researcher. These differences have been discussed in the literature review. According to Lancy (1992), the first step in historical research is to have a clear point of view, and "good historical research takes the work of other historians as a starting point" (p.
265). Using the research of Biblical historical critical scholars, Chapter Four of this study presents an overview of the Jewish wisdom tradition and Jesus' identification as a sage in that tradition.

Interpretation of the Facts: Biblical Social-Scientific Criticism

After an analysis of Jesus and the wisdom tradition, each of the three theories used in this study will have defined factors: transformational and transactional leadership theory with their factors, psychological and common sense theory with their factors, and conventional and critical wisdom traditions with their factors. Also, it is hypothesized that contemporary wisdom and common sense theory will correspond to critical and conventional wisdom tradition. The next phase of the study will be to assess the acting relationship of these theories in the historical Jesus.

Leadership occurs in context, and the context has profound implications for understanding a leadership behavior. Therefore, understanding the context of first-century Palestine is important for understanding the nature of Jesus' leadership and its relationship to his role as a sage. What might seem a logical interpretation of Jesus' sayings and parables through a twentieth-century lens might not be perceived that way by a first-century Jew. Leadership is a social construct. Therefore, at this point, social-scientific criticism of the Jesus' sayings is necessary.

One of the distinguishing hallmarks of third quest historical Jesus scholars is their use of interdisciplinary models from the social science fields:

The atomistic and diachronic approach of the traditio-critical methods (source,
Using social sciences with Biblical texts is called Biblical social-scientific criticism. Elliott (1993) defined it as "that phase of the exegetical task which analyzes 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" (p. 7).

Social science is a branch of modern science which "specializes in the study of human societies, social systems, and their component parts, social behavior, and social processes" (Elliott, 1993, p. 14). Social-scientific criticism recognizes the social dimension of the New Testament. The New Testament describes the social context and the patterns of behavior evident at that time. The texts communicate meanings about the social system which then serve as vehicles for understanding social interaction (Elliott, 1993). Therefore, in order for twentieth-century readers to understand the social interaction, they must first understand the social system.

In social-scientific criticism, there are three presuppositions to the interpretation enterprise (Elliott, 1993). First, researchers "presuppose that all knowledge is socially conditioned and perspectival in nature" (Elliott, 1993, p. 36). This means that complete objectivity is a myth. The social locations of the researcher and of the researched have perspectives which influence interpretations. This does not mean that "truth" is uncoverable. It does mean that the researcher approaches the task
humbly and honestly with open integrity of purpose. Using social critical methods "to prove a point" is not research, but unabashed bias.

Therefore, a second presupposition implies that the method of analysis "must include means for distinguishing and clarifying the differences between the social location of the interpreter and the social location of the authors and object to be interpreted" (Elliott, 1993, p. 37). This is accomplished by distinguishing between "etic" and "emic" information. One type of etic information identifies the perspective of the investigator according to factors such as gender, nationality, education, age, status, religious affiliation, language, and location in time and place. This information is provided in the curriculum vita appended to the end of the dissertation. Emic information is the descriptions and explanations given from the perspective of the authors studied. Emic information provides the what and how, but not the why. The investigator seeks to explain the why of the emic information through the use of other types of etic information: social science models.

The third presupposition of interpretation is that in order to clarify differences between the past and the present, theories and models are necessary. Theories and models act as conceptual frameworks. Therefore, they must be stated clearly. Theories and models are not absolutes, but rather are drawn from careful observation and are subject to tests and verification (Holmberg, 1990). The theories used have been clearly developed and defined in the first two chapters. Biblical social-science researchers have identified several models which apply to first-century Palestine.
Malina (1983) defined a model as "a symbolic representation of selected aspects of the behaviour of a complex system for particular purposes" (p. 231). Leadership and wisdom constructs are complex. A model of behaviors is needed where the constructs of leadership and wisdom would be found and where the purposes of the study might be accomplished. A model is different from a theory. The model acts as a link between theory and observations (Carney, 1975). The theory is known and the situation needs to be observed; thus the model bridges the gap between theory and potential data.

A model is structured to serve as an instrument for organizing and interpreting material: "Models do not create material evidence; rather, they provide the means for envisioning relationships and patterns among the evidence" (Elliott, 1993, p. 43). The use of models in this study is important for exploring the relationship of the leadership construct to the wisdom construct, and for determining if a pattern of relationships exists between the two constructs.

Models also serve a heuristic function as vehicles for discovery and for exploring new territory (Elliott, 1993). The purpose of this study is to explore the possibility that a transformational leader uses wisdom to negotiate her way through conflicted events and that a transactional leader uses common sense to establish order.

The selection of models is an important step. Malina (1982) suggested several features of a model. A model should facilitate cross-cultural comparisons, should be general enough to highlight similarities, and should be designed from experiences relevant in the Biblical social world. The quality of the model should conform to
social-scientific standards. Models used in this study that have these features are the purity model, the conflict model and the pre-industrial agrarian model.

Douglas (1966) researched the phenomena of pure and impure social systems. Borg (1984) applied the research to his study of the historical Jesus in first-century Palestine. The purity model illustrates the political and religious consciousness of first-century Jews. Purity was located in cultic practices in the Temple and in obedience to the holiness codes of the Torah, the Jewish law. The conflict model illustrates the social consciousness of first-century Jews. The pivotal social values were honor and shame, which were enhanced, acquired or lost through conflict. Malina and Neyrey (1991) applied the conflict model to first-century Palestine. The pre-industrial agrarian model explicated the economic consciousness of first-century Palestine. The patron-client relationship describes how the system functioned. Malina (1993), Oakman (1986), and Rohrbaugh (1991) and studied first-century economics and the economic intent of Jesus' message using the pre-industrial agrarian model.

Scholars have found that these models help explain the social system and the social interactions of first-century Palestine. Charlesworth (1994a) wrote, "Sociological models help us reconstruct Jesus' environment and help us comprehend his life and teaching" (p. 115). These models are presented in Chapter Five and are used for the basis of an analysis of Jesus' leadership and the relationship of leadership to wisdom.

The use of the social science models enables the researcher to move to interpretation for understanding. Interpretation is the step to determine meaning. Interpretation is "the application of the meaning to life situations today" (Thomas,
Since the area of concern is the understanding of the relationship of leadership style to wisdom and common sense factors, interpretation is a crucial step.

Interpretation brings the text to life. Traina (1980) wrote, "The problem of interpretation is the problem of re-creation" (p. 95). When re-creating the text, the interpreter interprets with provocation and purpose. The interpreter has a reason and specific aims for interpreting a text (Tate, 1991). This interpreter is interested in the use of the texts as historical documents to reveal something of the past in order to understand the present and to evaluate the data of selected hypotheses and theories. Through interpretation, the nature of the relationship between leadership style and wisdom and common sense will be explored. A bridge of understanding will be constructed from the leadership style of first-century Palestine to twentieth-century leadership theory and from the difference between conventional and critical wisdom in first-century Palestine to twentieth-century wisdom and common sense theory.

Questions will be asked using Jesus' sayings in context in order to evaluate the relationship of wisdom and common sense to leadership.

This study is interested in how wisdom and leadership style might be functioning dynamically and cogently together in the historical Jesus. Therefore, the researcher believes that by understanding the full implications and dynamics of the sayings and parables attributed to the historical Jesus, the relationship of wisdom to leadership will rise naturally from the study. At this stage in historical research, "the data is used to think with" (Hammersley & Atkinson, 1983, p. 178). The presence of patterns, the relationship of different variables, and the consistencies or contradictions
with theories used are all elements of the process of historical interpretation. Interpretation is an art and involves the process of making sense out of the information gathered (Denzin & Lincoln, 1994).

Limitations of the Study
Every study involves limitations because the researcher is a finite being, the subjects studied are embedded in a strange and distant socio-cultural context, and insight is a complex phenomenon. In this study there are limitations created in the larger field of qualitative research and in its sub-field, historical research. Studying select sayings and parables from Synoptic Gospels provides its own unique problems and limitations.

Qualitative Research
Qualitative research by nature is individualistic and operates in a complex field. Denzin and Lincoln (1994) described the qualitative researcher as a bricoleuer, a do-it-yourself person who must piece together differing research methods in order to provide solutions or analyses in concrete situations. The limitation, then, is the very individualistic manner in which the qualitative researcher brings her skills and knowledge to bear on a problem. However, the strength of qualitative research is that it is "multimethod in focus, involving an interpretive, naturalistic approach to its subject matter" (Denzin & Lincoln, 1994, p. 2).

Because of the eclectic nature of methodologies, qualitative research has been criticized for its inability to assure the validity of the results (Maxwell, 1992).
Validity assures that the richness of meaning in the data is not compromised (Babbie, 1992). Quantitative researchers have criticized the absence of "standards" in qualitative research. However, Maxwell (1982) contends that "validity is relative to purposes and circumstances" (p. 282).

The purpose of this study is to interpret the nature of Jesus' leadership and wisdom, and then to correspond the interpretation to modern leadership and wisdom theory. Interpretation seeks to understand the phenomenon from the perspective of the participants. In order to assure validity in the interpretation, qualitative researchers use triangulation as an alternative to validation (Denzin & Lincoln, 1994). Triangulation is the use of a combination of methods and perspectives to add rigor and depth to a study. In this study, the use of Biblical historical criticism and Biblical social-scientific criticism methodologies and the commonly accepted interpretations of historical Jesus scholars would strengthen the validity of the results.

Another possible limitation of a qualitative study is the reliability of the results. Reliability is "the likelihood that a given measurement procedure will yield the same description of a given phenomenon if that measurement is repeated" (Babbie, 1992, p. 135). To protect against coming to conclusions which are unreliable, the study uses a reliable leadership theory and a widely accepted wisdom theory as part of the theory foundation.

**Historical Research**

Historical research involves the personality of the researcher to a much greater extent than other types of research (Cohen & Manion, 1994; Hill & Kerber, 1967).
The researcher's interest, motivation, education, gender, and socio-cultural background can greatly impact the interpretation of the data. It is possible, then, that historical research can reflect more the interests and character of the individual than the need to investigate a socially significant issue. In this study, the historical perspectives of several respected scholars, such as Borg, Crossan, Fiorenza, and Witherington, are used to assure a broad and accepted perspective concerning the issues of historical Jesus research.

Historical research also depends greatly on interpretation: "There is a great deal of room in history for interpretation, perhaps more than any other social science discipline, because historical investigation begins and ends with interpretation" (Lancy, 1992, p. 247). At the point of interpretation, the researcher uses her insights and judgments to determine the meanings of the data gathered. In order to avoid selective attention and agenda-based judgment, the researcher must take care to use methods honestly and to see interpretation as dynamic (Johnson, 1983; McKnight, 1988).

Biblical historical criticism has a longer and more respectable history than Biblical social-scientific criticism. Biblical social-scientific criticism with its use of sociological models is a more recent development. The chief objection to the use of sociological models is the objection of historical particularism. Critics of Biblical social-scientific methods believe that the use of sociological models is inappropriate to study the past. The fear is that the uniqueness and often inaccessibility of past cultures makes it unlikely that present models can be made to fit historical data. Also,
the fear is that data can be made to conform to the models. Oakman (1986) argued, however, that models are necessary for analogy. In order to evaluate data about the past, a framework is needed. In this study, the models selected have been tested and widely accepted among Biblical scholars.

Traditionally, Biblical scholars relied primarily on the emic approach, assuming the absolute uniqueness of the ancient Jewish people. Biblical historical criticism mirrors that approach through careful study of the language and written texts. The emic approach accepts the viewpoint and values of the social group. However, Biblical historical criticism has been criticized for assuming that pure objectivity is possible in research (Soulen, 1981). Therefore, the use of other methods is essential.

Biblical social-scientific scholars use the etic approach, the comparative method: "The etic approach requires the development of models and theories to elucidate one group or society on the basis of a comparative body of information on, or a comprehensive knowledge of, societies in general" (Oakman, 1986, p. 248). Using both the emic work of Biblical historical scholars and the etic work of Biblical social-science scholars enhances the validity and reliability of the research.

Most Biblical scholars use the historical critical methodology carefully. Differences of opinion result from different choices of data and from different interpretations of the data. Osborne (1991) believed that the difficulties of objective interpretation are great: "The simple fact is that all of us read a text on the basis of our
own background and proclivities" (p. 367). This is understood in research. Therefore, the research must be aware of how these biases impact interpretation.

Nevertheless, for many people, the New Testament is a sacred document not to be tampered with, and Jesus is a divine figure. Therefore, studying the historical Jesus and using only material confirmed by the Jesus Seminar can be a sensitive issue. For some, even the use of historical critical methods secularizes the intent of the Scriptures and serves no other purpose than to undermine faith. All of the previous formal studies on Jesus and leadership accepted the whole of the New Testament portrait of Jesus without critical inquiry. Therefore, the impact and power of Jesus' leadership was contexted in his being the very Son of God.

This author suggests that the foundational nature of Jesus' leadership and his wisdom framework was so much a part of his nature that it can still be observed in the stripped-down historical figure. If it can be observed in the historical figure, then Jesus becomes a model of leadership for anyone in any field, not just in ministry. By getting beneath the divine to see the power of leadership and wisdom in the remarkable character of an ordinary man, the conclusions of this study are generalizable for many.
CHAPTER 4
THE WISDOM OF JESUS IN THE JEWISH WISDOM TRADITION

Until recently, wisdom literature in Biblical studies was a neglected area of research. The dominant trend was illustrated by a comment made by Murphy (1981):

"To put it sharply, wisdom, with a few late exceptions, has nothing to do with the characteristic biblical beliefs about Exodus, Sinai, covenant, promises to the patriarchs, etc." (p. 27). Wisdom was suspect because of its similarity to foreign wisdom traditions, especially Egyptian, and because of its failure to refer to God's mighty acts in history or to God's covenant (Collins, 1980). Wisdom seemed far removed from the typical Jewish salvation history concerns (Murphy, 1990b).

However, in the last twenty-five years, a wealth of research has indicated wisdom's influence on other Biblical literature, wisdom's important theological contributions to Jewish faith, wisdom's mark on the historical Jesus, and wisdom's influence on shaping the emerging Christology of the early church (Dunn, 1980; Fiorenza, 1984; Scott, 1990; Witherington, 1994). This study is particularly interested in wisdom's mark on the historical Jesus.

Perdue (1994) mentioned three important characteristics of wisdom literature. First, wisdom literature is grounded in the creation of the cosmos and humanity. Sages used a theology of creation as an alternative to the neighboring pagan fertility cults. They de-divinized creation and inculcated reverence for Yahweh, who was redeemer and creator (Witherington, 1994). Wisdom "does not re-present the actions
of God in Israel's history; it deals with daily human experience in the good world created by God" (Murphy, 1990b, p. 1). Wisdom's use of creation theology also acted as a corrective to a "God of the gaps" approach to religion (Witherington, 1994). God is a part of everyday life, not just a God who shows up whenever a crisis occurs.

Second, wisdom literature is concerned with a universal orientation to faith and ethics. Perdue (1994) explained:

This means, then, that God is a universal deity who speaks to all people through the voice of creation and gives to everyone organs of perception and understanding that make wisdom accessible. Further, the wisdom tradition affirms the importance of the role of reason and human experience in the analysis and critique of faith. (p. 34)

Wisdom in itself is the experience of God and a belief of God prevalent in everyday experience (Konkel, 1992; Murphy, 1990b). Therefore, the fear of the Lord is "the instinctive and intuitive recognition of the total claim of God which was felt in religious and moral issues" (Konkel, 1992, p. 16).

A third lesser, but still important, characteristic is wisdom literature's use of female metaphors for God. Sophia, Woman Wisdom, is portrayed as creator, provider, and revealer involved in the creation and nurture of humankind. Proverbs 1-9 introduces Sophia, the personification of Wisdom, as the manifestation of God in creation (Witherington, 1994). Jesus and his followers drew on the wisdom tradition to support his strong sense of authority and personal identity as God's leader and
messenger (e.g., Williams, 1971). To understand Jesus' use of wisdom in his leadership, a brief overview of Jewish wisdom literature is necessary.

Development of the Jewish Wisdom Tradition: Order and Conflict

The history of Jewish wisdom development is closely connected to the social, political, economic, and theological transformations of the ancient Hebrew people. Bruggemann (1990) wrote, "Wisdom must be explored in terms of a broadly based social transformation, and not on narrow literary or historical-critical grounds" (p. 121). Jewish wisdom is not just a compilation of sayings, such as those found in Proverbs, or dramatic stories of judgment, such as those recorded about Solomon, but instead represents an attitude toward reality, a worldview (Crenshaw, 1981). In order to understand their worldview, Perdue (1990), in his study of Jewish wisdom, used two major paradigm models constructed by sociologists to describe the organization of a society. These were the model of order and the model of conflict. Perdue (1990) wrote, "Each represents significant assumptions about the cosmos, human nature, society, and knowledge" (p. 457). Sages used both models.

The Paradigm of Order

The sages concerned with social order (sedeq) focused on correctness, righteousness, and conformity. Murphy (1990b) wrote,

It is practically commonplace in wisdom research to maintain that the sages were bent on discovering order, or orders, in the realm of experience and nature. This means that the sages recognized a certain autonomy (granted that
nothing could escape the divine sovereignty) in the actions and experiences of
the world. (p. 115).

The cosmos, created by a just and beneficent God, had an operating moral
order which corresponded directly to human behavior. Therefore, "wise actions and
thoughts led to well-being, while foolish and subversive actions culminated in
destruction" (Perdue, 1990, p. 458). Since the cosmos operated with moral purpose,
the sages believed in a theory of retribution (Von Rad, 1972). Righteous people
experienced well-being. Wicked and foolish people experienced suffering and misery.

However, Von Rad (1972) cautioned against understanding retribution merely
as a mechanical theory, but instead suggested understanding it as a social
phenomenon of the "good." Murphy (1990b) further warned that Israel's reality was
not an order "out there," but an order of analogies, an order of regularities gleaned
from experience in nature and everyday life. In other words, order was the deduction,
observed from common sense experiences, that certain behaviors lead to good results
and others to bad.

This wisdom has been called judicial wisdom by Crenshaw (1976), traditional
wisdom by Perdue (1990), conventional wisdom by Borg (1987), common wisdom
by Scott (1990), and proverbial wisdom by Collins (1980). Borg's term, conventional
wisdom, is adopted for this study. For all these authors, conventional wisdom is
anonymous and is concerned with the inherent order and meaningfulness in
experience (Collins, 1980). Crenshaw (1976) confirmed conventional wisdom's focus
on relationships and on the order of a social system. Borg described its importance for establishing a group's social identity.

Scott (1990) noted the conservatism of conventional wisdom. Sages concerned with social order were the intellectuals who were wealthy or in places of political power (e.g., Blenkinsopp, 1983; Bruggemann, 1990; Gammie, 1990; Perdue, 1990; Witherington, 1994). Gordis (1944) wrote:

Wisdom literature . . . was fundamentally the product of the upper classes in society . . . As to be expected, the upper classes were conservative in their outlook, basically satisfied with the status quo and opposed to change. Their conservatism extended to every sphere of life, and permeated their religious ideas, as well as their social, economic, and political attitudes. (pp. 81-82)

Epistemologically, sages concerned with social order believed "The fear of the Lord is the beginning of knowledge, but fools despise wisdom and instruction" (Prov. 1:7). Wisdom originated from God and was evident in the world. The world had a just and orderly nature which the sage could observe and, with reason and reflection, could understand (Murphy, 1985). However, Murphy (1985) cautioned that wisdom was more than a set of rules; it was a dialogue with creation. Though conservative, conventional wisdom was also dynamic. The ancient sages were like modern-day scientists: "The sages searched for patterns and consistencies in reality. They sought to discover regularity in the variety of natural and social phenomena and to establish their relationships" (Perdue, 1990, p. 461).
Conventional wisdom believed in the inherent ability of human beings to make rational and moral choices and to discern the good (Perdue, 1990; Witherington, 1994). Knowledge was mediated through Sophia, Woman Wisdom, and through Torah, the Law; the two becoming synonymous through the writing of Ben Sira. All sages acknowledged the sovereignty of God and the limits of human knowledge (Von Rad, 1972). Collective and anonymous knowledge formed the authoritative tradition which then shaped the values and beliefs of the whole social system (McKenzie, 1967).

In a society of order, roles and behavior are clearly delineated in order to assure a stable social system (Borg, 1987; Perdue, 1990). Sages wrote admonitions about ordinary human experiences such as family relationships, human nature, use of money, government, character-building, and balance (Carlston, 1980). Witherington (1994) and Borg (1987) noted that the sages were primarily interested in shaping a group sense of identity. In Mediterranean society, collective identity was more important than individualism.

Conventional wisdom reflected the dyadic personality's concern for honor and shame. Since conventional wisdom assumed a certain mastery of life through wise behaviors and thoughts, conventional wisdom played an important role in describing those social behaviors which preserved honor. For instance, Proverbs 17: 2 states, "A servant who acts wisely will rule over a son who acts shamefully, and will share in the inheritance among the brothers." Sages used shame to protect the collective social
identity as illustrated by Proverbs 14: 34, "Righteousness exalts a nation, but sin is a
disgrace to any people." Perdue (1990) wrote:

Implicit to the social tradition of the sages is the view that institutions are the
reified structures of communal life that control the way human beings live.

They serve to meet basic human needs, preserve the total social system, and
control contingencies that threaten corporate life. (p. 473)

Perdue named six social institutions that are significant: the state and political
organizations, economic organizations, law, education, religion, and family. All these
social institutions preceded individual action and choice. Conventional sages
preserved their admonitions concerning these social institutions through wisdom
literature. A prime example is the book of Proverbs.

The trajectory of early wisdom thinking begins with the book of Proverbs, the
oldest of the canonical wisdom books. Witherington (1994) wrote, "Proverbs reflects
two fundamental assumptions -- that the universe is basically harmonious and that it
has a moral structure, in particular a structure of retribution" (p. 18). Proverbs comes
from the Hebrew word meshalim. The precise meaning is unclear and ranges between
"similitude" to "powerful word" (Crenshaw, 1974). The book is a source book of
didactic material spanning several centuries of Israelite wisdom (Blenkinsopp, 1983).

The primary literary form is the māshāl, or saying. The term is used broadly in
the Hebrew Bible with a multiplicity of forms, but in Proverbs it is primarily the two-
line artistic saying (Crenshaw, 1974). Crenshaw (1981) used the definition that "a
proverb is a short sentence founded upon long experience, containing a truth" (p. 67).
The saying is a result of collective experience, and thus it is anonymous: "The weight of tradition rests behind proverbs; they do not represent the isolated view of one person, however intelligent he or she may be" (Crenshaw, 1981, p. 68). Crenshaw (1981) believed that the primary function of the proverb was to transcend time and space by linking the natural realm and the social order. Therefore, the proverb is inherently transparent, ringing true across time and space. Proverbs play an important role in different cultures, representing "a kind of deposit of the accumulated wisdom of the past, a distillation of experience based on the observation of order, regularity, and causality" (Blenkinsopp, 1983, p. 17).

Fontaine (1993) divided Proverbs according to social movements with their accompanying worldviews. The earliest form of the wisdom tradition was probably oral and invested in the clan, the tribal beginnings of the Jewish people (Scott, 1971; Witherington, 1994). In Proverbs, the earliest material contains instructions that retain the flavor of the family and tribe. The father, as the head of the family, is the authority figure, and the material reflects a male point of view. The teaching subjects pertain to everyday life (Witherington, 1994). The teaching is about relationships with one's parents and with neighbors, finding a good wife, disciplining children and slaves, and caring for one's family and land. Blenkinsopp (1983) concluded that "the corpus of proverbs in so-called primitive society serves to transmit its collective values, thus forming the basis for an agreed pattern of behavior over against which the conduct of the individual can be judged" (p. 17).
The next worldview reflects the social movement from tribalism to the monarchy. With the development of the monarchy, Israel began producing written wisdom material. Israel moved from a tribal society, to a chiefdom in Saul and David, and finally to a state under Solomon. Though it is unlikely that Solomon is the author of Proverbs, he was a patron of conventional wisdom and the catalyst for the production of wisdom literature in Israel (Whybray, 1990; Witherington, 1994).

Bruggemann (1990) suggested that the introduction of a centralized power controlling economic surplus, and of a more complex bureaucratic organization with advanced technology, required a transformation of the Israeli social system. The new social system needed justification and legitimacy. The "wisdom of Solomon," then, became the vehicle to promote the strength and legitimacy of the new power arrangements through the courts. Scholars disagree about whether the courts actually had schools and a class of sages (Whybray, 1990). However, the proverb collections in this milieu discuss the roles and talents of kings, the dangers of character flaws, the demands of justice, and the perils of involvement with certain women.

After the fall of Judah in 587/86 BCE, the social system experienced profound changes. The elite class went into exile in Babylon. New social needs arose, and wisdom provided ties to the past and an opportunity to reinterpret traditions for the future (Fontaine, 1993). Scholars believe that Proverbs probably received its final editing at this time. Some contend that Proverbs 1-9 was added, though other scholars suggest that Proverbs 1-9 was part of the middle stage (Camp, 1985). Proverbs 1-9 is a "theological introduction" with a sophisticated personification of Woman Wisdom.
The goal of "theological" wisdom is the education of everyone, and the belief is that education can make a difference (Crenshaw, 1981; Fontaine, 1993; Scott, 1971).

Proverb's overall purpose is to train a person, to show what life is like and how to cope with it (Murphy, 1990b). Witherington (1994) called it "the art of steering, 'a proper and successful course through life that leads not to an early grave but to a long and satisfying existence with many accomplishments and perhaps even some prosperity" (p. 37). Wisdom is the key to a good life. However, Witherington (1994) noted that this wisdom is produced for and by the well-to-do. He called it the "wisdom from above," a wisdom for those who had time for education and reflection. Proverbs is representative of the conventional wisdom which supported two basic assumptions: (1) the universe is basically harmonious, and (2) the universe has a moral structure of retribution (Witherington, 1994).

Collins (1980) concluded that Proverb's wisdom is dedicated to the idea of order and meaningfulness in experience. He classified Proverbs as retrospective and positivistic. The purpose of Proverbs was not to establish laws, but rather to promote a workable paradigm of social order. In Proverbs, human knowledge is limited, relative, and historically bound in time.

**The Paradigm of Conflict**

Within the paradigm of conflict, social life was characterized by a struggle between the divine forces of creation and chaos (Perdue, 1990). Therefore, order was not static, but was a process forever under the threat of chaos. Gammie (1990) wrote, "The critical wisdom tradition of Israel speaks to recurring life crises" (p. 483).
Human nature, instead of being inherently bent toward righteousness, was instead bent toward selfish desire. Just behavior had to be learned. Social institutions were not part of the cosmic order, but were part of a social order needed to limit the destructive capacity of humans. Perdue (1990) wrote, "Wisdom was both the rational process and the moral tradition that limited the destructive capacity of human nature. Through instructions and just institutions, social order could be achieved" (p. 460).

Catastrophe, either personal or social, "led to a destabilization and ultimately fragmentation of the cultural and religious traditions that this paradigm had produced. To attack the old order and to forge new traditions of meaning required a major paradigm shift for the critical sage" (Perdue, 1990, p. 469). Perdue suggested that critical sages were ones who had lost status and political power.

Critical wisdom has been called reflective wisdom by Konkel (1992), radical wisdom by Scott (1961), theological wisdom by Crenshaw (1976), and aphoristic wisdom by Williams (1971). Perdue's and Gammie's term, critical wisdom, is used in this study. In this type of wisdom, wisdom moved beyond the quest for well-being and into the quest for self-understanding. Critical wisdom evaluated the deepest questions of the human experience. It concerned itself with theodicy, questions concerning suffering and evil, and it affirmed God as ultimate meaning (Crenshaw, 1976). Critical wisdom dealt with the contradictions that were a fundamental part of God's order. However, the concepts of chaos and creation cannot be divorced (Crenshaw, 1976). Critical wisdom did not define divine order, nor did it deny
conventional wisdom. Instead, critical wisdom named the paradoxes without attempting to provide answers (Konkel, 1992).

Scott (1961) noted that critical wisdom used conventional wisdom images to subvert the voice of commonality or to innovate a distinctive voice. Williams (1971) discussed its nature as a counter-order, questioning accepted opinions and traditional knowledge. It focused on individual experience. Critical wisdom did not advocate disorder, but attempted to disorient in order to seek a better identity.

The literary form most used by the critical sage was aphorism. Aphorisms are similar to proverbs in that they are concise statements, but differ in that they use paradoxical speech (Crossan, 1983). Aphorists react against conventional order and articulate a counter-order which questions accepted opinions and traditional knowledge. Aphorisms offer the unique insight of a single individual (Williams, 1971). As the personal insights of an individual, aphorisms are the formulation of wisdom of the future. An aphorism reflects "the conflicting relationship of reality and conception and challenges the reader continuously to this reflection" (Crossan, 1983, p. 12). While the proverb has popular appeal that expresses conventional wisdom, the aphorism expresses the individual voice in critical wisdom (Williams, 1971).

Farmer (1991) wrote: "Those who spoke to a stable, settled, and orderly society might make observations about reality that would not hold true for those who lived in troubled or chaotic times" (p. 5). The book of Ecclesiastes represents the critical wisdom tradition in early Judaism. Job is another possible example. However, Job deals with the extreme suffering of a single individual, while in Ecclesiastes "the
whole ocean has become so turbulent that no one's boat seems safe on the water" 
(Witherington, 1994, p. 52). The title "Ecclesiastes" is the Greek Septuagint's 
translation of Qoheleth, a Hebrew word that probably denotes an office or function 
and is best translated "assembler."

Qoheleth was written in the first person by a sage during the post-exilic 
period. The author was a Jewish sage living in Jerusalem during the late fourth or 
individual of aristocratic status, with wealth, position, and leisure to pursue religious 
and philosophical questions" (p. 157). Von Rad (1972) placed Qoheleth firmly in the 
wisdom tradition because Qoheleth investigates events and seeks to know what is 
beneficial for a person. Qoheleth has three main themes: (1) all of life is vanity; (2) 
God determines events, and; (3) humanity is unable to discern God's intent (Von Rad, 
1972). The opening lines of Qoheleth proclaim, "Vanity of vanities, says Qoheleth, 
vanity of vanities, all is vanity" (Ecc. 1:2, New American Standard Bible). The 
Hebrew word for vanity is habel, meaning also absurdity and ephemerality.

The first theme, all of life is vanity, is expressed as a pessimistic outlook on 
life. The pessimism is the result of the prevailing social crisis during Qoheleth's 
lifetime. Crüsemann (1984) noted that economic disparity existed between the 
aristocracy and the peasantry, heavy taxation from outside forces impoverished the 
country, and the social fabric of kinship groups began to break down because of 
economic inequalities.
Qoheleth wrote during an age of oppression and individualism when conventional wisdom no longer served as a guide for behavior. He experienced an ethical and theological crisis because the relationship between order and moral behavior had broken down (Perdue, 1994). Qoheleth, then, desired to find the good in human living. The central question of the book is found in Ecc.1: 3 (New American Standard Bible): "What remains to a person from all the labor at which he/she toils under the sun?"

The second two themes depict God as sovereign and unknowable. God is "otherness" and mystery, and thus unknowable to humans (Murphy, 1990a). The limits of human knowing are presented in a series of subversive aphorisms which overturn the conventional worldview of reason and moral causality (Perdue, 1994). Using the repetition of "do not know," Qoheleth emphasizes the mystery of God and the ignorance of humanity.

Throughout the book, Qoheleth used the persona of Solomon -- the patron of sages and renowned for his wisdom -- to render a new worldview. This new worldview is a transformation of the traditional view of order found in Proverbs. The author separates goodness and beauty from righteousness (Perdue, 1994). The world, while good and beautiful, is not a just order. The sun shines on the good and the bad. He also presents God as distant and capricious about issues of justice. Governments are corrupt and the oppressed have no advocates.

The three themes lead to Qoheleth's conclusion woven throughout the text, that the single most important human value in living is to experience joy and
celebrate life. Joy is a gift from God, but it does not come from currying God's favor. Perdue (1994) wrote, "Qoheleth associates well-being with the human capacity to experience 'joy' that comes from three sources: eating and drinking, the intimate associations of family and friends, and human labor" (p. 242).

The difference between the worldview of Proverbs and that of Qoheleth is great, and illustrates a long history in the Jewish wisdom literature between those sages who lived in a paradigm of order and those who lived in a paradigm of conflict. Either one is insufficient in itself to explain the nature of God, the cosmos, the nature of humankind's relationship to God, and the problem of evil. Generally, conventional sages see God as creator and present, the cosmos as orderly and just, humanity in a relationship of trust and obedience with a loving God, and evil as the retribution for disobedience and injustice on the part of humans. Early critical sages like Qoheleth, present God as mysterious and sovereign, the cosmos as amoral (detached from issues of justice), humanity as finite and separate from an unknowable God, and evil as part of the fabric of humankind.

Murphy (1990b) warned against a simplistic assessment of the wisdom of order and the wisdom of crisis as two extremes. The wisdom of crisis is an outgrowth of the wisdom of order and uses the same literary genre and themes (e.g., Murphy, 1990b; Perdue, 1994; Von Rad, 1972). Qoheleth clearly shook the foundations of the wisdom tradition, and represented the critical sage who challenged the shortcomings of conventional wisdom. Qoheleth also represented the phenomenon of an anonymous sage speaking as an individual voice rather than as a collective voice.
The Trajectory of Wisdom From 180 B.C.E. to Jesus

The trajectory of Hebrew wisdom thinking continued to develop, but it still represented two wisdom traditions: one teaching the art of steering through life's difficulties and living well, and the other critiquing or attempting to accommodate a wisdom view to deal with life's crises and irregularities. Jesus Ben Sira, a popular sage who lived in Jerusalem around 180 B.C.E., reacted against the growing influence of Hellenism, the influence of Greek philosophy and culture on the Jewish culture. Grabbe (1995) described him as an exponent of "proverbial wisdom." Ben Sira stressed the need for a Torah-centered and Temple-centered orientation among Jews in order to combat Hellenism's growing influence. He wedded the wisdom tradition and Torah tradition. Witherington (1994) noted that the wisdom themes of Torah and the fear of the Lord come together in 19:20: "The whole of Wisdom is fear of the Lord, and in all Wisdom there is the fulfillment of the Law" (p. 78).

Ben Sira is viewed as a conservative response to the threat of Hellenism (Di Lella, 1966). Di Lella noted that Ben Sira attempted to solve contemporary problems with past solutions and truths. Therefore, Ben Sira celebrated Israel's past by grounding it in Israel's history. Thus, he demonstrated the inferiority of Greek thinking. To establish strong boundaries between Jews and Hellenists, he used honor and shame language to promote an ethic which focused on preserving an honorable name (Crenshaw, 1976). Male-female stereotyping and stressing traditional values separated Jews from outsiders (Witherington, 1994).
Ben Sira also reasserted the theory of retribution: one's acts had direct consequences in this life. Righteousness led to blessings and wickedness to cursings. Most of the wisdom in Ben Sira is about traditional subjects, such as appropriate speech, silence, right behavior, relationships of family and friends, honesty, hospitality, and religious duties. Ben Sira is also noted for his misogynistic tendencies (Crenshaw, 1976). Ben Sira's most significant contribution to the wisdom tradition was the marrying of the wisdom tradition with the legal and priestly tradition. Witherington (1994) wrote, "Wisdom took root amongst God's chosen people, and in a chosen place, in Torah, and even more particularly in the priestly service" (p. 97). The sage Ben Sira claimed the same inspiration as the prophets and also used prophetic material.

A differing response to Hellenism is found in the book, the Wisdom of Solomon. In 30 B.C.E., a sage who wanted to forge a relationship between Jewish and Hellenistic ideas began speaking through the persona of Solomon (Di Lella, 1966; Witherington, 1994). Di Lella (1966) described the pseudo-Solomon as "a genuine progressive who felt the urgent need to restudy the inspired books and to present a new synthesis in a language that the new age would understand" (p. 147). Pseudo-Solomon did not accept the theory of retribution in this life. He believed that rewards and punishments come in the afterlife. He also developed the personification of Wisdom, Sophia, as both the creator and the savior. Sophia is an emanation from God whose nature is similar to the goddess Isis of the Egyptian faith system. Wisdom through Sophia is identified as light and spirit penetrating all things (Murphy, 1990b).
In conclusion, wisdom in the Jewish tradition had a profoundly religious character. The sages were concerned with infusing a religious orientation into everyday life (Witherington, 1994). Within the Jewish tradition, one cannot look at either wisdom or leadership apart from the fundamentally religious worldview of the Hebrew people. Wisdom was a gift of God and was worthy of the disciplined effort needed to obtain it. Murphy (1990b) related the wisdom experience to a faith experience. The wisdom experience was the on-going dynamic dialogue with the present created order (Murphy, 1985; Von Rad, 1972). Therefore, the wisdom experience was characterized by trust and dependence on God.

Murphy (1990b) wrote that the wisdom tradition reflected a view of reality grounded in two principal truths. First, sages "draw upon daily experience as this was framed in the traditions handed down in the family and by teachers" (Murphy, 1990b, p. 113). Second, "wisdom recognizes a dynamic relationship between humans and their environment" (Murphy, 1990b, p. 113). Individuals could draw analogies from living experience and thus make conclusions about appropriate behaviors and decision-making skills.

However, at the heart of the wisdom tradition is also a fundamental comfort with ambiguity as highlighted by the critical sages. The problems of paradox and ambiguity are wisdom concerns. The wisdom tradition was to stay open and fluid in order to evaluate disconfirming experiences (Perdue, 1990). This comfort with the limitation of knowledge produced sages comfortable with openness to the world as a diverse system. Reality was also a thing of beauty; thus artistry in language was
important to the sage in emulating the goodness and delight of creation. Whenever mystery and ambiguity were negated, the subsequent dogmatism led to a crisis of wisdom.

At this point, an important question is this: Can the ancient wisdom tradition of the Jewish people have anything to say about the today's present problems and complex social systems? Scott (1971) suggested that knowledge from the past protects us from repeating mistakes in the present. He also suggested that problems faced today are, at their core, human problems involving moral issues: "Therefore, it is not irrelevant to ask how men ought to think and behave to one another, and what is the ground of this 'oughtness'" (Scott, 1971, p. 225).

Jesus and the Wisdom tradition

Bultmann (1958), and then Robinson (1971), traced the development of the wisdom sayings of Jesus back to the oral period between 30-50 C.E. The oral period goes from the death of Jesus to the writing of the first Gospels. Material written after the oral period presented Jesus as the resurrected Lord, the Christ of faith. Mark (the earliest written Gospel), Matthew, Luke, and John (the latest Gospel) presented Jesus as the early Christian community understood him. The sayings from the oral period were circulated by word of mouth and then written down into sayings documents. The first edition of the Gospel of Thomas and the Q Gospel are the earliest written Gospels to emerge from the oral tradition. These earliest and most reliable sayings of
the historical Jesus take the form of aphoristic sayings and parables (e.g., Crossan, 1973, 1983; Robinson, 1983).

In the Q Gospel, the sayings are examples of aphoristic discourse. They disorient the hearer and undermine the conventional worldview. Robinson (1971) developed the thesis that the sayings in Q were primarily *logoi sophon*, "sayings of the sages." In Q, the sages were the children of Sophia, who were identified as Jesus and John the Baptist (Robinson, 1983). In Q, Jesus did not violate the Torah but rather radicalized or idealized it (Robinson, 1983). The primary theme of Q is a call to action: "Q cannot be understood correctly at all as a teaching, but only as a guide for action and an appeal for a stance corresponding to action" (Robinson, 1983).

Kloppenborg (1987) traced the trajectory of Q's development in three layers: an early sapiential layer, a later apocalyptic layer, and finally an introductory narrative layer.

However, Crossan (1991), Piper (1989), Witherington (1994), and others disagree with Kloppenberg's distinction of layers. They concluded that Q presented Jesus as both a prophet and a wisdom teacher. Though Q had a sapiential agenda, Jesus was portrayed as a prophetic sage and sometimes as Wisdom herself.

Witherington (1994) wrote that Q was "*basically* a sayings collection, and the majority of the sayings are Wisdom sayings but it draws on diverse genres, including sapiential, prophetic, and also other kinds of material" (p. 213).

Both the Gospel of Thomas and Q interpret Jesus as a teacher of wisdom. The Gospel of Thomas presents Jesus in three steps (Crossan, 1986). First, Jesus is divine Wisdom. Second, as divine Wisdom, Jesus turns the believer back to creation. Third,
Jesus, as divine Wisdom, is anti-apocalyptic. The Gospel of Thomas was considered heretical enough to be banned and systematically destroyed during the fourth-century battles against the Gnostic heresy. However, Scott (1989) challenged the assumption that the Gospel was Gnostic because it lacks typical Gnostic vocabulary and speculations about typical Gnostic myths.

The Gospel of Thomas is important for confirming the clear presence of a wisdom tradition in the historical Jesus (Witherington, 1994). Also, both Q and the Gospel of Thomas attest to the unusual nature of Jesus' wisdom. Patterson (1993) wrote that the content of both Gospels is "socially radical and confrontative, critical of the conventions that made ancient Jewish and Hellenistic social life possible" (p. 205). The Gospel of Thomas and Q were composed for particular communities and thus have their own interpretation of Jesus. However, the unique literary forms preserve the voice of the historical Jesus.

The historical Jesus is known by his sayings and the interpretation of those sayings in the context of first-century Palestine. In order to understand these sayings, it is necessary to examine those forms which correspond to the wisdom tradition. Based on the historical critical analysis, historical Jesus scholars agree that Jesus' voice was distinctive. In order to evaluate specifically the words of Jesus selected for this study, the difference between the literary forms of the proverb and the aphorism need to be clarified.
The Literary Form of Historical Jesus Sayings

Overall, wisdom sayings have distinctive literary forms referred to as *mâshâl*, meaning similitude or rule. *Mâshâl* refers specifically to proverbs, but the genre has grown to include a multiplicity of forms. Perdue (1986) defined "similitude" (likeness) as a "reflection on the relationality of the components of a reality best expressed by the term, 'aesthesis' (a harmonious order that is wondrously beautiful, engagingly mysterious, yet coherent in its perceived rationality)" (p. 5). Perdue (1986) defined the "rule" (mastery) as:

Not so much the effort 'to master life,' though this may be a considered goal of wisdom's practitioners, but more the expressed intentionality to discover, sustain, and even create dimensions of aesthesis through language which takes up residence in the heart and forms and shapes both human character and the structure and norms of society. (p. 5)

The most common forms of the wisdom tradition are proverbs and aphorisms. Crossan (1983), Perdue (1986), Scott (1990), Williams (1981), and Witherington (1994) recognized a distinctive use of wisdom sayings used by Jesus as aphoristic.

Aphoristic wisdom sayings differ from the proverbial sayings in that the proverb is the collective voice and the aphorism is the individual voice (Williams, 1981). The proverb emphasizes tradition and order, while the aphorism emphasizes individual expression during disorder. Witherington (1994) explained, "An aphorism, by contrast with a proverb, involves a personal and individual insight though like a proverb it is formulated in a non-narrative manner as an assertion" (p. 162). Piper
(1989) defined aphoristic sayings as "short, pithy sayings, arresting in their succinctness of expression" (p. 4). Crossan (1986) described aphorisms as having three aspects: (1) they stand alone; (2) they lack discursive and narrative dimensions, and (3) they challenge creative development.

Perdue (1986) demonstrated that the aphorism can take any of the traditional wisdom forms, including proverbs, riddles, beatitudes, instructions, and questions. However, the intent of the aphorism is distinct from that of the proverb:

[The aphorism's] intent is not to reflect on, sustain, or shape the aesthetic which structures and enhances creation and social life, but rather it seeks to shock, disorient, and throw into disarray its hearers. It attempts to challenge and perhaps even undermine the hearers' worldview in which they find meaning and continuity for living. (Perdue, 1986, p. 28)

Aphoristic sages want to disconfirm the naivete and optimism of conventional wisdom. Perdue (1986) noted that aphoristic sages were the most potent when the contemporary conventional wisdom "forges a dogmatic theory of retribution which eliminates divine initiative and rids the world of its mystery" (p. 29).

All of the red sayings, the most authentic sayings attributable to the historical Jesus, are aphoristic. Turning the other cheek to one who is evil, giving someone your coat who sues you for your shirt, congratulating the poor, going a second mile for someone who conscripts you for one mile, loving your enemies, giving to beggars, and congratulating the hungry and the sad are shocking and disorienting statements.
Congratulating the poor, hungry and sad, turning the other cheek to one who is evil, and loving one's enemies were challenges to the first-century Jew's worldview.

All of these sayings stand alone. These aphorisms are the raw experience, "the confused and disordered data which is congealed in an ordered sentence" (Crossan, 1986, p. 108). They lack discursive and narrative dimensions. There is no argument or story to supplement or expand the intent of the saying. However, they challenge development. In other words, though the aphorisms of Jesus are short, stand alone, and lack discourse or story, they do compel dialogue. An aphorism is distinct from a proverb in that a proverb registers a nod of assent from the audience, while the aphorism registers questions and furthers discussion. How is it possible to turn your cheek to a wicked person? Or, how is it possible for persons to inherit the kingdom of God because of their poverty? The very nature of the aphorisms, and of Jesus' in particular, is the compulsion the listener has to react, to want to know more about what is meant. Crossan (1983) called it the dance of art and thought. The aphorism by nature upsets one's inner balance. Jesus used aphorisms to present a bold and original worldview.

Perdue (1986) concluded that Jesus questioned the validity of the cause-effect worldview of conventional wisdom. Conventional wisdom is based on a theory of retribution in which a righteous individual is materially rewarded and a wicked individual is punished. Jesus' aphorisms about congratulating the poor, hungry, and sad challenges the theory that poverty and hunger are punishments for wickedness. Jesus wanted to prepare hearers for a new reality, the kingdom of God.
Several of the red sayings of Jesus speak of the kingdom of God in parables. These include the parables called Leaven, Mustard Seed, and Vineyard Laborers. Other red parables are the Shrewd Manager and the Samaritan. All are aphoristic in nature, but not in form. The parables shock and disorient, but they are not short sayings. According to Crossan (1973) and most other Biblical scholars, Jesus' use of aphoristic parables was even more distinctive of his voice. Scott (1989) recognized two defining elements concerning the parables of Jesus. First, parables belong to the Jewish literary genre māshāl. The māshāl use connotative language. Connotative language puts a premium on interpretation and on the symbolic. Second, Jesus and rabbis developed the parable. The parable form is not found in the Old Testament. Rabbinic parables developed between 200 and 500 C.E. There is no evidence that the Pharisees, contemporary rabbis of Jesus, used parables.

Scott (1989) defined the parable as "a mashal that employs a short narrative fiction to reference a transcendent symbol" (p. 8). The term "parable" is a Greek word, parabole, which means "to set aside." The basic intent of the parable is comparison. Jesus' parables are characterized as narrative meshalim (the plural form of māshāl) and are not characteristic of the sages. Witherington (1994) suggested that the narrative meshalim, the parable genre used by Jesus, reflected a prophetic adaptation and expansion of wisdom forms. Ben Sira introduced this new development by claiming to be inspired like the prophets, by drawing on prophetic material, and by offering new revelations from God in sapiential forms. Therefore,
Jesus' teaching represented a cross-fertilization of the sapiential and prophetic traditions (Vorster, 1991).

Jesus' parables were first heard orally, then later written into sayings documents, and then Gospels. Scott (1989) noted that oral stories are not developed as causative, but rather as additive. In other words, events are layered on without concern for specificity or relationality. Parables are short and clean with explanatory details left out. For instance, in the story of the Vineyard Laborers, the hearers are not told what time of year it was, what was being harvested, or why the later laborers were not seen on earlier visits by the vineyard owner. How the revealed elements of the story do relate is dependent on the interpretation of the parable.

Parables are generally hard to understand. Scott (1989) suggested that the reason is that parables are based on concrete thought, not abstract thought. First-century Palestinians were members of a concrete culture. Stories were their vehicles for thinking, not symbolic representations of abstract thoughts. For instance, the story of the Vineyard Laborers might be perceived in our abstract culture as a story about the nature of grace. However, in a concrete culture, Jesus used the story to have his audience think about the way God's kingdom disrupts the usual patron-client relationships.

Scott (1989) further clarified that a concrete culture would organize itself through myths. Myths represent the need for order: "In a myth a thing is sacred because it is in its proper place" (Scott, 1989, p. 37). If something is out of order, then cultural chaos ensues. A myth takes opposites and provides a resolution. Scott (1989)
used the example of the Horatio Alger stories which resolved the problem that everyone is created equal but, in reality, not all persons are equal. However, hard work on the part of Horatio Alger bridged the gap between the two realities. He moved from poverty to wealth. Therefore, a myth provides a logical explanation for contradictions.

- Myths provide order and identity for a social group. Therefore, myths are anonymous. Jesus' parables are anti-myths, not myths (Scott, 1989). His stories created a disorder. He took cultural myth themes and aphoristically disoriented the expected outcomes or relationships. For instance, Jesus used the parable of the Mustard Seed to illustrate the kingdom of God, and yet the mustard plant was considered a weed and a nuisance. The audience would have expected that Jesus would have used the mighty cedar, the usual symbol of Israel's greatness, as an illustration of the kingdom of God.

- Jesus was a teacher, but his teaching was radical and was intended to disorient the hearers so that they would consider an alternative worldview. The parables of the Samaritan, the Vineyard Laborers, and the Shrewd Manager are examples of narrative *meshalim*. All three of the parables would disorient the hearers. Even today, the Shrewd Manager is a parable which confuses its hearers. No one expects that an embezzler who tries to save himself by further deceitfulness would be praised by his employer for acting shrewdly.

- Other Jewish parables of the same period usually dealt with the figure of a king and his concerns. Jesus' parables, on the other hand, dealt with ordinary
occurrences with a paradoxical twist. Vineyard laborers should get paid an honest
day's wage, but no one would have expected the vineyard owner to pay those who
worked only an hour the same as the ones who worked all day long. Jesus presented a
counter-order that caused persons to entertain a new perspective on reality. Blomberg
(1990) concluded that Jewish parables supported conventional wisdom and gave
added interpretation. Jesus' parables had an eschatological element and were usually
not explained.

Rabbinic parables were used to illustrate and explain the Torah, but Jesus'
parables rarely referred to Scripture. Most of Jesus' parables referred to the kingdom
of God. Much of the debate about the historical Jesus has centered around his use and
understanding of this term, "kingdom of God." Scholars generally do agree that the
term "kingdom of God" refers to the sovereignty and rule of God (Vorster, 1991).
Though a full discussion is outside the realm of this study, one important point should
be clarified.

Scott (1989) believed that Jesus used the term in his parables as a symbol
rather than as a metaphorical concept. An abstract social group would use the term as
a concept, but a concrete social group would use it as a symbol. A metaphor suggests
that one thing is like another (A is B). A symbol suggests that "the forms do not
signify themselves; rather they 'allude to,' hint at a wider meaning" (Scott, 1989, p.
58). A symbol is an enigma, representing something which is perceptive and
experiential. Therefore, an element of mystery and paradox remain. With a metaphor,
the mystery and the paradox can be explained. Most scholars agree that Jesus used the
term as a symbol, but they vary in their understanding of its interpretation (e.g., Crossan, 1973; Perrin, 1967; Fiorenza, 1984).

The important observation is that Jesus used parables to challenge the traditional structural notions of God's kingdom without implying a structural solution. For instance, the parable of Leaven compares the kingdom of God to a woman hiding leaven in flour. The primary associations of God's kingdom are located in male power and in holiness. Therefore, to associate the kingdom of God with a woman hiding a corrupt substance, leaven, would be very disorienting to the listeners. However, it would also be erroneous to conclude that God was female and corrupt, a metaphorical and structural interpretation. As symbol, the parable surprises and pushes the listener to think about the diverse nature of God's kingdom. Jesus used parables to enfold and encompass the symbol of the kingdom of God. Jesus' parables and his sayings are examples of aphoristic discourse heard from an individual voice.

**An Analysis of Jesus' Sayings and Parables**

Members of the Jesus Seminar isolated Jesus words' from the editorializing and explaining of others on the basis of four assumptions. These assumptions emerged from the careful scholarship of Biblical historical critical scholars. First, Jesus' sayings and parables "cut against" social and religious norms. For instance, Jesus said "When someone sues you for your shirt, let that person have your coat along with it" (Mt. 5:40).

Second, Jesus' sayings "surprise and shock; they characteristically call for a reversal of roles or frustrate ordinary, everyday expectations" (Funk, et al., 1993, p.
The parables of the Samaritan and the Vineyard Laborers are examples of stories that go counter to traditional roles and expectations. The injured man did not expect a Samaritan to assist him. The laborers who came at the end of the day did not expect a full day's wage, and those who labored throughout the workday expected more.

Third, Jesus' sayings are also characterized by humor, exaggeration, and paradox. The beatitudes are full of paradoxes. No one expects the poor to inherit the kingdom of God or the hungry to be satisfied. Though Jesus used ordinary speech and images from the everyday world, such as leaven and the mustard seed, he would add a strange twist. For example, Funk and others (1993) noted that "the leaven is surprisingly employed as a figure for the holy, whereas leaven was customarily regarded as a symbol for corruption and evil . . . The mustard weed pokes fun at the mighty cedar of Lebanon, the symbol of Israel's greatness and power" (p. 32).

Fourth, Jesus' sayings are usually concrete and vivid, without explanation. Jesus would not give explicit instructions. If people pressed for more information, Jesus would ask them more questions shifting the decision back to them. Jesus challenged the conventional thinking of first-century Palestinians, but he did not propose a structural solution. He trusted the outcome to those who would "hear" and understand.

Jesus' manner of leadership was typical of the sages. Funk and others (1993) noted that he did not initiate debate, speak of himself in the first person, or make claims about his divinity. Scholars see this as evidence of his role as a sage. In the ancient Near East, the holy person did not seek recognition or status. Funk and others
(1993) wrote, "As a rule, the sage is self-effacing, modest, unostentatious" (p. 32). Jesus, following in the traditions of the sages, did not promote himself as a hero, but rather urged humility and servanthood.

Jesus' main mode of communication was the art of persuasion used by the sage rather than the proclamation used by the prophet (Witherington, 1994). The earliest material collected in the Synoptics represented the teaching material commensurate with the wisdom tradition. Witherington (1994) conservatively estimated that 70% of the Jesus' tradition is found in the form of an aphorism, riddle, or parable. Carlston (1980) noted that Jesus used a considerable number of wisdom sayings. He counted 102 in the Synoptics. He, along with many others scholars, concluded that Jesus was primarily a wisdom teacher.

Studies of sapiential material point to distinctives between traditional sayings and counter-order sayings. Fontaine (1982), studying traditional sayings in non-wisdom material, concluded that traditional sayings upheld the norms, institutions, and beliefs of the social order. Carlston (1980) pointed out that proverbs, or traditional sayings, are widely accepted as being true, and their challenge lies in action and not thought. Using the criterion of dissimilarity negatively, evaluating not what was distinctive to Jesus but what was not said by Jesus, Carlston drew conclusions about Jesus' mission and early identity. The traditional proverbial themes of first-century Palestine were not observable in the earliest materials written about Jesus. Several traditional wisdom themes are missing from Jesus' teaching:

In other words, our historical judgments about how Jesus might be related
to the wisdom-tradition must take cognizance of the fact that education, personal character and habits, friendship, women and family relationships, ethnic matters, politics, and prudence are all missing from the proverbial material in the surviving Jesus-tradition. (Carlston, 1980, pp. 98-99)

Williams (1971) reiterated that Jesus said little or nothing about the virtue of silence and the need for moderation and balance.

The Wisdom of Jesus: Conclusion

The development of the wisdom tradition and its manifestation in the historical Jesus are seen most clearly in the genre used by the sages: the aphoristic sayings. The conventional sages used proverbial sayings and the critical sages used aphoristic sayings. Though defining the difference between aphorisms and proverbs has been a problem historically (Crossan, 1983), Williams (1971) believed that the difference was not in form but in purpose and function. Proverbial or traditional sayings had four important motifs: (1) retribution and divine justice, (2) wise utterance, (3) tradition and the fathers, and (4) individual self-discipline and moderation. The language reveals order as a central concept.

The counter-order found in aphoristic wisdom is usually individualistic and used paradoxical speech. The collective voice expressed ancient communal wisdom, and the aphoristic voice expressed individual critical wisdom. The point was to disorient the hearer in order to consider another view. Williams (1971) warned that the disorientation was not to create disorder, but to seek a better order. Aphorisms
focused on those elements of a social system which are in conflict with tradition.

Williams noted that Jesus grounded his authority in ancient collective wisdom: "He [Jesus] stood at least as much within his tradition as outside of it" (Williams, 1971, p. 57). Crossan (1983) distinguished the interrelatedness of aphorisms and proverbs by defining proverbs as "a summation of the wisdom of the past" and aphorism as "the formulation of the wisdom of the future" (P. 25).

The presence of aphorisms in all the early material demonstrates that Jesus questioned the worldview of conventional wisdom (Perdue, 1986). He challenged conventional wisdom and traditional values. Jesus was a sage of the paradigm of conflict and is identified as a critical wisdom teacher: "His teaching was a radical criticism of the conventional wisdom that lay at the core of the first-century Jewish social world" (Borg, 1987, p. 97).

An analysis of the studies done by historical Jesus scholars indicates that the features of Jesus' critical wisdom are:

• *Guidance for contradictions*: Jesus dealt with the contradictions that were a fundamental part of God's order (Konkel, 1992; Von Rad, 1972). He sought a better order (e.g., Borg, 1987; Scott, 1989; Trainor, 1991; Williams, 1971).

• *Paradigm of conflict*: The destabilization of the Jewish social world required a paradigm shift (Perdue, 1990). He was concerned with theodicy crisis, which "occurs when the dominant social values, presuppositions, and policies no longer function meaningfully and claim assent" (Bruggemann, 1990, p. 130).
• **Individual voice**: Jesus' voice was distinctive and individual. He used aphorisms and parables to jolt his hearers by subverting the popular wisdom of the day (Crossan, 1983; Perdue, 1986; Piper, 1989; Scott, 1990; Segerberger, 1987). Jesus' authority was grounded in collective wisdom, but he emphasized the authority of individual experience in relationship to traditional concepts of order.

• **Paradoxical view of reality**: He sought to transform his social world by drawing attention to the paradoxes and ambiguities of life (Carlston, 1980; Crossan, 1983; Fiorenza, 1984). Jesus demanded a bold reconstruction of the hearers' view of reality, criticizing conventional wisdom (Carlston, 1980).

On the other hand, the conventional wisdom in Jewish wisdom literature had these features:

• **Practical guidance**: It gives practical guidance for everyday life; admonitions pertain to family relationships, government, balance, honor and virtue, and wealth (Borg, 1987; Carlston, 1980).

• **Paradigm of order**: Reality is organized on the basis of rewards and punishments suitable to a defined order (Borg, 1987). Traditional sages work within a paradigm of order (Perdue, 1990). Order protects from chaos and ensures survival (Konkel, 1992). The goal is theodic settlement, "a long-standing consensus about how life works, how society functions, how a system of benefits is allocated, what suffering must be tolerably and inescapably borne, and by whom it must be borne" (Bruggemann, 1990, p. 130).
• *Communal view of reality:* There is no moral insight for paradox and ambiguity (Konkel, 1992; Perdue, 1994; et. al.). The central concern is for comfort and security.

• *Collective voice:* Represents the collective voice; conventional wisdom is the summation of the wisdom of the past, gleaned from collective experience (Crossan, 1983).

**Jesus' Wisdom and Wisdom/Common Sense Theory**

At this point in the study, a little can be said about the relationship of the historical Jesus to common sense and modern wisdom theory. The features of common sense are good sense and common opinion. Jesus obviously was aware of the values and behaviors that represented good sense and common opinion to the first-century Jew; otherwise, he would not have been able to disorient his audience. His words and stories would have had little impact.

Common sense and conventional wisdom have very similar features. Common sense gives practical guidance and common opinion represents the collective identity of a social group. Conventional wisdom also gives practical guidance and represents the collective views of the social group. Jesus' use of aphorisms indicates that he understood the conventional wisdom, but he also understood its limitations.

Conventional wisdom clarifies the paradigm of common sense. Common sense functions in a paradigm of order. Conventional wisdom or common sense protects from chaos and ensures survival. The strength of common sense is its ability to establish boundaries and order in a social group. However, when there is disorder,
chaos, or extreme change, conventional wisdom or common sense often is an insufficient source for solutions.

Conventional wisdom clarifies the fact that common sense, a communal view of reality, is defined by persons in position of power and authority. Usually, such persons are those with wealth and education. Therefore, the weakness of common sense is its tendency to ignore, to misunderstand, or to be unaware of the conditions and needs of the powerless. Evaluating the common sense proverbs of a culture would help identify the collective values and behaviors of that culture group, and thus allow for an understanding of its blind spots.

In modern wisdom theory, wisdom is "the integration of the affective, conative, and cognitive aspects of human abilities in response to life's tasks and problems" (Birren & Fisher, 1990, p. 326). Wise persons, using personal experience and cognitive processes, make choices for a certain course of action (Kramer, 1990). The features of wisdom are: (1) recognition of and response to human limitation; (2) judgment and communication skills; (3) exceptional understanding of ordinary experience; and (4) personal, interpersonal, and transpersonal skills.

The critical wisdom of Jesus and modern wisdom theory have several similarities. Both deal with contradictions. Jesus was willing to deflate conventional ideas and deal with change. He was comfortable with ambiguity. Also, Jesus' insights were not just cognitively based, but were expressed in outward behaviors. He responded to the limitations that he saw. He spoke out and gathered a group of disciples for instruction.
Jesus apparently communicated well, as his words are remembered to this day. His aphorisms and parables, though drawing attention to limitations in his social world, continue to shock and impact people today. Jesus was willing to deal with life's paradoxes. His exceptional understanding of ordinary experience and his interpersonal skills are not readily apparent without a more thorough understanding of the content of his messages. The next chapter, Chapter Five, discusses the content of his sayings in the social world of his time.

The study of the Jewish wisdom tradition suggests that critical wisdom is similar to modern wisdom theory. Jesus, the sage, and modern wisdom theory have much in common. However, the critical wisdom of Jesus clarifies that the voice of the wise person is usually an individual voice. The individual voice of the wise person compels a social group to consider its boundaries and its power systems, to guard against complacency and exclusion.

Critical wisdom also confirms the importance of wisdom's ability to function best during chaos and change. Wisdom is not merely sagacious advice for managing well in a social system, but rather wisdom offers unique and often surprising solutions to problems when conflicting interests are at stake. Wisdom functions most creatively in a paradigm of conflict. When disorder or extreme social change prevails, the value of wisdom is considerable. Wisdom suggests a different way of seeing, enabling wise persons to steer through contradictions to a new reality. The following chapter, Chapter Five, will continue to confirm the continuities and discontinuities between
Jesus as a sage and modern wisdom theory, plus explore the relationship between wisdom and leadership.
CHAPTER 5

THE LEADERSHIP OF JESUS IN FIRST-CENTURY PALESTINE

Today, scholars believe that Jesus lived and was influenced by the events and social environment of first-century Palestine (Charlesworth, 1994b). During the first century, the Mediterranean was under Roman control. Pompey annexed Palestine to Rome in 63 B.C.E. The period from 6 to 40 C.E., the period during which Jesus lived, was relatively quiet, with Rome establishing roads and communication systems and securing trade routes throughout the Mediterranean world. However, despite the outward calm, an inward discontent brewed. Mack (1995) eloquently wrote, "Cultures clashed in Greco-Roman times, and the Eastern Mediterranean filled to bursting with a heady and volatile mix of peoples, powers, and ideas" (p. 19).

By the time Jesus was born, the social worlds of Judaism, Hellenistic culture, and Roman power were in serious conflict. In that social system and during that time period, conflict was rampant despite the pax romana which kept violent outbreaks in check. Borg (1984) wrote, "Palestine was a society under pressure, characterized by conflict: vertically between the Jewish people and the Roman occupiers, horizontally between the Jews and Gentiles sharing the same land, and internally among the Jewish people themselves" (p. 28).

To understand the leadership of Jesus in the midst of these conflicts and the intent and impact of Jesus' sayings and parables, three sociological models are used: (1) the purity system model, (2) the conflict model, and (3) the pre-industrial agrarian
model. These models allow for an etic interpretation of the sayings of Jesus. Then the leadership of Jesus and its relationship to wisdom will be clearer. The translation (Funk, et. al., 1993) of all the sayings and parables used in this chapter is located in Appendix B.

The Purity Model: Political and Religious Consciousness

Douglas (1966) researched the phenomena of purity and impurity rituals in social systems and found that they were positive and symbolic, as well as practical, ways to establish order and public unity. Borg (1994) explained, "In such societies, purity is the core value or paradigm structuring the social world" (p. 108). Such societies are organized around gradations and polarities of pure and impure things, behaviors, individuals and groups, places, and times. Elliott (1993) defined it as "A system of order based on the social construct that categorizes phenomena and behavior into the binary opposites of clean/unclean, whole/fragmented, sacred/secular, valuated positively and negatively, respectively" (p. 132).

First-century Jewish society was a purity society. The Jewish people lived by a holiness code: a system for delineating the sacred and the secular, the clean and the unclean. The holiness code demanded *imitateo dei*, the imitation of God. Their God was a holy God: "Speak to all the congregations of the sons of Israel and say to them, You shall be holy, for I the Lord your God am holy" (Lev. 19: 2, New American Standard Bible).
As a purity society, the Jewish social world was intrinsically religious. Therefore, politics was embedded in the holiness life of the community. Borg (1987) called it the politics of holiness: "The politics of holiness was a continuation in intensified form of a cultural dynamic that had emerged in Judaism after the exile" (p. 86). Holiness was the paradigm of conformity to the Jewish social and religious system.

The foundational institutions which represented the politics of holiness were the Temple and the Torah. The Temple was the foremost testimony of Israel's covenant with God. The Temple was where primary religious duties and events were observed and practiced. The Torah was the law given by God to guide Jewish social and religious behaviors. God promised to protect and prosper the Jewish nation if the people remained a kingdom of priests, a holy nation. The security of the Jewish people depended on the quest for holiness. Therefore, the politics of holiness was concerned with both faithfulness and social survival.

The primary ingredient of holiness was separation from anything that defiles. Jews separated themselves from other nations and put great emphasis on internal reform with such things as Sabbath observance and proper tithing. Borg (1984) emphasized that the intent of holiness was thoroughly noble: to save the nation from disappearing as a separate, chosen and holy nation of God.

The Jewish purity system established social identity and boundaries: "This system established the structure and social stratification of the Jewish community, the norms of public and private behavior, and the lines of demarcation between holy
Israelites and those at or beyond the margins of God's holy people (i.e., physical or social deviants, Samaritans, and Gentiles)" (p. 221). Sharing the land with Gentiles, who brought in outside philosophies and religions, and being dominated by the Romans created great social tensions for first-century Jews.

These tensions were aggravated by the incompetent governors and the tax burdens imposed by Rome. Borg (1987) described the governors sent out from Rome to rule Judea as "second-rank and often second-rate Roman colonial administrators, sometimes simply incompetent, sometimes corrupt, sometimes deliberately provocative of Jewish loyalties" (p. 84). Pilate in particular, who ruled during the life of Jesus, was arrogant and insensitive, and often embroiled in controversy (Cassidy, 1979).

The Roman taxation system was burdensome. It included a crop tax (12.5% of produce), a land tax (1% of its value), and other customs and tribute taxes (Borg, 1987). The Jewish people already had a tax system required by the Torah which amounted to about twenty percent each year. This tax was required by divine revelation and provided for the care of the priests, Temple, and the poor. The combined Jewish and Roman taxes came to around thirty-five percent.

Romans enforced collection of their taxes, but the Jewish taxes had no legal element to enforce their collection. Therefore, often the rural Jew was faced with a serious dilemma. Many could not afford to pay both systems of taxes without losing their land. The heavy double taxation compelled many of the rural class to become nonobservant Jews because of economic pressures. Because their identity was
grounded in their religious system, this economic dilemma created enormous personal and social tensions.

Eventually, the economic and social pressures produced several renewal movements. These movements were different political reactions to these pressures. The nature of each movement's political reaction depended on how each one responded to the threat of impurity. Three main renewal movements were functioning during the time of Jesus: the Pharisees, the Essenes, and the Zealots.

The Pharisees are the most prominent group mentioned in the New Testament Gospels. The Pharisees desired to transform Jewish society into a kingdom of holy people in order to counteract the threat of Roman occupation and Hellenistic influences. They did not separate from society, but sought rather to bring cultic purity into everyday life. Their name means "separated," the same as "holy." They sought to accomplish this by intensifying the practice of holiness. The major focus was laws regarding purity and tithing (Borg, 1984). All tithes were to be paid. Since Pharisees had no power to enforce conformity, they used social and religious ostracism as a sanction measure.

The Essenes combated social and religious impurity by isolating themselves from all others. They formed self-sufficient communities. Their monastic life conformed to strict rules of discipline and communal living. They believed themselves to be the children of light, while the Romans and most of the Jewish people were children of darkness. They referred to themselves as the "men of
holiness" (Borg, 1984). Many scholars believe that John the Baptist was affiliated with this community.

Another possible major renewal movement is commonly known as the Zealots. Josephus called them the "fourth philosophy," and he did not designate them as a particular sect or movement. He noted that they were similar to the Pharisees except that they had an unconquerable passion for liberty (Borg, 1984). Zealots believed that holiness was possible only if the contamination of Roman occupation was removed from Palestine. They radicalized the Jewish commandment that "You shall have no other gods before you." The Zealots represented the various resistant attempts, perhaps armed, but definitely philosophical (Horsley & Hansen, 1985). They would not pay taxes to Rome, but only to God.

All three groups attempted to preserve the identity and future of the Jewish people with God through a politics of holiness. By doing the will of God, all such renewal movements hoped to hasten God's intervention to restore Israel to independence and liberty. The Essenes withdrew. The Zealots protested. The Pharisees lived publicly a life of purity among the defiled; they were separated within society.

According to Borg (1984), the result of these movements was sharper divisions among the Jewish people. The economic pressures and ostracism of nonobservance produced a large group of Jewish outcasts and sinners. Horsley and Hanson (1985) defined the conflict as being fundamentally between the Romans and the ruling Jewish elite on one hand and the rural poor on the other. The peasantry
engaged in several types of social movements to force change. These included social banditry (displaced peasants who banded together and plundered Romans), popular messianic movements, and several prophetic movements. Horsley (1985) believed that the prophetic movements functioned as the earlier Biblical prophets: "They undertook to interpret the deeper or broader significance of their own social-political situation" (p. 453). All these movements had an apocalyptic flavor.

Into this environment, Jesus came as another renewal movement leader. Jesus did not isolate himself and his disciples, nor did he advocate violence or leave strict codes of discipline. Josephus writing during the last decade of the first century, said of Jesus:

About this time there lived Jesus, a wise man . . . For he was one who wrought surprising feats and was a teacher of such people as accept the truth gladly. He won over many Jews and many of the Greeks . . . When Pilate, upon hearing him accused by men of the highest standing amongst us, had condemned him to be crucified, those who had in the first place come to love him did not give up their affection for him . . . And the tribe of the Christians, so called after him, has still to this day not disappeared. (Crossan, 1994a, pp. vi-vii)

Jesus, recognized as a wise man by Josephus, had an impact on Jews and Greeks, and developed a group of followers who were devoted to him.

Borg (1984) noted that Jesus' style of ministry indicated Jesus' concern to reach all of Judaism, "... his life 'on the road' as an itinerant preacher, the restrictions
of ministry to Israel, the urgent tone of his preaching, his selection of followers to be wandering charismatics and preachers like he himself was, and his deliberate decision to bring his ministry to Jerusalem and the Temple, the heart of his people's life" (p. 70).

Scholars agree that the central vision of Jesus was expressed by the symbol of the kingdom of God (Fiorenza, 1984). All the renewal movements shared this symbol (Fiorenza, 1984). Jews expected the return of the Golden Age, the rule of David, through an apocalyptic event which would restore the sovereignty of Israel and abolish the unholy occupation of the Romans. Jesus was concerned with the transformation of the present world, though he probably did have some eschatological expectations (e.g., Borg, 1984; Crossan, 1991; Fiorenza, 1984).

Fiorenza (1984) contended that the earliest of the Gospel strata contain the kingdom sayings which are located in the most authentic material about the historical Jesus. Jesus proclaimed the kingdom for three groups: (1) the poor, (2) the sick and maimed, and (3) tax collectors, sinners, and prostitutes (Fiorenza, 1984). All three groups were outcasts and morally reprehensible in the social purity system of that time. Jesus' view of holiness was different than the other renewal leaders of the time. His leadership was distinctive. An analysis of his sayings and parables using the model of the purity system illustrates the nature of his message and its impact.
Jesus' Sayings and Parables: Holiness Codes

Several of Jesus' red sayings and parables are a response to the purity system paradigm. These include Emperor and God; Congratulations, Poor; Leaven; Mustard Seed; Love of Enemies; and Abba. Each one will be treated in turn.

Emperor and God

The holiness system was political. This can be seen in the responses of the Pharisees, Essenes, and Zealots to the Jewish and Roman tax requirements. The saying of Jesus, "Pay the emperor what belongs to the emperor and God what belongs to God!" (Mk. 12: 17b), probably came as a response to a question put to him of whether to pay taxes. Borg (1984) believes that the saying implies that Jesus did not advocate national resistance. However, Jesus' answer does not really tell them to pay either the tax due the emperor or the Temple tax. Instead, he indicates that they should know themselves the difference between the claims of God and the claims of the emperor (Funk, et al., 1993). This aphorism clarified the broad issue, but Jesus did not answer the direct question. Apparently, Jesus did not advocate rebellion against the Roman or Jewish system, but neither did he give the hearers any specific guidance regarding their tax dilemma.

This saying illustrates that Jesus did not provide strict behavior codes to follow. He put the issue into perspective, and then left the resolution of the problem up to each individual. Jesus had a remarkable capacity for changing the social perspective of hearers without giving any "how to" instructions. He treated his
audience as intelligent and gave them the power, and thus the responsibility, for making necessary decisions.

**Congratulations, Poor!**

With the saying, "Congratulations, you poor! The kingdom of God belongs to you," Jesus announced that the kingdom of God was given to the poor. Jesus turned the Jewish purity system upside down with this kingdom of God saying. The poor were the powerless and often the socially disenfranchised. According to the prevalent theory of retribution, favor with God was possible when one lived a holy life. Economic well-being was indicative of God's blessing. The priests and Pharisees lived holy lives and, thus, in a purity system, they had political power. They would inherit the kingdom of God.

However, Jesus' words were an indictment of the powerful and elite Jewish ruling class. The wealthy added to the burden of the rural class by demanding strict observance of all the requirements of the law when they were the only ones who had the resources to live separated lives of holiness. Jesus indicated that, despite their successes, the kingdom of God actually belonged to the poor. Wealth was not an indication of favor with God: "Wealth was not the result of being an ambitious hard-working individual striving to advance in the world, but the product of being part of an oppressive social class that extracted its wealth from peasants" (Borg, 1994a, p. 104).

Jesus' words were good news for those who had been economically oppressed by the Roman occupation and then the added Jewish tax burden. The paying of the
Jewish taxes was an obligation to maintain the purity system. Many of those impoverished by the tax burden had to become nonobservant Jews. They had no reason to believe that the kingdom of God was theirs. Jesus said it was. With this saying, Jesus challenged the injustice of the ruling class and gave hope to the powerless.

Leaven

The kingdom of God parable about leaven was also unconventional and challenged the purity system paradigm. Jesus said, "What does the kingdom of God remind me of? It is like leaven which a woman took and concealed in fifty pounds of flour until it was all leavened" (Lk. 13: 20-21). Three elements of the story would shock the hearers. The parable "... involves leaven, a woman, and the act of hiding, all of which have negative connotations in their original social matrix" (Crossan, 1991, p. 280).

First-century Palestine was both patriarchal and androcentric. Fiorenza (1983) defines patriarchy as a socio-cultural system which is hierarchical and male-dominated. She further defined androcentrism as a mind-set, a way of seeing from a male point of view. Jesus lived in a society of both. The family system was a microcosm of the whole social system, with the father as the head figure. Women were usually separated from men, were not taught the Torah, and had very specific roles and spheres of functioning. Women were always subject to a male figure, usually a father or a husband. The kingdom of God was usually associated with the elite ruling class, males with status. In Mediterranean culture, the male was a symbol
for purity and the female was a symbol for the religiously impure. Therefore, using a woman as an image for the kingdom of God was incongruous to the audience.

Leaven in Judaism was a metaphor for corruption, stemming from the practice of ridding a house of leaven in preparation for the Jewish Passover. A Jewish household rid itself of leaven during the Passover, because leaven was made by letting bread rot in a dark damp place (Scott, 1989). Therefore, leaven became a symbol of defilement because of the leaven-producing process of putrefaction (Patterson, 1993). Proverbially, leaven was used to illustrate the corrupting quality of a little evil (Scott, 1989). In Israel, leaven referred to the unholy and the everyday, while unleavened referred to the sacred (Crossan, 1991). The hearers would wonder why leaven was used as a symbol of the kingdom of God.

Using the verb for hiding the leaven, rather than kneading the leaven into the dough, was also surprising. Hiding the leaven conveyed the idea of concealment, and concealment was symbolic of darkness and evil. Scott (1989) noted that the figurative use of hiding leaven rather than mixing the leaven is not found in any Greek or Hebrew text. Traditionally, the kingdom of God was not thought to be hidden, but open (Witherington, 1994).

The woman, the leaven, and the act of hiding were all three unholy symbols. Conventional wisdom equated all three with corruption. Proper symbols for the kingdom of God would have been a man, unleaven, and revealed (Scott, 1989). With this parable, Jesus challenged the conventional views of holiness. The imagery itself implies that holiness is part of the normal and everyday, not something set apart
The parable also implies that purity is not located in certain individuals or elements. Women and leaven can be holy.

The act of hiding the leaven, working it secretly throughout the dough, implies the internal nature of God's kingdom. God's kingdom does its best work hidden internally. The leaven in the parable permeates a great quantity of dough -- fifty pounds -- thus providing nourishment for many. Scott (1989) concluded:

The parable calls into question ready attempts to predict on the basis of our knowledge of the holy and good where the kingdom is active. Instead it insists on the kingdom's freedom to appear under its own guise, even if it be the guise of corruption. (p. 329)

Jesus took three unlikely and unholy images and used them to describe the kingdom of God, subverting the common views of holiness.

Mustard Seed

The parable of the mustard seed adds to the idea of the small and hidden having a great impact. In this parable, the kingdom of God is compared to a mustard seed: "It's [the kingdom of God is] like a mustard seed. It's the smallest of all plants, but when it falls on prepared soil, it produces a large plant and becomes a shelter for birds in the sky" (Th. 20: 2-4). The mustard seed is a very tiny seed and yet, in the parable, it becomes a large plant and provides shelter for the birds. Usually the kingdom of God was compared to the mighty cedar of Lebanon (Crossan, 1991). Here the kingdom of God is compared to something small and seemingly useless, rather than the majestic and strong.
Oakman (1986) noted that the mustard seed was often considered a weed, because it was overly reproductive and huge. Crossan (1991) made the point that the mustard seed "tends to take over where it is not wanted, that it tends to get out of control, and that it tends to attract birds within cultivated areas where they are not particularly desired" (pp. 278-279). In fact, the plant was so prolific that in first-century Palestine, it was forbidden to plant it in a garden. It had to be cultivated in small separate areas away from other plants (Patterson, 1993). According to Old Testament law, it was also forbidden to plant together seeds of diverse kinds: "The basic rule is simple: Maintain order and separation, keep plants in their proper place, and do not mix them" (Scott, 1989, p. 382).

The hearer of the parable would be in conflict about whether the growth of the plant violated holiness laws. Neither would a farmer want birds to come and nest in the branches because of the threat they would bring to a newly-planted garden or field. Again the kingdom of God is compared to things and actions which violate the holiness code. The mustard seed is an obnoxious weed. It should not be planted in a garden; neither does a farmer want it to get so huge that birds are attracted to set up housekeeping in its branches. The parable coheres with the parable of the leaven.

Comparing the kingdom of God to things undesirable, like leaven and the mustard seed, and to the permeating aggressive effect of a small element in a larger system, is a radical departure from the typical understanding about God's reign. Everything about the kingdom of God is compared to things unclean. Jesus rejected the notion of holiness being evident in outward power (such as that of certain elite
males, or as symbolized by the cedar) or in certain outward behaviors. Purity was ordinary, non-exclusionary, and extremely potent. Jesus called for a different understanding of the rule of God.

**Love Your Enemies**

The most flagrant reconstruction of the purity system is revealed in the saying, "Love your enemies" (Lk. 6: 27b). Borg (1984) described this saying as the new mercy code. The imperative is to replace holiness, as the content of the *imitateo dei* [imitation of God], with mercy. If one wants to imitate God, Jesus suggests that one be merciful. Holiness is not the primary content of imitating God.

Borg (1984) sees a striking similarity between the terminology and the content of Luke 6: 27-36, where the injunction to love your enemies is located, to the holiness code of Leviticus 19. In Leviticus 19, the holiness code begins with verse 2b: "You shall be holy, for I the Lord your God am holy." Leviticus 19: 18 says to love your neighbors. In Luke 6: 27b, Jesus says instead to love your enemies. Neighbors implied one's kinship groups, but enemies would be non-Jews, such as the Romans. Enemies would be the unholy, the defiled. Loving persons such as Samaritans and Romans would have been unthinkable for the first-century Jew, not just because of the emotional animosity that exists between conflict groups, but because the Jewish primary sense of identity was embedded in its notion of holy separation.

Borg (1984) concluded that Jesus was proposing a new paradigm for Judaism. Rather than having holiness as the paradigm of the community and the source of the community's identity, mercy should govern the new paradigm with its accompanying
identity. It is important to reiterate that this paradigm goes beyond the notion of simply feeling kindly, even acting kindly, toward persons outside one's comfort zone. Jesus was saying that separation as a source of identity and strict nationalistic boundaries as a source of community was not coherent with the imitation of God. Jesus proposed that the Jewish people think concretely about a radical restructuring of their paradigm.

**Abba**

Jesus referred to God as Abba in the opening line of what is known today as the Lord's Prayer, located in Matthew and Luke. Abba is the Aramaic (the Semitic language spoken in Palestine) word for "father." Jeremias (1978) concluded that Jesus' use of Abba was unparalleled in ancient Palestinian Judaism. Jesus addressed God in an intimate fashion as his daddy. Dunn (1980) disagreed that Jesus' use of the term is unparalleled in Judaism, but he did agree that the use of Abba significantly distinguished Jesus from his contemporaries.

The use of the term Abba has been interpreted as a metaphor that God is like a father and is therefore male (A is B). This would seem to contradict Jesus' attempt to disengage cultural boundaries of gender identity as seen in the parable about leaven. However, if the term is understood as a symbol, then Abba alludes to a wider field of meaning. Fiorenza (1984) suggested, "The saying of Jesus uses the 'father' of God not as a legitimization for existing patriarchal power structures in society or church but as a critical subversion of all structures of domination" (p.151). If God was the "father" in first-century Palestine, then no other authority figures were needed.
Borg (1984) believed that addressing God as "Abba," father, rather than the usual Elohim, represented a shift from a focus on God as holiness to a focus on God in a relationship of love. Kaylor (1994) suggested the term implies a familial framework for relationships rather than an institutional one. Jesus did not intend to deny the holiness of God, but rather Jesus wanted the focus of one's relationship with God, and thus with others, to be based on mercy rather than holiness. Jesus shifted the paradigm.

Jesus' response to holiness was distinct from that of the Pharisees, Essenes, and Zealots. Jesus located the imitation of God in a loving relationship with God and others rather than in purity codes. Purity codes lead to isolation and exclusion. Jesus extended the boundaries of God's kingdom to include the powerless and the outcasts. He used everyday imagery to disorient his hearers. Jesus wanted them to think concretely about the social implications of a life motivated by love rather than holiness.

The Conflict Model: Social Consciousness

Conflict theory suggests that social systems consist of various groups which have different goals and interests, and each group will use different tactics to realize its goals (Malina, 1993). Each group will try to protect its own interests; therefore, relations between groups include disagreements, conflict, and sometimes force. Each group will also try to protect the interests of its individuals in the larger social setting.
For example, the Pharisees wanted to promote their interests within Jewish society and also protect their interests with the Roman conquerors.

Malina (1993) explained that the conflict model "presupposes that all units of social organization, that is, persons and groups in a society, are continuously changing unless some force intervenes to correct this change" (p. 22). Social life equates with conflict. In first-century Mediterranean society, conflict was endemic (Borg, 1984). The conflict was not just political and economic, but part of the fabric of the Jewish social system. In order to understand the conflict model in first-century Palestine, an understanding of Mediterranean society is a necessary first step.

In Mediterranean society, collective identity was more important than individualism. Malina (1993), using insights gleaned from cultural anthropology, called this group psychological orientation, the dyadic personality. Malina (1993) described the dyadic personality as "characteristic of individuals who perceive themselves and form their self-image in terms of what others perceive and feed back to them" (pp. 67-68). Therefore, individuals found contentment and security through awareness of others' value of them and through living up to social expectations. The pivotal values for the dyadic personality were honor and shame (Malina, 1993; Malina & Neyrey, 1991; Torjesen, 1993).

Malina (1993) described honor as "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 groups. Honor is a claim to worth along with the social acknowledgment of worth" (p. 31). Honor can be ascribed through social status, being born into an honorable family,
or by a notable person of power, such as being granted honor by a king as when King Saul honored David after he killed Goliath.

Honor can also be acquired through a challenge. Malina (1993) wrote, "Now 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 honor, a mutual attempt to acquire honor from one's social equal" (p. 37). Cultural anthropologists call Mediterranean culture an agonistic culture, a culture where each social interaction outside of family and friends is a contest for honor.

The contest for honor, a male concern, always takes place with a public challenge and a public response (Malina, 1993). The exchange takes place in the form of a communication between a source and a receiver. The source is the challenger. The message can be words, a symbolic gesture, or some action. The receiver must respond in some way. Non-action is a response (Malina, 1993).

Malina described the challenge as stepping into another male's social space either positively or negatively. A positive challenge is perceived as an opportunity to gain some space or to share the space. A negative challenge is perceived as an attempt to dislodge a person from his social space. The receiver recognizes the potential of the challenge to dishonor his self-worth. Therefore, the perception of the message is very important.

Shame, on the other hand, is a concern for one's reputation which necessitates a defensive posture rather than an offensive one. It is a positive value assuring a proper interest in preserving one's honor. Shame was the female component of honor:
"Shame in this context refers to a woman's sensitivity about what others think, say, and do with regard to her worth" (Malina & Neyrey, 1991, p. 41). For females, shame is a defense of honor. For males, shame is a loss of honor. Honor is a male privilege establishing his power and status in the social system (Torjesen, 1993).

Honor is social power. French and Raven (1959) recognized the importance of cultural values for endorsing legitimate power. In a purity system, honor would come primarily from observing the holiness codes, and shame would come from nonobservance. The principal type of challenges would be around the quality of one's holiness. The Gospels are rampant with examples of Jesus' conflicts with the Pharisees around holiness issues. Jesus' conflicts centered around two principal issues: table fellowship and the observance of the Sabbath laws (Borg, 1984). Jesus ate with unclean, thus dishonored, persons, and he healed on the Sabbath. The conflict model is set in the context of a purity society.

**Jesus' Sayings and Parables: Honor and Shame**

Several of Jesus' sayings and one of his parables are best interpreted through the lens of the conflict model in a purity system context. These include: Other Cheek, Coat and Shirt, Second Mile, Love of Enemies, and the Samaritan. The first four are found together in a collection of sayings.

**Other Cheek, Coat and Shirt, Second Mile, and Love of Enemies**

Jesus' most authenticated saying was, "Don't react violently against the one who is evil: when someone slaps you on the right cheek, turn the other as well" (Mt. 5: 39). In Matthew, this saying is followed by the sayings about giving your coat
when sued for your shirt, going the extra mile when conscripted to go one, and later, loving your enemies. In a conflict society, these sayings would have shocked the hearers.

These sayings are a cluster of case parodies. Case parodies are non-literal and aphoristic. They are "the comic exaggeration of a law where certain features are overstated for effect" (Funk, et al., 1993, p. 144). The audience would have perceived the humor in them, because certainly, if they were followed to the letter, an individual would end up destitute, exhausted, and possibly badly beaten.

The sayings, particularly the first three, describe circumstances where one's rights are infringed upon in a humiliating way: "Being struck on the right cheek by a backhand slap is an insult, as humiliating as being successfully sued in court or being forced to carry military gear for a mile" (Malina & Rohrbaugh, 1992, p. 55). Wink (1991) noted that to hit someone on the right cheek required the use of the left hand, "but in that society the left hand was used only for unclean tasks" (p. 8). Therefore, the intention of the slap was to humiliate. In such circumstances, the offended individual would be forced to defend his honor. The events compelled the offended to act or be shamed. The presence of outsiders and thus evil persons in a purity system was already a source of shame. Compliance would indicate that one had no honor, thus no social power.

Malina and Rohrbaugh (1992) noted two important features in these circumstances: (1) a challenge to one's honor is always public, and (2) in Mediterranean society the typical response to a public fight would be to break it up. If
a male were slapped or conscripted, it would be done in a public way. If a fight erupted, the crowd would break it up. Jesus suggests that the person not defend his honor. Jesus subverts the way in which honor is gained through conflict. Malina and Rohrbaugh (1992) believed that Jesus meant for the individual to allow someone in the crowd to defend his honor, rather than defend it himself. Kaylor (1994) suggested that Jesus forbade "insisting on rights to such an extent that one desires to render 'justified' injury on others" (p. 110). Wink (1991) believed that turning the cheek would rob the oppressor the power to humiliate.

Wink (1991) noted that only the poorest give their garment as a collateral for a loan. By law, the garment had to be returned every evening. Jesus recognized the extreme indebtedness of the poor and the humiliation they suffered because of it. Wink (1991) suggested that, translated correctly, Jesus advised the unfortunate individual to give up not only his outer garment, but his inner garment as well. This would leave him naked. In Jewish culture the opprobrium for nakedness did not fall on the naked person, but on those viewing his nakedness. Therefore, the creditor is culpable and dishonored, and the absurdity of the economic situation is made clear. Likewise, going a second mile with an enemy soldier, Jesus counsels the oppressed to seize the initiative. The result would be the discomfiture of the enemy and the retention of one's dignity.

The saying, "Love your enemies," is another response to an agonistic culture. Most scholars believe that it is at the heart of Jesus' teachings (e.g., Borg, 1984; Crossan, 1991; Funk, et al., 1993; Witherington, 1994). Public challenges were part
of the fabric of the social system. Therefore, the males would have many enemies. Peasant males viewed enemies as those who would destroy their honor or economic viability. However, the saying is paradoxical because if persons love their enemies, they would have no enemies.

Among first-century Mediterraneans, one's social identity was embedded in a kinship group. Kinship groups were the basis for one's conscience and security. Malina and Rohrbaugh (1992) referred to it as the external conscience of the group which is non-introspective. Western society functions on the internal and introspective conscience of the individual. Therefore, "love" and "hate" are not just terms about an inward state. They also refer to outward behaviors. Malina and Rohrbaugh (1992) translated love as group attachment demonstrated in behaviors of devotion: "There may or may not be any affection, but it is the inward feeling of attachment along with the outward behavior bound up with attachment that love entails" (p. 57).

Hate, on the other hand, is detachment and indifference (Malina & Rohrbaugh, 1992). To detach from someone, then, is to hate them. When Jesus says to love one's enemies, Jesus is implying that one has no enemies because everyone is of the same kinship group. An individual cannot use one single kinship group as one's conscience. Nor can an individual be indifferent in his or her behavior toward outsiders.

Again, Jesus subverts the social system. Honor, as a source of social power, and challenges, as a means for acquiring or diminishing social power, are rejected by Jesus. Apparently, honor is not gained through personal confrontations or at the
expense of others. Jesus presents a radical "new approach to life which abandons natural pride, standing on one's own rights, and prudential considerations" (Borg, 1984, p. 131). By exaggerating an unexpected and opposite response, Jesus suggests again that mercy is the most important thing. It is more important than honor. Mercy has no boundaries. It is extended toward enemies. Mercy cannot be shamed.

The Samaritan

Nowhere is mercy illustrated more clearly among the historical Jesus' sayings and parables than in the parable of the Samaritan (Lk. 10: 30-35). The parable is based on the historical and long-term animosity between Samaritans and Judeans. Both groups considered the other a mortal enemy. In the parable, a man is robbed and beaten by bandits, and then left naked and half-dead beside the Jerusalem to Jericho road. The Jewish audience would have assumed that the injured man was a Jew, even though his name was not given. Since the bandits stripped him, there was no way for the audience or the story characters to identify his nationality or status. Being half-dead, he was totally at the mercy of others.

The first to pass by is a priest, a member of the upper class devoted to holiness and to religious duties. He sees the injured man and crosses to the other side of the road. Next a Levite passes the injured man. A Levite was a man who had sacred duties in the Temple, but who did not offer sacrifices. The Levite does the same thing as the priest. Seemingly, both avoid the man out of concern for their own safety and for maintaining their ritual purity.
In the story, the priest and the Levite are holy men of honor and influence. Holy men may not defile themselves by touching a dead body unless it is that of a close relative (Lev. 21: 1-2). Being at the top of the purity list, neither one could touch the injured man because there was no way to tell if the man might die at any moment, or what his social status and ethnic identity might be. Touching a dead body, a non-Jew, or even a nonobserving Jew would have contaminated them. Although the audience might have been sympathetic to the dilemma of the religious leaders, they would have expected that, in such a life and death situation, someone would have acted to help the man. Interpretations of the law give examples of cases where, in extreme situations, a priest or Levite may touch a neglected body (Scott, 1989). From the perspective of the audience, the priest and the Levite acted in a merciless and shameful way.

In the normal development of such a story, the listeners would have expected that the third character would have been an ordinary Jew (Scott, 1989). The Jewish audience would anticipate the development of the story to go from the priest, to the Levite, to an ordinary Jew. They expected to identify with the honorable action of a regular Jewish man. However, the shock value of the story is that the paragons of virtue do not stop, and the very next character is a Samaritan, the paragon of corruption: "The Samaritan's insertion into the story as its hero, the one who helps, shatters the hearer's expectation" (Scott, 1989, p. 198).

The third to pass, the Samaritan, stops and cares for the injured man. He places the injured man on his donkey, takes him to an inn, provides money for his
care, and promises to return to settle the balance. A Samaritan traveling in Judean
territory was probably a trader particularly since he had supplies and funds. Among
Jews, being a trader was a despised occupation. In a limited goods society, it was
assumed that a wealthy trader could only get that way at the expense of others
(Malina & Rohrbaugh, 1992). Also, inns were notorious and dirty places. Most
travelers stayed with family or friends. If someone had to stay in an inn, it meant that
they had no connections, thus they had no honor. Under the circumstances, the
audience would have despised the Samaritan, and most likely the injured man would
not even have wanted help from the Samaritan.

The hearer of the parable had expected to identify with the hero, who was
supposed to be an ordinary Israelite. Now the hearer is faced with the dilemma of
identifying with the injured man and receiving aid from a dishonorable Samaritan:
"To remain in the story the hearer cannot play hero but must become a victim" (Scott,
1989, p. 200). The normal order of reality is subverted. The Samaritan is the hero, and
the hearer is the victim.

The parable is less about boundless love, the usual interpretation, and more
about a counter-order which exceeds the usual bounds of Jewish thinking
(Witherington, 1994). In this counter-order, in this new kingdom of God, God
reorders normal thinking and transforms persons. The Samaritan does a loving act
toward a traditional enemy. The priest and the Levite acted shamefully. The
Samaritan had to cross social and religious boundaries to give the injured man aid.
The parable is about breaking down barriers. Hedrick (1994) suggested that the
parable "invokes the 'deeds of righteousness' that were required by Torah of all Jews" (p. 114). The ideal of the righteous man who performed compassionate deeds was located in the Samaritan. Righteousness had no boundaries for Jesus.

The story also highlights the limitation of a purity society: the conflict created by holiness codes and their exclusive nature. As presented in the previous section, an essential characteristic of Jesus' ministry was controversy over the interpretation of holiness. Jesus and the other renewal leaders wanted holiness, but they disagreed about how to reform it. Witherington (1993) and Borg (1984) concluded that the solutions of the Pharisees and the Essenes furthered strengthened the ethnic purity of Jews from outsiders. However, their solutions also further divided and alienated Jews from each other. Their reform efforts alienated those who were able to observe the codes from those were unable.

Jesus stressed the moral demands of the holiness codes rather than the legal demands. Like the Samaritan, the right act was the loving act, not the act of the religious leaders to protect their holiness status. Jesus invited the Jews to be a people who imitated the all-merciful father God rather than a people who practiced the ritual requirements of holiness. Witherington (1994) wrote, "It is precisely because compassion is a weightier matter of the law, that all such ritually based distinctions are set aside when the dominion [the kingdom of God] breaks into Israel's midst" (p. 196).

When holiness is invested in merciful actions rather than right behaviors, then honor goes to the most loving person. In the parable of the Samaritan, he was the one
who acted honorably. Witherington (1994) suggested that Jesus used the contrast between the honored and ritually clean religious leaders with the dishonored and unclean Samaritan as a striking example of the need to return to the example of God's remarkable outpouring of grace. For Jesus, one's social identity would then be grounded in one's relationship of love with God and others rather than in positions of honor.

As he did with the purity model, Jesus subverted the hearers' thinking about conflict and honor. Jesus wanted people to formulate their interactions with others based on love rather than confrontation. Honor comes from loving enemies as well as neighbors. Loving enemies means one has no enemies and outsiders are brought into the boundaries with insiders. Jesus had a bigger vision for the Jewish people. They were not simply people set apart as an inner-active kingdom of priests, but people chosen as God's intra-active priests to the world.

Jesus also criticized the pretensions of honor. An individual cannot feel shame or be dishonored if love rather than status motivates how that person chooses to act and react. Other renewal leaders strengthened the honor system by isolating, imposing stricter holiness codes, or challenging the oppressors. Jesus subverted the system, suggesting that honor comes from a moral imperative of love rather than from specific norms and procedures for interactions.
The Pre-industrial Agrarian Model: Economic Consciousness

A pre-industrial agrarian model has pre-industrial cities with surrounding agrarian villages. The rural peasants are in a fixed labor force system where they provide the flow of goods and services to the cities. The city is the center of control. Such a system depends on the social and geographical separation of the peasant and the elite classes (Rohrbaugh, 1991). The system is characterized by "... the dominance of a small center, by sharp social stratification, and by physical and social distancing of component populations that were linked by carefully controlled hierarchical relations" (Rohrbaugh, 1991, p. 136).

The most striking feature of this type of social system is the marked social inequality between the rural peasants and the urban elites (Lenski, 1966). The urban elites are the rulers of a centralized form of government. Oakman (1986) demonstrated that in pre-industrial agrarian societies, the wealthy are usually the powerful. In such a system, they would have controlled central political and religious institutions, giving them authority and power in strategic social locations. Lenski (1966) wrote that "the great majority of the political elite sought to use the energies of the peasantry to the full, while depriving them of all but the basic necessities of life" (p. 270).

The ruling urban elites increased wealth by renting land to peasants and taxing their income. The elite were literate individuals who held administrative and religious positions of authority. They had political control through the principal functions of exacting taxes and maintaining order. Malina (1993) called their role "the culture's
'Great Tradition,' the embodiment of the norms and values which give continuity and substance to the ideals of Israelite society" (p. 92).

Palestine was a pre-industrial agrarian society. By the time of Jesus, power relationships were hierarchical and located in central places, particularly Jerusalem and the Temple. The pre-industrial cities, such as Jerusalem, constituted ten percent of the total population of the area, and of that ten percent less than two percent were the elite (Malina, 1993). Two-thirds of the country's agricultural wealth ended up in the hands of ten percent of the population. Borg (1994a) wrote, "Ancient Israel was a two-class society divided between oppressive urban elites and exploited rural peasants" (p. 103). The rural peasants were primarily exploited through rent and taxes.

Borg (1994a) estimated that land rent constituted paying one-fourth to one-third of agricultural production to the land owner. Besides rent, the peasant class paid taxes to the government, and religious tithes to the Jewish religious authorities. Along with the rent payment, peasants could end up paying sixty percent of agricultural income to the ruling elites. Sanders (1992) disagreed with these figures, believing Borg exaggerated his estimates. However, Sanders estimated taxes added up to twenty-eight percent even without of the Temple tithes, which, along with the land rent, was still a heavy burden. Oakman (1986) concluded in his study of the socio-economics of first-century Palestine that the peasants exploited by land-owning elites ended up in hopeless debt.
The first-century peasants were subject to the demands of the occupying Romans and the urban elite. Land holdings were concentrated in the hands of the urban elite. Among the non-elite, goods were limited and peasants had no way of increasing available quantities. The peasant had to balance outside demands with his need to provide for his household. Limited goods also meant that families or individuals could only improve their position at the expense of others: "Since all goods exist in limited amounts which cannot be increased or expanded, it follows that individuals, alone or with their family, can improve their social position only at the expense of others" (Malina, 1994, p. 95).

Oakman (1986) demonstrated that the problem occurred when the traditional economic system based on reciprocal exchange moved to one based on redistribution. Earlier tribal relationships involved "village-based reciprocal types of exchanges and relatively horizontal kin relationships" (Oakman, 1986, p. 206). In the older traditional Jewish economic system, wealth was distributed through reciprocity exchanges. However, this had changed by the first century. Wealth flowed to the cities through taxation and rent collections. Therefore, wealth was redistributed from the country to the city.

Malina (1994) called reciprocity the most significant form of social interaction practiced by the Jews. Though it had broken down during the lifetime of Jesus, it still existed between kinship groups and colleague contracts. Malina (1994) defined reciprocity as "an informal principle of reciprocity, a sort of implicit, nonlegal contractual obligation, unenforceable by any authority apart from one's sense of honor"
and shame" (p. 100). Reciprocity arrangements are called dyadic contracts and can be either contracts between persons of equal status (colleague contracts), or between persons of different status (patron-client contracts). In these contracts, an honorable person either selects or is selected by another for reciprocal support.

Within villages, the colleague contracts were initiated by a positive challenge. The acceptance of a gift or an invitation to supper signaled the beginning of future reciprocity. In a limited goods context, sellers were assured of keeping their clientele because of previous dealings (Malina, 1994). Oakman (1991) referred to it as a balanced reciprocity: "Exchanges are balanced if done on a quid pro quo basis and when the debt is liquidated fairly quickly" (p. 156). Within kinship groups, reciprocity was general. The exchange was unilateral with no time boundary. In other words, within kinship groups needs were met without thought given to repayment.

Patron-client contracts involved persons of different social statuses. Therefore, the reciprocity was different. The patron provided favors of some limited object or action. Moxnes (1991) wrote, "Patron-client relations are social relationships between individuals based on a strong element of inequality and difference in power" (p. 242). The patron could provide scarce social, political, or economic resources. In return, the client increased the honor of the patron through loyalty.

Moxnes (1991) listed five characteristics of the patron-client relationship: (1) patron-client interaction is a simultaneous exchange of different resources; (2) the relationship is characterized by solidarity linked to honor and obligations; (3) the relationship may have a spiritual attachment; (4) the relationship is binding and long
range; and (5) the relationship is based on inequality and difference in power. Since
honor was a core value of first-century Palestine, the patron-client relationships were
an important source of acquiring honor in unequal relationships.

With the land owners moving to the cities and the rural wealth flowing to the
cities, the usual patron-client relationship often changed to a relationship of
exploitation (Oakman, 1986). Patronage encouraged a balanced redistribution
between the patron and the client. However, urbanism "encouraged acquisitive
attitudes, insensitive exploitation of the agricultural producers, and the worship of
Mammon [money]" (Oakman, 1986, p. 211). The changes in the usual patron-client
relationships had a great impact on first-century Palestine. Some of Jesus' red sayings
and parables address this issue.

Jesus' Sayings and Parables: Patron-Client Relationship

When Jesus addressed God as "Abba," father, he referred to God as the patron
of Israel. No other patron was needed. The parables about the Shrewd Manager and
the Vineyard Laborers are examples of stories using patron-client themes. The
collection of sayings, Other Coat, Second Mile, and Give to Beggars address the issue
of reciprocity. The sayings, Congratulations, Poor, Hungry, and Sad, look at the
problem of poverty and wealth in a redistribution system.

Shrewd Manager

The parable about the Shrewd Manager (Lk. 16: 1-8a) illustrates Jesus'
understanding of the patron-client relationship. In this parable, a rich man accuses his
manager of squandering his property. The manager, rationalizing that he cannot beg
or dig ditches, calls in his master's debtors and diminishes each of their debts. When the master hears this, he praises him because he acted shrewdly.

The manager acted as the agent for the land owner, and was responsible for renting property, making loans, and liquidating debts. Since the land owner had a manager, the hearers would know that the master was a rich man. Because of the exploitation of the rural peasants by the ruling elites, the audience would have perceived the figure of the rich land owner as the protagonist. The first line of the story sets the tone by the hostile accusation of the land owner (Scott, 1989).

However, the audience would not approve of the manager's unwillingness to dig or beg. His comments would make him seem aloof from the necessities and realities of the working class. The hearers of the parable would find themselves in a predicament because they could identify with no one. Neither identification with the wealthy land owner nor with the schemes of the manager was possible.

Scott (1989) proposed that the story presents a counterworld where the normal patron-client relationship does not work as expected. The audience expected that the manager would get punished, not praised. According to Scott (1989), the master's praise leaves the hearer in an uncomfortable position, since the manager was unjust. In the conventional world, power and justice go together. In this parable, power and justice do not go together. Scott (1989) concludes that the parable breaks the relationship between power and justice.

Malina and Rohrbaugh (1992) suggested that the parable does work in a unique way to preserve the honor of both characters. They suggested that when the
manager realized his master knew of his dishonesty, he had to act quickly before the locals heard of his dismissal. A public dismissal would have brought shame on himself and on his patron. The patron would lose honor by having a disloyal client. The client or manager would lose honor when others heard he had broken his contract with his patron. Usually, such an act would lead to immediate imprisonment.

However, when the client reduced the debt of the patron's tenants, he did act shrewdly. He found new patrons for himself, and he preserved the honor of his present patron. His present patron praised him for acting shrewdly, because the present patron got rid of the dishonest manager without damaging the patron's most important asset, his honor. In fact, his honor and reputation as a patron increased because his debtors would perceive him as a generous man (Malina & Rohrbaugh, 1992), and the manager would not have to worry about how to make a living.

Without the setting for Jesus' use of this parable, it is difficult to know exactly why Jesus used the story. However, the conclusion and the ambivalent feelings the hearers would have toward the rich man and the manager are characteristic of Jesus. His use of the unexpected and his tendency to have surprising twists in his parables are representative of his themes of subverting the counter-order. The interesting thing about the parable is its amoral quality. In this parable, Jesus did not moralize, but rather he guided persons to reexamine their own understandings. Jesus provoked the thinking of the audience about established social relationships of the time.
Vineyard Laborers

The parable of the Vineyard Laborers (Mt. 20: 1-15) presents another unique perspective on the patron-client relationship. Jesus used this parable as an illustration of the kingdom of heaven. In other words, God's patronage works like the patron in the story. In the parable, a vineyard owner is anxious to complete the harvest and goes to the market several times throughout the day to get more workers.

The securing of employment in the first-century honor society is different from that of today. A person of lower status would not seek out a patron for work (Malina & Rohrbaugh, 1992). That would be dishonorable. Individuals would wait in the marketplace until a patron would invite them to work. Apparently, jobs were scarce, because some men loitered in the marketplace most of the day. These day laborers were probably the poorest of the poor, with no land of their own to work.

The vineyard owner promises to pay the first laborers a silver coin at the end of the day. He goes again at 9 a.m., 3 p.m., and 5 p.m., gathers workers, and promises to pay "what is right." The promise to pay "what is right" is the question that drives the parable. The listeners would have equated rightness, dikaios, with a correct orientation toward God: "A 'right' person is virtuous, a person who fulfills his duties towards God and society" (Scott, 1989, p. 292). Rightness implied generosity, not just a legalistic adherence to a certain code. The hearers of the parable would then wait to discover "what is right" in relationship to the differing amounts of time the workers toiled in the vineyard.
At the conclusion of the story, the hearers would have been startled to hear that all the laborers received the same wage. Like the full-day workers, the hearers were expecting that, instead of paying the agreed upon silver coin, the vineyard owner would have paid "what is right." They were expecting generosity. Scott (1989) noted that the various working hours implied a hierarchy among the workers: "The hierarchical pattern of the parable replicates the hierarchical pattern of the patron-client society" (p. 296). The workers first hired were expecting generosity commensurate with their labor.

Jesus thwarted the traditional concept of justice found in the patron-client relationship. The standard of justice is not based on worth, but on acceptance (Scott, 1989). By giving beyond what was due to the workers who came at the end of the day, the patron showed equal patronage to all. Fiorenza (1984) noted that the parable establishes the equality of all as rooted in the gracious goodness of God.

The ones who worked all day were upset that others, who had worked fewer hours, were made "equal" to them. The complainers were not upset with the fact that they received a silver coin, but that the late-comers were honored in the same manner as those who worked all day. The owner of the vineyard replied that he intended to be generous and treat everyone the same. The patron then asked the complainers if "your eye is filled with envy because I am generous?" (Mt. 20: 15b). Because the day-long workers complained about his generosity, the patron shamed them by implying that they were motivated by money and not honor.
Witherington (1994) suggested that the parable is not primarily about generosity, since a silver coin was "no great sum." Scott (1989) noted that a silver coin would only support a worker's family at a subsistence level. He suggests that Jesus used the parable as an answer to those who objected that his disciples were from the least among Israel. The hearers would recognize the vineyard as representative of Israel and the urgency of the vineyard owner to bring in the harvest as an analogy for the eschatological convictions of Jesus and the audience (Witherington, 1994).

Witherington (1994) wrote, "The point may be that it requires a group effort, and just as a team's members all equally share in a victory, regardless of how many minutes one or another player has played, so too every worker equally shares in the remuneration in the dominion of God" (p. 200). Jesus' parable reverses the conventional expectations of receiving benefit in proportion to the amount of service rendered. Jesus wanted his hearers to consider the need for solidarity with all persons, not just with those worthy of the honor.

Coat and Shirt, Second Mile, Give to Beggars, and Love of Enemies

Several sayings of Jesus illustrate a return to a human solidarity of mutual support and kinship unmarked by boundaries. These include the aphorisms, "When someone wants to sue you for your shirt, let that person have your coat along with it," (Mt. 5:40); "Further when anyone conscripts you for one mile, go an extra mile," (Mt. 5: 41); and "Give to the one who begs from you" (Mt. 5: 42a). The Coat and the Beggar aphorisms are probably addressed to the elite (Malina & Rohrbaugh, 1992). Jesus challenged the elite to function in universal reciprocal relationships rather than
the typical patron-client ones. The most universally accepted saying of Jesus, "Love your enemies" (Mt 5: 44b), is based on this indiscriminate universal reciprocity. Oakman (1986) concluded that Jesus' kingdom was a new order based on partnership and interdependence.

Several of the authentic sayings of Jesus indicate that he understood the economic difficulties his fellow Jews were experiencing. Jesus responded to the economic chaos of his time by calling for a return to general reciprocity, "giving without expecting in return" (Oakman, 1986, p. 215). General reciprocity is similar to the colleague contracts. However, Jesus went a step further and advocated a universal reciprocity, not one based on equals. Kaylor (1994) called this a negation of reciprocity. He suggested that Jesus negated reciprocity in relationships whether positive or negative. In other words, interactions should not be based on any sort of expectation for gain or loss: "Response to others [should] be based on the love one receives from God and not on categorizing others or their actions" (Kaylor, 1994, p. 111).

**Congratulations, Poor, Hungry, and Sad**

The sayings, "Congratulations, you poor;" Congratulations, you hungry," and "Congratulations, you who weep now," are radical departures from the common social view toward poverty and misfortune. In the ancient Mediterranean, people worked primarily to maintain honor, not to enrich themselves (Malina, 1993). Money was not the determiner of social status; birth was. Prior to the increasing economic indebtedness of the peasants, people were neither rich nor poor.
In a pre-industrial agrarian society, the basic perception was that goods were limited. Peoples' existences were determined by their social status and the limited natural resources. Therefore, in the Mediterranean world, poor was not an economic designation. Malina (1993) described poor persons as "those who cannot maintain their inherited status due to circumstances that befall them and their families, such as debt, being in a foreign land, sickness, death of a spouse (widow), or some personal accident" (p. 106). Therefore, the poor would never have expected to belong to the kingdom of God. They had lost their status and, once lost, it was difficult to retrieve. Jesus was saying that misfortune did not affect one's status in the kingdom of God. Honor was ultimately bestowed by God.

On the other hand, the term "rich" referred to the greedy, those who tried to accumulate wealth. Striving to improve one's economic position in a limited-goods society would lead to imbalance in the community (Malina, 1993). Therefore, in the previous parable of the vineyard laborers, the owner's accusation that the all-day laborers might be acting enviously was a serious charge. He suggested that they were trying to accumulate wealth rather than honor.

Jesus' solutions to the crises and conflicts in first-century Palestine were systemic rather than isolated. He saw the big picture. He challenged the core values and paradigm that ordered the Jews social world. Jesus did not throw out the paradigm and values, but rather he challenged first-century Jews to see their social world through a different lens. The Pharisees, Essenes, and Zealots offered isolated solutions. They maintained boundaries. Jesus broke them down.
Economic oppression in a limited-goods society can be resolved by having a system of universal reciprocity. For Jesus, patron-client relationships are based on acceptance, not the receipt of honor, loyalty, or goods. God is the only patron one needs. As the patron, God's justice is based on God's acceptance, not on the worth others designate according to status or behaviors.

The Leadership of Jesus in Context: Conclusion

The historical Jesus lived in the context of first-century Palestine. This context is understood through the models of the purity system model, the conflict model, and the pre-industrial agrarian model. The purity system explained the operating religious and political paradigm of first-century Judaism. The conflict model, expressed in the honor-shame challenges to the dyadic personality, explained the operating social and psychological system. The pre-industrial agrarian model defined the economic system.

As a purity society, the Jewish people's primary source of identity was as the "people of God," separated by God to be holy. Therefore, the practice of holiness was more than a set of behavioral codes. Holiness codes established the political structure and social stratification of the Jewish community as located in religious duties. The holiness codes established the norms of public and private behavior. They also set the Judean people apart from all other social groups. With the "corrupting" influence of the Roman government and Hellenistic philosophies, several renewal movements emerged in an attempt to preserve the purity of the Jewish system.
Jesus' reform efforts are the ones which bore lasting fruit. Jesus attempted to locate the holiness codes, not in Temple practice or Torah observance, but in a spiritual relationship of love with a holy God. Jesus' proclamation of the kingdom of God defined the holiness of God not in terms of cultic practice, nor in terms of specific social roles, but rather in terms of wholeness (Fiorenza, 1984). Through his sayings and parables, Jesus established that the moral implications of God's holiness had precedence over the practice of holiness. The moral implications of God's holiness were grounded in the identity of God as a God in a relationship of love.

Jesus did not intend to establish a new religion nor begin a political revolution against the Romans. Scholars agree that his historical concern was the renewal of Judaism, which had political and social ramifications (Charlesworth, 1994a). Fiorenza (1984) wrote, "The praxis and vision of Jesus and his movement is best understood as an inner-Jewish renewal movement that presented an alternative option to the dominant patriarchal structures rather than an oppositional formation rejecting the values and praxis of Judaism" (p. 107). Jesus expected that his sayings and parables would have political ramifications for the present. Jesus boldly and openly challenged the preoccupation with purity demanded by the rich and powerful in Jerusalem (Charlesworth, 1994a). He also broke down social barriers engendered by rigid purity codes and by patriarchy (Borg, 1984; Fiorenza, 1984). Jesus' message differed from that of other renewal leaders in that he stressed the present experience of the kingdom.

The conflict model illustrates that religious renewal movements develop out of social tensions and out of an attempt to give new directions (Theissen, 1978). In
first-century Palestine, conflict was part of the fabric of the Jewish social system. Not only was conflict evident because of the Roman occupation and the various Jewish renewal movements, but it was also evident in the very psychological orientation of a Palestinian at that time. The dyadic personality of the first-century Jew found worth through the confirmation, acquisition, or loss of honor in public challenges. Jesus' sayings and parables themselves were public challenges, but the analysis of his words suggests that he subverted the dominant understanding of honor.

Because of Jesus' understanding of holiness motivated by mercy, Jesus challenged the psychological orientation of the dyadic personality. Jesus taught that honor was not based on social status, but on one's compassionate nature. Therefore, any "poor" person, any dishonored person, could inherit the kingdom of God. Jesus had a vision of love and reconciliation, rather than a vision based on status and challenge (Theissen, 1978). Honor is based on God's acceptance, rather than on gaining honor in confrontation.

In the pre-industrial agrarian model, the cultural elites controlled the resources and the political and religious institutions. The rural peasants were subject to their demands and often systematically exploited. Jewish peasants were in debt and oppressed. Oakman (1986) wrote:

The historical context of Jesus, therefore, reflects a social and economic situation in which exploitative urbanism, powerful redistributive central institutions like the Roman state and Jewish temple, concentration of land holdings in the hands of the few, rising debt, and disrupted horizontal
relationships in society were becoming the norm. (p. 211)

Jesus responded to the destruction of the traditional economic system and the resulting oppressive state of the rural peasants. The traditional reciprocal economy had broken down to one based on redistribution. Jesus called for a return to universal reciprocity, a return to human solidarity and mutual support. The only patron needed was God, and the primary and over-arching patron-client relationship was between God and the individual.

Crossan (1994a) wrote that Jesus "had both a religious dream and a social program" (p. 3). His vision for a new purity paradigm was coupled with the social program he espoused. For Jesus, the kingdom of God was the "absolute conjunction of religion and politics" (Crossan, 1994a, p. 7). Jesus used ordinary imagery and circumstances to subvert the present view of God's kingdom. Therefore, as a leader, the elements of Jesus' response to his first-century context are:

- **Source of identity in a spiritual relationship:** Jesus challenged the source of identity and security of the ruling class. The primary source of identity and security was one's relationship with a loving God. [Abba, Congratulations Poor, Leaven, Vineyard Laborers, Samaritan]

- **Praxis of Attachment:** A relationship of love compelled a praxis of attachment, honor, and devotion. [Abba, Love of Enemies, Samaritan, Vineyard Laborers, Coat & Shirt, Second Mile]
• **Vision of renewal based on an alternative paradigm:** Jesus sought to renew the Jewish system. Jesus' renewal subverted the existing paradigm. [All of the red sayings and parables]

• **Politics of empowering others:** Jesus' challenged the knowledge of the ruling class and the status of the privileged. Jesus equalized the playing field. He left the response and the decision-making to the hearers. [Congratulations, Poor, Sad, and Hungry; Emperor and God, Samaritan, Mustard Seed, Leaven, Shrewd Manager]

• **Inclusive acceptance of persons and dynamic roles:** Jesus suggested new boundaries in understanding the concept of neighbor, and also accepted diversity. Jesus broke down role stereotypes. [Love of Enemies, Coat & Shirt, Second Mile, Leaven, Samaritan, Vineyard Laborers, Mustard Seed; Congratulations, Poor, Hungry, & Sad]

• **Field of reform comprehensive and holistic:** Jesus had a social praxis which went far beyond religious reform. Jesus also intended the reform of the political, economic, and social systems. [Other Cheek, Coat & Shirt, Second Mile, Give to Beggars, Vineyard Laborers; Love of Enemies; Congratulations, Poor, Sad, & Hungry]

• **Creative bold communicator:** Jesus used everyday language and known symbols to communicate a counter-order. He challenged the hearer to rethink his or her
paradigm, but he did not specify its form, just its nature. He provoked questions. He challenged simple cause-effect thinking. [All red sayings and parables]

The prevailing social structure had contrasting features:

- **Primary source of identity in the cultural elite**: The prevailing social structure represented the interests of the established class. It established boundaries, hierarchies, and status. Honor, the community's recognition of achievement, and religion were culturally conferred sources of identity and security.

- **Praxis of right action**: The challenge was right action. Honor came from adherence to holiness codes.

- **Vision of renewal based on existing paradigms**: Other renewal movement leaders were concerned about the social situation, but their solutions were based on the existing paradigm.

- **Politics of hierarchical power structures**: The hierarchical and androcentric nature of the culture supported the political system. Power was based on the status of the male in the purity society.

- **Separation and defined roles**: The sphere of behavior was defined according to holiness codes. Set boundaries and role definitions existed for women, Gentiles, nonobservant Jews, and sinners. The boundaries and role definitions of the elite gave them power.
• **Field of reform local and limited:** Other renewal movement leaders reformed the holiness system in order to renew the present status of a holiness people separated by God.

• **Traditional Communicators:** The later Pharisees who wrote parables used conventional wisdom themes and imagery.

In the ancient Near East, social power was located in religious and economic realities. Therefore, Jesus' ministry goals were not just religious, but, unlike the other reformers his ministry was distinctive. Though Jesus was recognized as a Jewish holy man, he differed from other such leaders in important ways (Borg, 1984). After his crucifixion he became the central figure in a new religion and several of his teachings are preserved in the New Testament. He proclaimed the kingdom of God and saw himself as a prophetic sage of this kingdom. He associated with outcasts. He challenged the religious and thus the cultural and social direction of the Jewish people.

**The Historical Jesus and Transformational Leadership**

Several previous researches have evaluated the transformational leadership of Jesus as the Christ of faith. This study looked at the leadership of Jesus as a historical person by analyzing the red sayings and parables of Jesus in the context of first-century Palestine. In this section, a comparison of the leadership elements of Jesus in first-century Palestine and the factors of transformational leadership offers fresh affirmation of his transformational leadership capacity and provokes new thinking
about the nature of transformational leadership. The factors of transformational leadership are four: (1) idealized influence, (2) inspirational motivation, (3) intellectual stimulation, and (4) individualized consideration.

The leader's idealized influence provides vision and a sense of mission. The leader has high moral values and sets challenging goals. Followers identify with and emulate the leader. Jesus had a vision of renewal distinct from that of other renewal leaders. The kingdom of God presented by Jesus was based on universal reciprocity with God as the patron. In God's kingdom the socially and economically oppressed inherit God's favor. Jesus' vision inspired the loyalty of his followers and the birth of the Christian church. His vision was based on imitating God through a code of mercy.

The leader with inspirational motivation communicates vision, using symbols and images to focus efforts, and emotional appeals to increase understanding. Jesus was a creative communicator who used ordinary images to challenge the thinking of his hearers. His parables and stories emotionally impacted the audience in order for them to see an alternative paradigm; for instance, the Samaritan hero created emotional dissonance. However, Jesus did not shock his audience in order to manipulate their feelings, but rather his subversive use of traditional symbols, such as leaven, and the use of everyday common events, such as work or making bread, helped the hearer identify with the sayings and parables.

The leader who provides intellectual stimulation, encourages problem-solving and promotes intelligence and rationality. The leader encourages followers to think on their own and to question their values. Jesus challenged the traditional understandings
of the purity system and the conflict system. The woman hiding leaven, the patron basing worth on acceptance and not on behavior, the loving of one's enemies -- all provoked reflection. However, Jesus did not give specific "how to's" for this kingdom of God. He encouraged each person to consider God's claims on his or her life and then to decide. Jesus always left the hearer with the responsibility of sorting out a response, as illustrated by the saying Emperor and God.

Individualized consideration exists when a leader coaches, advises, and treats each one as an individual. Followers become aware of their need to mature and are encouraged to grow. In Jesus' parables, the individual's merit came from God's acceptance, not others. Therefore, a woman, a Samaritan, and a shrewd manager were all ambassadors depicting God's rule and acceptance. Jesus' attention to the poor, the hungry, and the sad indicated his concern for the powerless. The parodies about loving one's enemies, turning the other cheek, and walking the extra mile suggest that status is not the object of maturity, but love is.

Transactional leadership is characterized as an exchange between leader and follower in order to accomplish individual or organizational interests. Most of the other leadership models in first-century Palestine seemed to be transactional. The holiness codes, the honor-shame challenges for defining worth, and the pre-industrial agrarian model all depended on an exchange system. Right behavior led to covenantal favor. The patron offered limited goods for the client's loyalty. The unbalanced redistribution system of the elite with the rural peasant kept the peasants in an oppressive exchange system.
The similarities between the leadership of Jesus and transformational leadership are obvious. This study based the relationship of Jesus' leadership to transformational leadership on a historical perspective rather than a faith perspective. However, the leadership of the historical Jesus provides additional insights into the construct of transformational leadership. As noted in the first two chapters, transformational leadership works best in a culture experiencing rapid change. Jesus was such a leader in such a circumstance. Therefore, Jesus' leadership suggests other qualities about the nature of transformational leadership.

The leadership of Jesus suggests that effective transformational leaders have their source of identity in a spiritual relationship. Jesus' security about his message was founded in his Abba relationship with his God. The basis of Jesus' message to others was that their security and identity comes fundamentally from a spiritual relationship and not from social, religious, or economic status. A leader thus grounded would be less likely to look for security in wealth or positions of power. The leader would remain focused on the security he or she finds in a relationship with God, and would be more likely to act ethically and courageously, since status and rewards would not be the primary motivational factor.

Jesus' leadership also implies that the individualized consideration of a transformational leader is more comprehensive than just attention to one's followers. The transformational leader has an orientation of attachment and responsibility toward all persons. For Jesus, love meant acceptance of a person's worth and a person's right to inclusion. Jesus encouraged solidarity with the whole of humankind,
not just with kinship groups. The leader has an ethical responsibility to practice love
toward whomever crosses the leader's path, be it the cab driver, the airline
reservationist, or the grocery clerk.

Also, it is easy to value a colleague, but much harder to value a competitor or
an outcast (which will vary from group to group). Jesus was comfortable with all
persons, because Jesus fundamentally accepted them. Not having enemies allows the
leader to focus on the transformation of his or her system rather than the destruction
of "enemies." Having a social perspective which cares for all humankind also keeps
the leader open to other ways of thinking and opens up a wider field of possible
creative solutions.

The politics of empowering others confirms the value of attending to all
voices, both those with and those without power. Such politics allows the leader to
value the voice and impact of each individual in a company. In contrast, artificial
boundaries, hierarchical power arrangements, and outcome-based rather than process-
based decision-making, are more descriptive of leadership functioning as
management.

Some might object to the transformational leadership factors of sourcing one's
identity in a spiritual relationship and of having a praxis of attachment and
responsibility and a politics of empowering others. Some might say that Jesus was a
spiritual transformational leader and thus would have a spiritual orientation.
Therefore, they might consider the above factors unimportant for leaders in the
business or education fields. In fact, some might consider these factors trite or even
dangerous in the competitive modern marketplace. However, Jesus was not just interested in the spiritual renewal of Israel. His renewal movement had social, political, and economic ramifications. Jesus was transforming a paradigm, an entire social system. His spiritual relationship with God served as the source of his vision and energy for this new paradigm.

Jesus' paradigm for renewal was comprehensive and holistic. Simply seeing business as a way to make a profit, rather than as an opportunity to benefit the global community is descriptive of transactional leadership, whereas effective transformational leaders are motivated and sustained by a global vision. Therefore, effective transformational leaders consider the impact of renewal comprehensively and have a vision for an alternative paradigm. In conflicted settings or settings experiencing great change, the traditional paradigm no longer works for solving problems. Jesus' leadership suggests that effective transformational leaders use an alternative paradigm, a paradigm which subverts but does not destroy the traditional paradigm. For instance, Jesus' economic solution used the patron-client relationship and the system of reciprocity. However, he called for a change from the existing oppressive patron-client relationship and the unbalanced reciprocity to kinship (balanced) reciprocity based on God as the patron.

Jesus, as a transformational leader in a conflicted setting, confirms the importance of idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration. However, a study of his leadership through his red sayings and parables also suggests other factors of transformational leadership. This
study finds five. First, a transformational leader has her source of identity in a spiritual relationship. Second, a transformational leader has a praxis of attachment and responsibility. The leader has an ethical motivation as the basis for behaviors. Third, the transformational leader has a politics based on acceptance and respect for every individual. Fourth, the transformational leader has a comprehensive vision that engages the whole social system in which the leader works. Fifth, the vision of the transformational leader is based on the subversion of the traditional paradigm.

Jesus' Transformational Leadership and Wisdom

It seems from this study that wisdom is the piece that explains how a transformational leader can operate effectively in a changing and conflicted system. Jesus was not just a renewal leader; he was also a critical wisdom sage. The study in Chapter Four confirmed the relationship of critical wisdom to psychological wisdom theory. This concluding section relates transformational leadership theory to wisdom theory as illustrated in the historical Jesus.

As seen in Chapter Four, Jesus was a critical wisdom sage who exhibited the features of wisdom theory. With the analysis of Jesus' sayings in the context of first-century Palestine, these features are even more evident. The features of wisdom introduced in Chapter One are: (1) a recognition and response to human limitation, (2) judgment and communication skills, (3) exceptional understanding of ordinary experience, and (4) personal, interpersonal, and transpersonal skills.

Jesus' red sayings and parables recognized the limitations of the cultural system of first-century Palestine. The sayings and parables were his response to those
limitations. The holiness codes tended to exclude certain people from God's kingdom, so Jesus proposed that the imitation of God be based on mercy and not on holiness codes of behavior. The contemporary patron-client relationship was oppressing the rural peasant, so Jesus proposed that honor comes from imitating God as the merciful patron. The unbalanced redistribution system of the urban elites led Jesus to suggest universal reciprocity as a basis for dealing with one another.

Jesus demonstrated exceptional judgment and communication skills. His saying about paying the emperor and God what belongs to each communicated the major premise of taxation without specifying an exact code of behavior for each person. This left the decision up to the questioner and the hearers. Jesus' use of everyday imagery and events enabled his audience to identify with the characters and events in his stories and sayings. He wanted to present a counter-order, so he subverted the expected through ordinary stories. The Samaritan story, for example, compelled the hearer to consider the limitations of the purity system.

Jesus had an exceptional understanding of ordinary experience. He knew that the poor felt excluded from the kingdom of God and that the urban elites were the ones who laid that burden on the shoulders of the poor. He knew that addressing God as Abba, "Dad," put God in a primary familial and intimate relationship with God's people. Jesus understood how the hearers of the parable of the Vineyard Laborers would have been confused by the wage given at the end of the day. His exceptional understanding of ordinary experience was the vehicle he used to present his
alternative vision. For example, in the parable of the Leaven, a woman making bread is the agent of God's kingdom.

From the content of his sayings, one can assume that Jesus had personal, interpersonal and transpersonal skills. A wise person is humble and socially unobtrusive. Jesus was comfortable with who he was and with his relationship to God. He was comfortable with diverse kinds of people. He advocated honoring the oppressed, loving enemies, and trusting a merciful God. Jesus did not seem to feel threatened by espousing a view which surely provoked a lot of controversy. Many of Jesus' challenges laid the responsibility for the present state of affairs at the feet of the powerful elite. He was comfortable enough within himself that he did not have to promote his own honor, but suggested that God is the one who bestows honor.

The features of Jesus' critical wisdom are: guidance for contradictions, paradigm of conflict, individual voice, and paradoxical view of reality. Chapter Four suggested that both critical wisdom and psychological wisdom deal with contradictions and change. Both are willing to deflate conventional ideas. For both, wisdom is expressed in outward behaviors. Both deal with exceptional judgments and communication skills. Both exhibit relationship skills. The features of critical wisdom confirmed the importance of the individual voice of the sage, and wisdom's ability to function best during chaos and change. Wise persons are able to steer through contradictions to a new reality. This suggests that wisdom has an important relationship to effective transformational leadership.
A social world experiencing destabilization through change and conflict is located in a paradigm of conflict. A paradigm of conflict requires a paradigm shift. Jesus came as one renewal leader among several into an unstable social world, calling for a paradigm shift among his contemporaries. He called for a bold reconstruction of the worldview of first-century Palestine. Other renewal leaders, particularly the Pharisees, tried to reform the traditional paradigm. The Essenes proposed a radical paradigm shift which still left many on the outside without solutions. Jesus proposed a solution which had an alternative paradigm constructed from the foundations of the traditional paradigm. Jesus was thoroughly acquainted with the traditional paradigm of his time. He did not attempt to destroy that paradigm, but only to shift its focus.

Transformational leadership also works best in a climate of change. This study suggests that, during times of change, an effective transformational leader is working in a paradigm of conflict. In order to be effective, the leader must be thoroughly acquainted with the traditional paradigm in order to offer a vision for an alternative paradigm. This would suggest that outsiders, brought in to solve a company's problems, would not be as effective as ones who are intimately acquainted with the culture or who are able and willing to immerse themselves in it and learn about it.

Jesus was able to shift the paradigm of first-century Palestine, because he had a paradoxical view of reality. Jesus focused on the paradoxes and ambiguities. This suggests that a vision for a paradigm shift comes from an awareness of existing paradoxes and ambiguities. The traditional order, the communal view of reality, has no insight for conflicts. The paradigm of order is concerned with comfort and
security, while the paradigm of conflict is concerned with contradictions. The wise person understands the limitations of order. Therefore, an effective transformational leader understands the contradictions and offers guidance through the chaos, or within the chaos.

This study also suggests that an effective transformational leader has a distinctive and individual voice. The vision of the transformational leader is communicated in a creative and distinctive way through the leader's unique understanding of the situation. The transactional leader will represent the communal voice and an orientation toward getting the job done. The transactional leader will have common sense. The sourcing of the identity of the leader in a spiritual relationship and a praxis of attachment distinguishes the transformational leader from the radical, the narcissistic, or the wayward charismatic leader. The transactional leader may also have a spiritual relationship, but attachment to the spiritual relationship is defined more by the transactional leader's faith community than by openness to God. The historical Jesus illustrates the relationship of wisdom to transformational leadership. The historical Jesus also provides us with an effective model for leadership during chaotic and conflicted times.
The purpose of this study is to suggest an integrating and interpreting framework for leadership. The study hypothesizes that wisdom is the construct that enables a leader to "see" and thus interpret more clearly a path of action. The theories of transformational leadership and of wisdom illustrated in Jesus clarify the "what" of leadership in a conflicted situation. Having both constructs operating in the person of Jesus suggests a link between the two theories and suggests that this link is "how" transformational leadership functions during chaos and change. Wisdom is the construct that enables leaders to "see" circumstances in a special way, and the "seeing" results in a leadership able to act transformationally in a changing culture.

Three questions explored were: (1) How does Jesus' wisdom mode cohere with modern psychological wisdom and common sense theories; (2) How does the historical Jesus' leadership style cohere with transformational and transactional leadership theory; and (3) How do modern wisdom theory and transformational leadership theory cohere together in the historical Jesus? In this final chapter, the answers to each of these questions will be summarized. After the summary sections follows a section on the implications of the study, suggestions for further study, and the limitations of the study.
Jesus and Wisdom Theory: The Mode

At the inception of his teaching, Jesus was seen as a prophetic sage in a culture long accustomed to the wisdom tradition. Jewish wisdom tradition was woven between two paradigms: the paradigm of order and the paradigm of conflict. Sages in the paradigm of order were concerned with correctness, righteousness, and conformity. Sages in the paradigm of conflict were concerned with steering through contradictions to a new reality.

Conventional sages established the group's social identity, focusing on relationships and order. Such sages were naturally conservative and usually represented the interests of the ruling and educated class. The overall purpose of conventional wisdom was the art of steering a successful course through life.

Conventional wisdom has four features. First, conventional wisdom gives practical guidance. Second, it operates in a paradigm of order. The central concern in a paradigm of order is for comfort and security. Third, conventional wisdom represents a communal view of reality. Such wisdom describes the long-standing consensus about how life works and how society functions. Fourth, conventional wisdom is the collective voice of a social group. Conventional wisdom is the summation of the wisdom of the past.

When compared to modern common sense theory, conventional wisdom has a clear relationship. Common sense is the accumulated shared beliefs of a culture. Besides having the features of common sensation (ordinary perception made through the five senses) and ordinary intelligence, common sense represents good sense and
common opinion. Good sense is the practical understanding and judgment about everyday behavior. Common opinion represents the collective good. Both conventional wisdom and common sense give practical guidance and represent the collective identity of a social group. The strength of both is their ability to establish order and security in a culture.

Conventional wisdom teaches that common sense works best in a paradigm of order. Therefore, if the social system is experiencing upheaval, common sense solutions do not often resolve conflicts. Common sense solutions are those adages which work well when stability and order are prevalent. Conventional wisdom also teaches that common sense approaches to problem-solving probably represent the interests of those in power. The communal view of reality is defined by persons in positions of authority. Common sense approaches, then, tend to ignore or to misunderstand the conditions and needs of the powerless or of outsiders.

Marcel (1954) lamented that common sense was disappearing in the twentieth-century. Perhaps common sense has not disappeared, but rather has broken down as a universally-shared system of norms for today's Americans. If the traditional views of those in authority are no longer held as common assumptions by various diverse groups within a society, then "common sense" solutions would not be perceived as common sense. The phenomenon is best explained as a lack of a common understanding about how to steer a way through life's complexities.

Smedslund (1982) defined common sense as those assumptions which all users agree are true in a given context. For the users, the negation of the assumptions
seems senseless. Because of the rapidity of change evident in today's social system, it would be difficult to find a majority opinion about what is true. Paradigms of order occur during times of stability. Common sense, like conventional wisdom, does not have moral insight for paradox or ambiguity. Therefore, without consensus about a group's social identity, a new view of reality is needed. Jesus sought to bring that to first-century Palestine where change and confusion was also rampant.

Jesus represented the sage from the critical wisdom tradition. In that tradition, conflict is the operating paradigm. The conflict paradigm operates during recurring crises. Several catastrophes, either personal or social, lead to a destabilization and fragmentation of the cultural traditions of the paradigm of order. Critical sages are concerned with the deepest questions which haunt human experience. They attempt to name the paradoxes evident within order. Their purpose is not to disrupt the order, but to reorient the social group to a better identity. Critical sages usually do not have power or status in the order social system.

Jesus was a critical wisdom sage who criticized the conventional wisdom of the first-century Jewish social world. His wisdom had four features. First, Jesus' critical wisdom gave guidance for contradictions. Second, Jesus' wisdom functioned in a paradigm of conflict. The destabilization of the Jewish social world caused by the Roman occupation, Hellenistic influences, and internal economic and social changes created great social upheavals. Third, Jesus sought to transform his social world by drawing attention to the paradoxes and ambiguities of life. He had a paradoxical view of reality. Fourth, Jesus' voice was individual and distinctive. His use of aphoristic
sayings and parables subverted the conventional wisdom of his day. Jesus' critical wisdom was the formulation of the future.

Modern wisdom theory defines wisdom as the integration of an individual's affective, conative, and cognitive abilities in response to life's tasks and problems (Birren & Fisher, 1990). The features of a modern sage are: (1) recognition of and response to human limitation, (2) judgment and communication skills, (3) exceptional understanding of ordinary experience, and (4) personal, interpersonal, and transpersonal skills. Jesus' critical wisdom is similar. Both Jesus' wisdom and modern wisdom deal with contradictions and change. Jesus as a sage exhibited judgment, communication skills, exceptional understanding, and a wide range of relationship skills.

Jesus' critical wisdom confirms that wisdom's primary task is to give guidance for contradictions. Jesus' wisdom teaches that wisdom functions best and is most needed in a paradigm of conflict. When diverse voices and rapid change disrupt the value of traditional norms, wisdom is needed to help create a new identity. Jesus' wisdom also confirms the distinctive and individual voice of the wise person. As a critical sage, Jesus' wisdom suggests that traditional authorities and structures are incapable of "seeing" in a nonprejudicial manner. Critical wisdom is needed when dogmatism negates mystery and ambiguity.

Sternberg (1990) commented that, for some, even the study of wisdom negates something of its mystery and ambiguity. Some think that the study of wisdom is in itself an unwise venture: "Efforts to make wisdom transparent and to transform it into
a subject matter of public knowledge and scientific debate is bound to change its basic foundation" (Sternberg, 1990, p. 89). Wisdom is a complex phenomenon, and the study of a complex construct is bound to misinterpret or not "see" something vital. Yet the importance of wisdom for today's paradigm of conflict compels the researcher to attempt its study. The industrial world has principally tended to validate technical knowledge and managerial expertise (Habermas, 1965/1971). The study of wisdom as it relates to transformational leadership is necessary to move toward a more balanced and holistic postindustrial view of influence. Scott (1971) wrote:

Institutions are man-made. If they fail to serve adequately the needs and aspirations of men they can be changed by men, and should be changed with a wisdom that can see beyond the immediate scene to a more distant prospect. (pp. 225-226)

Orwoll and Perlmutter (1990) wrote that studying wise persons helps to determine the universal characteristics of wisdom and the influence of the social environment on wisdom. Jesus' wisdom shares many of the same features as modern wisdom theory, and also demonstrates the impact of the social environment on the manifestation of wisdom. During times of stability or of defining a group's identity, conventional wisdom is important and active. During times of change and of conflicting influences, critical wisdom -- true wisdom, not common sense -- sages emerge to offer guidance through the contradictions.

Sampson (1989) confirmed that when history changes a society, former ways of viewing reality may not provide vision for new emerging issues. Meacham (1982)
and Collins (1962) both noted a relationship between the socio-historical context of
an individual and her understanding of wisdom. Therefore, leadership is needed
which is able to view reality differently and provide vision for new perspectives. The
sage, Jesus, was such a leader.

Jesus and Leadership Theory: The Manner

Jesus was a renewal movement leader in first-century Palestine. The socio-
critical analysis of his red sayings and parables, using the purity model, the conflict
model, and the pre-industrial agrarian model, revealed several features of Jesus'
leadership. First, Jesus sourced his identity and security in a spiritual relationship.
Second, his view of reality, centered on a merciful God, compelled a social praxis of
attachment. He based his social vision on attachment and devotion to all humankind.
Third, his vision of renewal subverted the existing paradigm. Fourth, Jesus had a
politics of empowering others. He challenged the status of the privileged. Fifth, Jesus
suggested new boundaries for social relationships. Jesus was comfortable with
diversity and broke down traditional boundaries, whether social, economic, religious,
or political. Sixth, Jesus' field of reform was comprehensive and holistic, and lastly,
he was a creative bold communicator.

These descriptors of Jesus' leadership do not necessarily mean that
transformational leaders everywhere will have the same features. In other words,
some social systems might already empower others or might function with an identity
sourced in a spiritual relationship rather than a social one. The significant features of
Jesus' leadership are that he "saw" the limitations of his present social system, and he had a vision and a passion for its renewal. His vision was comprehensive, and he communicated that vision clearly and boldly. Jesus also led out of compassion and commitment to others. He was not motivated by a need for personal power, status, or wealth. His interests seemed to be completely based on a desire to serve others and to correct injustices in the social system.

Compared to transformational leadership, Jesus' leadership was very similar. Jesus modeled idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration. Jesus' leadership raised the consciousness of his followers by appealing to higher values and humanitarianism. This study collaborates Burns' (1978) belief that transformational leadership stimulates change that is moral. Jesus' leadership also coheres with Tichy and Devanna's (1990) transformational leader descriptors: Jesus was a change agent; he was courageous; he empowered others; he was able to handle complexity and ambiguity, and; he was a visionary. Tichy and Devanna (1990) also described transformational leaders as value-driven.

However, Jesus' leadership further suggests that effective transformational leaders have their source of identity and security in a spiritual relationship. Several authors have written that effective leaders attend to their own spirituality and the spirituality of organizational life (e.g., Conger, 1994; Renesch, 1992; Vaill, 1989). Jesus' leadership was also committed to correct injustices and to break down socially-placed barriers which excluded or suppressed the voices of the powerless. Jesus' leadership concerns were value-based. Jesus' leadership also indicates that a
transformational vision has an impact on the whole culture of a system and is created from an alternative paradigm. Jesus' vision for change, though contextualized within first-century Palestine, was comprehensive in its scope, involving the renewal of the social, economic, and political system. Transformational leaders are creative and compassionate visionaries.

The study of Jesus' leadership in the context of first-century Palestine also complements transactional leadership theory. Transactional leadership features contingent reward and management by exception. Contingent reward is an exchange of rewards, such as salary and job security, for effort and good performance. Management by exception occurs when a manager watches for deviations from the rules and takes corrective action. In contrast to Jesus' leadership, the leadership found in the social structures of first-century Palestine were: (1) primary source of identity in the cultural elite, (2) praxis of right action, (3) vision of renewal based on the existing paradigm, (4) politics of hierarchical power, (5) separation and role-definition of others, (6) field of reform local and limited, and (7) traditional communication.

Comparing the two indicates that the powerful urban elite led transactionally. This does not mean that groups like the Pharisees or the Essenes were not spiritual, sincere, or effective in their reform efforts. Rather, it does suggest that transactional leadership relies on traditional structures of authority, and that the vision for reform is more localized and homogeneous with the group's particular view of reality.

Historically, even Biblically, one reaction to the threat of outside influences was to
tighten authority, define group roles and expectations, quickly punish or shame deviance, and solve existing problems with solutions from the past. It is possible that the threat of chaos or annihilation might be so profound that this type of reaction is the one needed to assure survival. However, the transformation of a social system requires an approach which, as modeled by Jesus, is more courageous and comprehensive.

Today's complex and diverse social system needs leaders like Jesus. Kanter (1983) called for innovative leaders and described such leaders as able to encourage "their people to solve problems, to seek new ideas, to challenge established wisdom, to experiment, [and] to innovate" (p. 20). Kanter (1983) believed that innovation stems from moving beyond received wisdom to integrative problem-solving. His implicit ideas of innovative leadership cohere with the distinctions made in this study between transactional leadership with its conventional wisdom and transformational leadership with its critical wisdom.

A singular problem with leadership such as Jesus' is its risk. Jesus was killed. He was crucified, not because he might have said he was the son of God, but because his vision threatened the delicate balance of powers that existed between the ruling elites and the Roman conquerors (Tatum, 1982). Other such leaders have also been murdered for their vision which threatened traditional power structures and social norms: Abraham Lincoln, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., and Itzak Rabin.
Leadership and Wisdom: Modeled by Jesus

Jesus as a sage and a renewal leader provides a model for the study of the relationship between wisdom and leadership. This study suggests that wisdom explains how a transformational leader can operate effectively in a changing system. In order to "see" clearly in a system with conflicting solutions, the leader must be wise. The features of wisdom and transformational leadership are similar. Both deal with ambiguity and change. Wisdom and transformational leadership function best and are most needed during chaos and conflict. Both demonstrate effective communication skills and relationship skills. Both know how to attend to and consider individual needs. Both stimulate maturation in others.

Max De Pree (1989) believed that the first responsibility of the leader is to define reality. Jesus, as a critical wisdom sage, had a paradoxical view of reality and thus was able to see the limitations of the paradigm of order. Then Jesus was able to be the individual voice giving guidance for change. Transformational leaders, in order to transform a social system, need this same perspective. A different way of seeing allows the leader to give guidance and make judgments that resolve dilemmas in an exceptional way. These leaders are thoroughly acquainted with the assumptions and norms of the system, and are thus able to use familiar symbols, ordinary expressions, and experiences to challenge individuals to change.

The study of Jesus' wisdom suggests that transformational leadership is the individual voice which has a vision for an alternative social paradigm. This voice has a paradoxical view of reality, so such a leader is able to attend to diverse solutions
and nontraditional alternatives. The individual voice is not the same as individualism, but rather is the courage to make a difference for others. Jesus' wisdom also suggests that effective transformational leaders understand the prevailing paradigm well enough to recognize its limitations. From the recognition of its limitations, the leader has a new vision for renewal.

Jesus' critical wisdom leadership indicates that the vision for renewal is moral and encourages the maturation and empowerment of followers. Jesus' leadership was value laden. He was challenging first-century Palestinians to a supreme good which was not discriminatory or unjust. Burns (1978) believed that values motivated leaders and that the function of leadership was to stimulate the change of values to higher and higher levels.

Rost (1991) noted that Burns' theory of transformational leadership, though revolutionary in its attention to moral leadership, is not helpful for making ethical decisions because it does not "deal realistically with the conceptual ambiguities of the ethical content of leadership" (p. 164). Wisdom represents that level of human development which is comfortable with ambiguity and is able to deal with contradictions. Rost felt that Burns left unaddressed three problems with the moral leadership of the transformational leader.

The first problem is that the ethical issue in a leadership context lies not in the moral character of the leader, but in the impact of her decisions. Rost (1991) asks: "Will the changes that the leaders and followers propose eliminate discriminatory practices in this organization so that justice can be served?" (p. 164). Jesus modeled
wise leadership which aimed at eliminating economic, religious, and social discrimination. Jesus pointed out the problems that first-century power structures and social mores created for others. The parable of the Vineyard Laborers, for example, evaluated the complex issue of "what is right" regarding pay.

Second, Rost questioned transformational leadership's purpose as raising leaders and followers to higher levels of morality. Rost believed that the purpose of leadership was not personal redemption, but rather organizational impact that raises the institution to higher levels of morality. Jesus' leadership as a critical wisdom sage was directed toward total social renewal. His kingdom of God parables described a rule of life which moved far beyond simple social preservation and individual empowerment. He compared the kingdom of God to unholy persons, things, and activities. Jesus had a vision for a higher level of maturity for first-century Palestine.

Third, Rost pointed out the pretense of a leader knowing exactly what is the higher moral ground. Ethical pluralism makes such consensus very difficult. Again, Jesus as a wise leader understood the complexities of morality. His parable about the Shrewd Manager left the Jewish hearer of the parable in an uncomfortable moral dilemma. The hearer was not able to sanction the actions of the owner or the manager. Wisdom understands the complexities of moral decision-making. The wise leader is more apt to work with others in coming to a consensus about the best way to proceed.

Transformational leadership, as a model of leadership, is inadequate. However, with the construct of wisdom, the model is closer to clarifying the nature of leadership able to deal with positive social change. This type of social change impacts
the entire system toward higher levels of motivation and morality. Csikszentmihalyi and Rathunde (1990) noted that the cognitive dimension of wisdom has been researched, but that the moral aspects of wisdom, though recognized, have received little research. Jesus' vision had far-reaching moral implications for first-century Palestine.

The study of wisdom in the historical Jesus confirms Birren and Fisher's (1990) belief that wise leaders are a critical element in today's rapidly-changing world. Wise leaders are more capable of tackling complex problems and making crucial decisions using exceptional insight and judgments. Leaders in the twenty-first century must be able to navigate through a multiplicity of perspectives (Wheatley, 1992). Leadership based solely on common sense and traditional structures and paradigms will not be able to problem-solve effectively or creatively. Wise leaders use common sense, but they are aware of its limitations and of its nature to represent the views of those in power. Common sense provides the practical social knowledge which is needed in order to effectively communicate and thus challenge a group to change.

This study confirms Birren's (1985) belief that wise leaders have a greater capacity for dealing with long-range issues. Jesus modeled that wise leadership is geared toward comprehensive and long-term social problem-solving. Jesus demonstrated that wise leaders have diagnostic ability (Hersey & Blanchard, 1993), and are peak performers (Baltes & Smith, 1990).
Several modern wisdom theorists have defined wisdom as an integration of the affective, conative, and cognitive abilities in order to respond to life's problems. Wisdom is a balanced dialogue between cognition and affect which results in positive chosen behavior (Birren & Fisher, 1990). Transformational leaders are those who are able to stimulate intellectual development and emotional maturation. Jesus challenged the minds and the hearts of first-century Palestinians.

Argyris (1976) related effective leadership with learning to change the underlying values and assumptions of a system. He wrote that leaders need to "know how to discover difficult questions, how to create viable problem-solving networks to invent solutions to these questions, and how to generate and channel human energy and commitment to produce solutions" (p. ix). Wisdom and transformational leadership combined enable the leader to change underlying values and assumptions. Jesus was trying to change the common sense assumptions and beliefs of his social system. He stimulated that change by communicating the limitations of the system and by offering a solution, a new type of kingdom.

Implications

The relationship of wisdom to leadership has many implications for researchers, educators, and practitioners in the fields of wisdom and leadership theory. Understanding the nature of wisdom, and the function of wisdom as the key to how a leader can act transformationally in a chaotic environment, clarifies the construct of transformational leadership. It also confirms that a major function of wisdom is providing guidance in social institutions. Training, mentoring, or
evaluating persons for leadership would need to include an analysis of persons' ability for and development toward wisdom.

Kramer (1990) proposed a model of wisdom in which integration of the affective and cognitive development of an individual occurs through a cycle of wisdom processes, functions, and resolutions. Wisdom-related processes are: (1) recognition of individuality, (2) recognition of context, (3) ability to interact effectively, (4) understanding of change and growth, and (5) attention to affect and cognition. Jesus was an individual voice keenly aware of his context. His red sayings indicate that he demonstrated an ability to interact effectively, that he understood change and growth, and that he gave attention to affect and cognition. Training or evaluation for transformational leadership should attend to each of these processes.

Most institutions and businesses that prepare persons for leadership focus primarily on the content information needed in the field and the managerial skills needed such as administration, time management, goal setting, and team building. Adams (1986) described leadership as a state of consciousness rather than particular skills or personality traits. Kramer's wisdom processes are abilities of the conscious. This study suggests that wisdom-related processes have a more fundamental impact on the effectiveness of leadership.

Jesus also demonstrated the interrelated functions of wisdom (Kramer, 1990): (1) solution of problems confronting self, (2) advising others, (3) management of social institutions, (4) life review, and (5) spiritual introspection. Kramer (1990) suggested that these processes and functions lead to resolutions of crises and
dilemmas. This study of Jesus' wisdom and his leadership indicates a coherence with Kramer's assessment of wisdom. Therefore, the training and development of transformational leaders would need to attend to the processes and functions of wisdom.

An essential purpose of this study was to clarify the nature of wise leadership in order to create a value for it. If wisdom and transformational leadership is clarified by the critical wisdom and renewal leadership of Jesus, most organizations would not desire it. Wise transformational leadership transforms environments through a counter-order which requires comprehensive and holistic change toward higher values and goals. Many businesses, educational institutions, hospitals, and churches want to be more profitable or effective in accomplishing their goals, but few truly want the kind of change created by leadership such as Jesus'. However, survival might depend on a more creative and courageous leadership which is not afraid to challenge the assumptions and power structures of an institution or a social system.

Csikszentmihalyi and Rathunde (1990) researched the meaning of wisdom over a period of twenty-five centuries. They consistently found that wisdom had three main dimensions: a cognitive process, a guide to action, and an intrinsic personal reward. As a cognitive process, wisdom "refers to attempts at understanding the world in a disinterested way, seeking the ultimate consequences of events as well as ultimate causes while preserving the integration of knowledge" (p. 48). Wisdom is far-sighted and comprehensive in its decision-making processes. Jesus exhibited such a leadership. Wisdom preserves individuals and communities from short-sighted and
limited vision. With the complexity of today's social, political, and economic problems, leadership is needed which is wise.

Wisdom, as a virtue combined with the nature of its cognitive processes, "provides the most compelling guide to action" (Csikszentmihalyi & Rathunde, 1990, p. 48). Wisdom protects leaders and followers from the devastating pursuit of self-interests which give no thought to the implications of decisions. Jesus' moral vision compelled him to action. He traveled from place to place, communicating his vision and training followers.

Also, wisdom as a personal good brings happiness and enjoyment to an individual. Leaders today are plagued by stress and burnout (Doohan, 1982). Burnout results in physical and emotional exhaustion. Some causes of burnout are "an authoritarian management style, and an inability to delegate authority . . . a lack of talent or ability to achieve a goal . . . and an inability to communicate strong feelings" (Doohan, 1982, p. 353). Jesus as a wise leader was nonauthoritarian, was able to empower others and achieve his goals, and was able to communicate his strong feelings. Wisdom would help insure the happiness of leaders and followers. They would be able to balance the demands on their lives, share power, and integrate conflicting information in order to do creative problem-solving.

Another implication is the contribution that wisdom brings to making a better world. Therefore, wise persons should be trained, encouraged, and sought for helping transform an institution. Wisdom is found most often, but not exclusively, in older adults. Western culture tends to treat old age as a phenomenon of decline.
Researchers, such as Baltes and Staudinger (1993), have found that older wise adults move beyond solving problems with just factual knowledge and procedural knowledge (strategies of information search and decision-making). Older, wise adults are also able to deal with uncertainty, relativism, and life-span contextualism (age, culture, idiosyncratic contexts, and priorities of life domains). Therefore, older leaders have the potential of being the best leaders.

Birren (1985) bemoaned the practice of retiring persons early exactly when they are the most mature and competent to lead effectively. Birren (1985) wrote:

The qualities of wisdom are sorely needed in leadership positions in various institutions of society. The use of wise elders in institutional roles is arousing interest not only because of the shift in age structure of society, but because older wise persons may bring to organizations and nations better balance and a greater capacity for dealing with long-range issues, in contrast to the immediate returns that often are of more consequence to the young. (p.35)

Wisdom guides persons toward considering the consequences of judgments and actions (Clayton, 1982). Rationality as a problem-solving skill is insufficient for making judgments in complex situations (Khandwalla, 1985). Therefore, businesses and institutions would benefit from consulting with older wise persons before implementing changes.

However, a word of caution is necessary. Wisdom is not directly equated with aging. Many times the problem in older entrenched leaders and followers is a lack of vision and an inability to deal with change. Wisdom is a domain developed chiefly
through individual life experience rather than aging (Smith & Baltes, 1990). This suggests that the stimulation of wise leaders comes through a diversity of leadership experiences. Therefore, young leaders can be stimulated to develop wisdom if wisdom is a value sought by a company and if the young leader is exposed to a wide variety of leadership experiences. This suggests that the tendency to localize and specialize managers would inhibit their development as wise leaders.

Another implication of wise transformational leadership is that leaders will express doubts and question the traditional assumptions underlying an institution. Argyris (1976) discovered that Chief Executive Officers equated strong leadership with not having doubts, not asking for help, and not expressing much feeling.

Usually, the CEO has the role of influencing the culture of an organization. The CEO is expected to be a catalyst for change. This study implies that, in order to influence the culture of an organization, doubts are necessary. Doubts lead to asking questions, seeking solutions, and getting input from followers. However, in many traditional settings, especially the ministry, an expression of doubt about a church culture usually means the professional doom of the minister. She will probably never serve as a bishop or superintendent. This study suggests that an organization wanting to grow will not just reward traditional leaders with positions of authority, but will also nurture and empower wise transformational leadership.

Wise transformational leadership has important implications for today's culture. The first-century Jewish world and the twentieth-century postmodern world both experienced conflicting interests and changes. Today, paradox, pluralism, and
diversity is rampant. Handy (1994) believed that people need to learn to balance contradictions and inconsistencies in order to find a better way. Jesus wanted to show a better way to his contemporaries. Wisdom is the construct most capable of managing paradox in order to find that better way.

Berquist (1993) called for postmodern leaders who are able to master the unexpected and can tolerate ambiguity. Wisdom is the construct which encourages this ability in leaders. Bolman and Deal (1991) called for leadership which is flexible, versatile, and deeply moral. They wrote, "The truly effective manager and leader will need multiple tools, the skill to use each of them, and the wisdom to match frames to situations" (p. 12). Wise transformational leadership is a model for this type of leadership in today's postmodern culture.

Cleveland (1985) noted that, in today's postmodern culture, information is the most important and pervasive resource, and the leadership needed to manage information is different from that used to manage things. He called for information achievers who know how to integrate knowledge. He described them as risk-taking, unafraid of newness, intellectually curious, interested in others' thinking, and courageous. However, the management of information is potentially a very dangerous skill if the person is not also moral and committed to the growth and empowerment of others. A characteristic of wisdom is the ability to integrate information. A more important characteristic of wisdom provides for protection from the misuse of information. Wisdom seeks the good of the community, not just the profit of one
company. Jesus did not use his insights to empower himself, but rather he used them to set free the oppressed.

Suggestions for Further Research

Jesus' leadership today is primarily interpreted as religious. In order to check the reliability of the conclusions for transformational leadership in general, other transformational leaders should be studied. Particularly, more study is needed to ascertain whether transformational leaders have their identity sourced in a spiritual relationship and whether they have a politics and praxis of attachment (love). More study is needed to see if wisdom and leadership relate today in the same way Jesus' critical wisdom and renewal leadership related in first-century Palestine.

Another important arena of study for the relationship of transformational leadership and wisdom would be to study "ordinary" transformational leaders whose sphere of influence is small. Maccoby (1981) demonstrated that good leadership must and can be found at various interdependent levels in a company. Therefore, the study of church leaders, educational administrators, parents, teachers, or small business owners would validate the data as generalizable for many. The question is whether Jesus was a unique and atypical type of leader or whether he truly is a model of leadership for anyone in the position of influencing others.

Study is also needed to address the problem of leadership which transforms a social system, but the results are ambivalent or negative. Some leaders have an alternative paradigm and comprehensive solutions to conflicting problems, but, upon reflection, their leadership had a negative impact. This study suggests that those kinds
of transformational leaders would have discrepancies between their wisdom mode and their leadership manner. Perhaps the wisdom mode clarifies the difference between wise transformational leadership and leadership which transforms. This would need to be researched.

Another area for studying the relationship of wisdom to leadership is to research the wise leadership of a woman. Orwell and Achenbaum (1993) researched the possible gender differences between men and women in the development and expression of wisdom. Traditionally, feminine ways of knowing have been devalued. The researchers did find that wise "actions" are described as combining the masculine and feminine sensibilities of integrity, mature interpersonal relationships, and spiritual/philosophical commitments. However, they also found that culturally-based perceptions of wisdom tended to favor masculine prototypes.

Hackman and others (1992) studied perceptions of gender-role characteristics and transformational leadership. Though leadership is often associated with masculinity and followership with femininity, the researchers found that transformational leadership required both masculine and feminine characteristics. However, since wisdom perceptions favor masculine prototypes, and since this study used a male leader, a study looking at the relationship of transformational leadership and wisdom through the eyes of a female leader would be useful. Such a study could confirm or disconfirm the outcomes found in this study, and could also further evaluate the nature of wisdom in a woman leader.
Limitations

Sometimes the danger of unveiling a piece of the leadership puzzle is the tendency to commercialize the information. The proliferation of seminars, books, and training centers on leadership is more often fueled by the desire to compete than to transform. Transformational leadership itself has become a faddish term almost to the point that no one takes it seriously anymore. It was yesterday's fare. People move on before really pushing the boundaries and experimenting fully with the implications of what is learned. Adding wisdom to the discussion of leadership could create a similar reaction. Everyone will want to be wise, think they are wise, or have it as another objective on their leadership training menus.

Several dangers are inherent at this point. Csiksentmihalyi and Rathunde (1990) warned that many persons confuse expertise with wisdom. Prestigious degrees, specialized experiences, and important networking connections are helpful assets. However, specialties do not guarantee wise leadership. Wise persons use their expertise, but they focus on practical affairs and relationships and reflect on ways to offer guidance through contradictions. Knowledge can lead to pride, but wisdom results in humility.

Wisdom has always been equated with humility. Holliday and Chandler (1986) called it social unobtrusiveness. Therefore, wisdom cannot be acquired simply by exposure to its character. Wisdom is not something one owns, but rather it is the outcome of one's development. A business should take care not to shift the focus from the functions of wisdom to the wise individual. If the focus is on the one able to guide
the company through its current crisis, the danger is that others will not take responsibility for their own development and their own responsibility to influence. Wisdom knows its limitations and relies on the input of all those involved and impacted by decision-making processes.

In a study such as this, care also must be taken not to create an overly-idealized vision of an organizational "savior." Jesus as a model for leadership might suggest that an institution only needs a certain type of leader in order to flourish. First, the reader must remember that Jesus' ministry was short, and he was killed for his vision. Leadership such as his is courageous, but also extremely controversial. Second, the reader must note that Jesus' vision did not die with him. Jesus' followers recreated his vision in their own lives. His followers became the new leaders with the same mission to renew Judaism. When it was clear that the vision (as interpreted by those who believed in the Christ of faith) became incompatible with Judaism, the Christian movement was born. In other words, transformational leaders are successful when they have followers who recreate the vision in their own leadership venues.

An institution that desires change should not look for a "savior," but for a leadership which is mature, compassionate, and visionary, and for a followership which has the same characteristics or at least is willing to move toward those values. Though this study is focused on the nature of leadership, this author is aware of the interrelatedness and interdependence of leadership and followership (Rost, 1991). Wisdom itself is a construct which acknowledges the interrelatedness of experiences
(Csikszentmihalyi & Rathunde, 1990). Therefore, a wise leader would value, empower, and work with followers toward mutual goals.

Another limitation regarding the study of Jesus is the diversity of portraits scholars have proposed regarding his identity and mission. This study did not try to create a complete portrait of the historical Jesus, but only tried to evaluate the nature of his leadership and wisdom. Even so, the rule of evidence used by the Jesus Seminar scholars also pertains to this study: "Beware of finding a Jesus entirely congenial to you" (Funk, et al., 1990, p. 5). It is hoped that this study was careful to present as data and interpretations of data, material about Jesus that is broadly accepted among historical Jesus scholars. However, even the veridicality of that data can change and probably will change. Carlston (1980) warned, "As methods change and become more refined, evaluations of the probable will also change, and we must be content to live and work with a more or less continuous spectrum of probability" (p. 104).

Another limitation is that leadership is not a separate reality which can be observed, dissected, and understood from a distance. Hunt and others (1988) identified leadership as a socially-constructed reality. Leadership research reflects the assumptions, values, and preconceptions of the researchers. The nature of the wise transformational leader is constructed from this researcher's own dynamic but time and culture-bound viewpoint. Therefore, it is possible that other interpretations of the same information exist. It is also probable that the model of transformational leadership will continue to evolve until perhaps it is discarded altogether.
The shaping and analysis of the information and its comparison to leadership and wisdom theories represent the interpretations of this researcher. Therefore, the conclusions of the study are humbly extended for evaluation. This author realizes that leadership models will continue to evolve, portraits of Jesus will continue to unfold, and understandings about wisdom will continue to develop. However, this researcher believes that research about the nature and function of leadership should include discussion about the construct of wisdom. The historical Jesus was not only one who could "see," but was one who "set an example for all the world to see" [Crossan's translation of Jesus' words] (Crossan, 1994a, p. 36).
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APPENDICES
### The Development of the Jesus Tradition in the Gospels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>27 C.E.</th>
<th>50 C.E.</th>
<th>70 C.E.</th>
<th>90 C.E.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crucifixion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall of Jerusalem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerusalem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>100 C.E.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>70 C.E.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke</td>
<td>90 C.E.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew</td>
<td>80 C.E.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>70-100 C.E.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>50 C.E.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Tradition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parables &amp; Aphorisms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**THE LIFE OF JESUS**
1. Other Cheek (Q) -- Mt. 5:39 and Lk. 6:29a

Don't react violently against the one who is evil: when someone slaps you on the right cheek, turn the other as well.

1. Coat & Shirt (Q) -- Mt. 5:40 and Lk. 6:29b

When someone wants to sue you for your shirt, let that person have your coat along with it.

2. Congratulations, Poor! (Q, Thomas) -- Lk. 6:20; Th. 54; Mt. 5:3

Congratulations, you poor!

God's domain [kingdom of God] belongs to you.

3. Second Mile (Q) -- Mt. 5:41

Further, when anyone conscripts you for one mile, go an extra mile.

4. Love of Enemies (Q) -- Lk. 6:27b; Mt. 5:44b; Lk. 6:32, 35a

...love your enemies....

5. Leaven (Q, Thomas) -- Lk. 13:20-21; Mt. 13:33; Th. 96:1-2

What does God's imperial rule [kingdom of God] remind me of? It is like leaven which a woman took and concealed in fifty pounds of flour until it was all leavened.

6. Emperor & God (Thomas, Mark) -- Th. 100:2b; Mk. 12:17b; Lk. 20:25b; Mt. 22:21c

Pay the emperor what belongs to the emperor, and God what belongs to God!
7. **Give to Beggars** (Q) -- Mt. 5:42a; Lk. 6:30a

   Give to the one who begs from you.

7. **The Samaritan** (L-Lk's special source, not borrowed from Mark or Q) -- Lk. 10:30-35

   There was a man going from Jerusalem down to Jericho when he fell into the hands of robbers. They stripped him, beat him up, and went off, leaving him half dead. Now by coincidence a priest was going down that road; when he caught sight of him, he went out of his way to avoid him. In the same way, when a Levite came to the place, he took one look at him and crossed the road to avoid him.
   But this Samaritan who was traveling that way came to where he was and bandaged his wounds, pouring olive oil and wine on them. He hoisted him onto his own animal, brought him to an inn, and looked after him. The next day he took out two silver coins, which he gave to the innkeeper, and said, "Look after him, and on my way back I'll reimburse you for any extra expense you have had."

8. **Congratulations, hungry!** (Q, Thomas) -- Lk. 6:21a; Mt. 5:6; Th. 69:2

   Congratulations, you hungry! You will have a feast.

8. **Congratulations, sad!** (Q) -- Lk. 6:21b; Mt. 5:4

   Congratulations, you who weep now! You will laugh.

9. **Shrewd Manager** (L) -- Lk. 16:1-8a

   There was a rich man whose manager had been accused of squandering his master's property. He called him in and said, "What's this I hear about you? Let's have an audit of your management, because your job is being terminated."
   Then the manager said to himself, "What am I going to do? My master is firing
me. I'm not strong enough to dig ditches and I'm ashamed to beg. I've got it!
I know what I'll do so doors will open for me when I'm removed from
management."
So he called in each of his master's debtors. He said to the first, "How much
do you owe my master?"
He said, "Five hundred gallons of olive oil."
And he said to him, "Here is your invoice; sit down right now and make it
two hundred and fifty."
Then he said to another, "And how much do you owe?"
He said, "A thousand bushels of wheat."
He says to him, "Here is your invoice, make it eight hundred."
The master praised the dishonest manager because he had acted shrewdly;...

9. Vineyard Laborers (M-Mt.'s special source, not from Mk. or Q) -- Mt. 20:1-15

For Heaven's imperial rule [kingdom of Heaven] is like a proprietor who
went out the first thing in the morning to hire workers for his vineyard. After
agreeing with the workers for a silver coin a day he sent them into his vineyard.
And coming out around 9 a.m. he saw others loitering in the marketplace
and he said to them, "You go into the vineyard too, and I'll pay you whatever is
fair." So they went.
Around noon he went out again, and at 3 p.m., and repeated the process.
About 5 p.m. he went out and found others loitering about and says to them,
"Why did you stand around here idle the whole day?"
They reply, "Because no one hired us."

He tells them, "You go into the vineyard as well."

When evening came the owner of the vineyard tells his foreman: "Call the workers and pay them their wages starting with those hired last and ending with those hired first."

Those hired at 5 p.m. came up and received a silver coin each. Those hired first approached thinking they would receive more. But they also got a silver coin apiece. They took it and began to grumble against the proprietor: "These guys hired last worked only an hour but you have made them equal to us who did most of the work during the heat of the day."

In response he said to one of them, "Look, pal, did I wrong you? You did agree with me for a silver coin, didn't you? Take your wage and get out! I intend to treat the one hired last the same way I treat you. Is there some law forbidding me to do with my money as I please? Or is your eye filled with envy because I am generous?"

9. **Abba, Father (Q)** -- Lk. 11:2b; Mt. 6:9b; Mt. 6:9c

   Father [the beginning of the Lord's prayer]....

10. **Mustard Seed (Th., Mk, Q)** -- Th. 20:2-4; Mk. 4:30-32; Lk. 13:18-19; Mt. 13:31-32

   It's [kingdom of God] like a mustard seed. [It's] the smallest of all seeds, but when it falls on prepared soil, it produces a large plant and becomes a shelter for birds of the sky.