

**A RHETORICAL AND PRAGMATIC ANALYSIS OF MARK 1:21-28 AS A
REMEDIAL TO THE ABUSE OF BIBLICAL AUTHORITY “ἐξουσία” IN SOME
AFRICAN INITIATED CHURCHES**

SSEMPIJJA KAJUNA CALEB

**A THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE SCHOOL IN PARTIAL
FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE AWARD OF THE DEGREE OF
MASTERS OF ARTS IN BIBLICAL THEOLOGY**

PAN AFRICA CHRISTIAN UNIVERSITY

MAY, 2023

Declaration

I declare that this thesis is my original work and it has never been submitted to any other university for academic credit.

Signature..... Date.....

Ssempijja Kajuna Caleb

MBTH/8822/0/17

This thesis has been submitted with our approval as the University supervisors

Signature..... Date.....

Prof. Elizabeth Mburu

Signature.....Date.....

Dr. Nguchie Gathogo, PhD

Dedication

I dedicate this work to my best friend and wife, Grace Namukose, and my son, Garry Liam Kajuna, who allowed me time away from home to pursue my studies. They have supported me so much; always encouraging, praying, and sacrificing their joy, time, and love while living without me.

Acknowledgments

I thank God for having brought me this far with this thesis. He has been faithful to me throughout all my time in Kenya.

I appreciate my supervisors, Prof. Elizabeth Mburu and Dr. Nguchie Gathogo, for working with me closely throughout the entire study period, advising and guiding me. With a sincere heart I acknowledge my close friends, Kay and Ian, from Australia for the financial support given towards my studies, to pursue further knowledge and be equipped to serve God better and also contribute to the academia. I cannot forget to mention Grace Christian Church, Australia, for the support they have always given to my family back home while I was away for my studies.

My parents, relatives, and friends in Uganda have been of great support during the time of my studies, I appreciate them all. I also wish to thank my friends, Amanda Thorsteinsson, and Madam Nabakooza Mary, for the time invested in proofreading my work amid their very busy schedules.

Lastly, I would like to appreciate my friends and Pastors, John Judah Unekwu from Nigeria, Rev. Gatete Godfrey from Rwanda, Rev. Dr. Jacob kipchilis from Kenya, and all my other classmates from Kenya, with whom we worked very closely throughout this entire journey.

Table of Contents

Declaration.....	ii
Dedication	iii
Acknowledgments	iv
Table of Contents	v
Abstract.....	x
Acronyms	xi
Definition of Terms	xii
Chapter One	1
Introduction and Background of the Study	1
Introduction	1
Background of the Study.....	2
Statement of the Problem	8
Objectives of the Study	9
Research Questions	9
Purpose of the Study	10
Significance of the Study	10
The Scope of the Study	10
Assumptions of the Study	11
Methodology	11
Conclusion.....	12

Chapter Two.....	14
Literature Review	14
Introduction	14
Definitions of Authority	14
Biblical Authority.....	15
Understanding Jesus’ Authority	16
Jewish Conception of Authority.....	18
Roman Conception of Authority	20
African Conception of Authority	22
Scholarly Perspectives on Mark 1:21-28	24
A Historical Literary Approach:.....	24
A Historical-Critical-Linguistic Approach:.....	30
A Literary Approach:	35
Conclusion.....	41
Chapter Three	42
Research Methodology	42
Introduction	42
Rhetoric	42
Rhetor	43
Elements of Rhetoric.....	43
Audience.....	44

Author.....	44
Purpose	44
Voice.....	44
Medium.....	44
Context	45
Content	45
Rhetorical Criticism	45
Historical Background of Rhetorical Criticism.....	46
Value of Rhetorical Criticism.....	48
Methods of Modern Rhetorical Criticism.....	50
Cluster Criticism.....	51
Metaphoric Criticism.....	52
Ideological Criticism	53
Narrative Criticism	54
Pentadic Criticism	55
Pragmatic Analysis.....	57
Definition of Pragmatics	57
Classical Pragmatics.....	57
Far-side Pragmatics	58
Near-side Pragmatics.....	59
Contemporary Pragmatics	59

Speech Act Theory	59
Locutionary.....	60
Illocutionary	61
Perlocutionary.....	62
Conclusion.....	62
Chapter Four	63
Analysis of the Text.....	63
Introduction	63
Text of study in Greek: Mark 1:21-28	63
My own translation of the text	64
Rhetorical: Pentadic criticism	64
Stage two. Labeling the five elements/terms in the artefact.....	64
Stage two. Identify the dominant/central term	66
Stage three. Identifying the motive from the dominant term	70
Pragmatic analysis: Speech Act Theory.....	70
Introduction	70
Verse-by-verse study	71
Conclusion.....	91
Chapter Five	92
Summary of Findings, Recommendations, and Conclusion	92
Introduction	92

Summary of the first four chapters.....	92
Summary of findings	94
Objective one:.....	94
Objective two:	95
Objective three:	97
Objective four:.....	98
Recommendation.....	101
Conclusion.....	102
List of References	104

Abstract

The current hermeneutics approaches and applications applied to the text of Mark 1:21-28 have tried capturing the right understanding and use of biblical authority “ἐξουσία.” The current hermeneutical approaches have not done enough in this case. There is no uniform hermeneutical approach that has been applied to the text that resonates with the issue of the abuse of biblical authority in some African Initiated Churches (AICs). This research exegeted the text of the study using rhetorical criticism, specifically the method of Pentadic Criticism, and Pragmatic Analysis, particularly the method of Speech Act Theory, and some textual analysis. This was done to provide a remedial to some witnessed abuse of biblical authority by the leaders in some of the AICs today. These abuses are evident in the manipulation of the congregants financially, spiritually, physically, sociologically, and psychologically as indicated in this document. The focus of this study is, therefore, directed to the interpretation and application of the text of Mark 1:21-28, to better understand biblical authority and also to correct the misuse of that authority by some leaders in some of the AICs. This will also reduce the misunderstanding of biblical authority by some leaders today, hence, achieving not only the development of biblical understanding of biblical authority and its application in some AICs by the leaders but also contributing to academia concerning the use of biblical authority.

Acronyms

AICs – African Instituted/Initiated/Independent Churches

RSV – Revised Standard Version

ESV – English Standard Version

NIV – New International Version

NLT – New Living Translation

HCSB – HOLMAN Christian Standard bible

CRL - Cultural religious linguistics

Definition of Terms

AIC - These are Christian churches independently started by African people in Africa and not by missionaries from other continents. Da Silva (1993) believes that the AICs fall under the Zionist type of church we have in Africa which believe and stress more of healing, speaking in tongues, spontaneity and emotionalism.

SADDUCEES - This was the second major group of Jews in Jesus's time. They were priestly aristocracy that made their way to power by their connection to the high-priestly families. They rejected the almost everything the Pharisees believed. They did not believe in angels, Spirits, resurrection, the last judgement, life and death, divine providence and the coming of the messiah. They disagreed with Jesus on those issues (Elwell & Yarbrough, 2013).

PHARISEES - Were the most known religious group during Jesus' time, though they were small in number, they were influential. They believed in the Old Testament and their Oral traditions which they considered equally authoritative. They made their people accountable to many traditions that were not included in the Law of Moses. They believed in God, prayer, Spirits, providence, angels, good works, necessity of faith, last judgement and the coming of the Messiah. Most of what they believed, the early Christians also believed. They disagreed with Jesus because He was reluctant with the respect to the Law, accepting sinful people, connecting with the Gentiles, and accused of blasphemy (Elwell & Yarbrough, 2013).

ESSENES - were a pre-Christian Jewish sect as described by Philo, Pliny and Josephus (Beall, 2004), they were smaller in terms of size as compared to the Sadducees and the Pharisees, the major groups in counteracting Jesus (Taylor, 2015).

DEMONS - are fallen angels, the army of Satan and the personification of all evil (Osborne, 2014).

MESSIANIC SECRECY - According to Watson (2010), has been in use since the early years of the twentieth century. It is attached to the Markan writing in which, according to William Wrede (1971), as recorded by Watson (2010), he explains the messianic secrecy as not publically announcing Jesus's identity as the Messiah and the necessity of his suffering, death and resurrection for it would jeopardize Jesus's big plan of saving the world. Mark, therefore, tries to show this messianic secret clearly in his writing, emphasizing Jesus as the messiah to his audience. Wrede, a key scholar of messianic secrecy in Mark, explains various scriptures in Mark to support the idea of messianic secrecy in his book, the messianic secret (Wrede, 1971). It is also important to note that several scholars have disagreed with the messianic secrecy idea, noting that it is not indicated in the other gospels that were recorded about Jesus Christ.

CAPERNAUM “Καφαρναούμ”, - it was a major city about ten thousand people then in the region of Northwest shores of Sea of Galilee (Osborne, 2014). MacArthur (1997) asserts that Capernaum was a more important city than Nazareth since it was located on a highway. Marr, Rogers, Vince, & Halcomb, (2012) record Charles Meeks who believes this city was Jesus' own city as to the gospel writers. The word Capernaum means “the house or town of Nahum” this city was a Centre of business where fishing and trading was done and also known as a Roman tax polling station. It was a small city located on the main road heading to Damascus. Jesus made this city his headquarter because it is from Galilee that he came to this city living there. The gospels refer to the city sixteen (16) times; it is in this city that he called Mathew the tax collector to follow him. Mark 2:14. And it is believed that it was in Capernaum where Peter lived and where Jesus healed Peter's mother in-law.

SABBATH “σάββασις” - is a day of complete rest from work after the six days of the week. This was established by God from the beginning of creation. In the Old Testament it began as a Holy day for God which included resting from work. The word Sabbath σάββασις means to cease, rest, complete rest, or desist which is reflected in most of the biblical texts. In the Old Testament roughly the term is used 40% in the Pentateuch, prophetic books 40%, 20% in the wisdom literature and historical books. And in the New Testament, Each text talks about the Sabbath and in the gospel Jesus teaches more about the Sabbath and how to observe it. Mark 1:21 shows Jesus entering the synagogue to teach on the Sabbath (Marr, Rogers, Vince, & Halcomb, 2012).

SYNAGOGUE - is a place where the Jewish people gathered for worship. They were places of worship and instruction. This word is a transliteration of a Greek word sunago meaning “to gather together.” A gathering place or a place of assembly to worship. The services in the synagogue included prayer, reading and exposition of the Old Testament, not forgetting teaching and worshiping (Osborne, 2014). Synagogues originated from the Babylonian Captivity after 586 B.C. the destruction of the temple by Nebuchadnezzar (Mare, W. H. 2004).

UNCLEAN SPIRIT - refers to a demon/evil spirit. These spirits are morally filthy and they cause much harm to the persons they possess.

NAZARETH “Ναζαρεθ” - is a person who comes from Nazareth (Mare, 2004). Ναζαρεθ was a village but now a city in lower Galilee which was Jesus’ childhood town (Marr, Rogers, Vince, & Halcomb, 2012).

TO DESTROY “ἀπολέσαι” - can also mean ruin

CONVULSING “Σπαράξαν” - has also been used to mean shaking violently, tearing
etc.

Chapter One

Introduction and Background of the Study

Introduction

The major focus of this study is to exegete the text of study to enhance the interpretation and application of the text as a remedial to the abuses of biblical authority in some AIC. This chapter presents the background to the study, the statement of the problem, the purpose of the study as well as the objectives of the study. The chapter also provides the research questions, scope of the study, along with the justification and significance of the study.

During the sixteenth century, there was a transformation in the understanding of biblical authority in the church as presented by reformers such as Martin Luther (Ives, 2012). They believed that clerical hierarchy and Episcopal secular power were human initiatives that were introduced in the church (Fear, Urbina, & Marcos, 2013; Ives, 2012). Too much emphasis was put on these clerical hierarchies, Episcopal secular powers, such that biblical offices like bishops, pastors, apostles, evangelists, and prophets that were abused by church leaders.

Some church leaders today have assumed leadership responsibilities, overshadowing the leading of the Christian congregation in the church and also representing the body of Christ outside of the church in non-church activities. They have advised congregants on spiritual matters, economic matters, family matters, and in many other aspects of life. Owing to too much trust in the church leaders by the congregants, biblical authority has been abused. As a result, congregants have misunderstood this biblical authority (Kraft, 2012). It is also the case that church leaders have taken up biblical authority over the church and all the activities that happen within and outside the church, which has led to the abuse of this

authority. Consequently, many believers have misunderstood biblical authority because of what they see the church leaders doing. In this regard, Kraft (2012) advises church leaders to give back authority to Jesus to take control of his church. This is in agreement with the reformers' view of biblical authority that Jesus can use any person in any office through the help of the Holy Spirit (Fear, Urbina & Marcos, 2013).

Background of the Study

The failure of the current hermeneutical approaches, procedures, techniques, and applications to capture the right understanding and use of biblical authority “ἐχουσία” in Mark 1:21-28, has contributed to the rampant abuse of biblical authority in some AICs. The different interpretations and applications of the text that have emerged have not effectively communicated what biblical authority is, resulting in the misunderstanding and subsequent abuse of biblical authority by some leaders in these AICs.

For instance, the literal approach has focused on the plain meaning of the text which does not readily lend itself to an African context on the one hand. On the other hand, the allegorical approach, especially the spiritual approach, while providing valuable insights, has failed to acknowledge the African context of authority. This failure of the current hermeneutical approaches, therefore, hinders the right discernment of God's message, leading to erroneous conclusions and wrong application of the Bible to life and ministry (Klein, Blomberg, & Hubbard Jr., 2017). Such erroneous conclusions and application lead to the abuse of biblical authority. This is exacerbated by the influence of African contextual understandings and applications of authority, which are read into the biblical text and then applied in the various ministry contexts of the AICs.

Generally, authority is defined as the power that someone acquires to influence or command the behavior or opinion of someone or something (The Merriam-Webster, 2020).

According to Youngblood (2014), authority is defined as the power or right to do something. That is to say, giving orders and seeing that they are followed through by whoever is ordered. Authority can also be a person's right to do something according to the office and position held. This is further explained by Lang, O'Driscoll, and Williams (2013), who cite Richard Friedman (1990) and Richard Flathman (1989), breaking authority into two, namely practical and theoretical. They believe practical authority is executing the agreed-upon agreements or laws. This kind of authority is referred to as being in authority, while theoretical authority is that authority that is acquired through knowledge and expertise, which is referred to as being an authority.

Biblically, authority is a gift from God to Jesus Christ (Mathew 28:18-19) and it is that same authority “ἐξουσία” that Jesus gives to the believers. It is important to note that authority is not given to benefit those that hold it but to benefit all individuals and the cosmos at large. The authority that God gives through Jesus to the believers is to benefit vulnerable people, namely the young, the aged, the orphans, the uneducated, the sick, the dispossessed, and many others. People need those with authority to utilize it well for the benefit of others, helping them to survive and thrive in life. Authority is, therefore, not the opposite of servanthood, but servanthood that ensures others thrive.

That said, power in this thesis links to authority in that it is the ability through which things are done when biblical authority is exercised. This is not physical power but spiritual power. When biblical authority is exercised, the power within works or changes things.

Some pastors in contemporary Africa are abusers of authority and, in many instances, they have abused the authority given to them by God (Carroll, 2011). To make matters worse, the followers do not have the proper understanding of biblical authority, and have chosen not to address the issue yet it is very key in the church and in Christian circles. It is also

important to note that there have also been some abuses of authority in the mainline churches in Africa, as seen, for example, in the Anglican and Catholic churches. The abuses have, however, not been as rampant as is in the AIC. This is most likely due to governance systems that are put in place to control the abuse of authority as opposed to most of the AICs that do not have such systems. Lumumba refers to these churches as husband and wife formations in a video he recorded in western Africa (SihlemkhizeZA, 2018).

Arguably, biblical authority in the churches today can be seen as one aspect that has been abused by church leaders because of the drive for prosperity and the need to be recognized as powerful, both physically and spiritually, hence misunderstood by the church members (Kretzschmar, 2002; Gathogo, 2011). Consequently, a culture of fear has been created among followers in the church due to the abuse of authority by its leaders. Followers fear to speak out and confront those in authority, too much intimidation is caused, and instead allegiance of believers is emphasized by those in church leadership.

It is also the case that church leaders have used their different leadership level capacities/offices to influence how church is done. According to Johnson and VanVonderen (2005), some church leaders have used spiritual authority to control and dominate others in an attempt to acquire their personal needs. They further state that, in the process, church members have been manipulated financially, physically, spiritually, sociologically, and psychologically.

Since those in church leadership use spiritual language that implies they are privately connected to God, confusion among the church members has developed. This makes followers think that whatever the church leaders say is the true word of God. In the long run, contradicting statements have left believers confused (Öhlmann, Gräb, & Frost, 2020).

Generally, biblical authority has been abused in most AICs. This is done not only by those good pastors/leaders preaching the right word of God but also by false pastors.

Observer (2017) reports about pastor Bugingo ordering his church members to burn bibles just because they had phrases like “Holy Ghost” and leaving out those that had “Holy Spirit”. He argued that there cannot be a ghost that is holy. Other examples are documented of some pastors in South Africa asking their congregants to drink petrol, eat grass, etc. (Kgatlle, 2017; CRL Rights Commission, 2017).

Another example is that of Pastor Boniface Mwamposa, commonly referred to as *the apostle* in Tanzania, who was reported pouring anointing oil, termed as *blessed oil*, on the ground for the congregants to step on, promising them that they will be healed of sicknesses. In the process of the people fighting to step on the blessed oil, twenty were trampled to death and many others were injured (Daily Monitor, 2020).

Pastor Bugingo in Uganda was observed publicly divorcing his wife, assaulting her, and introducing his new wife to be, because his first wife had an issue of bleeding for over ten years. He has further made outstanding statements that support divorce saying *marriage vows are satanic* (Conrad, 2019; Sabasaba, 2020). This is, in every way, a very bad example given to both believers and unbelievers, as it contradicts the word of God.

Prophet Elvis Mbonye, referred to by his followers in Uganda as “the most ultimate authority” is recorded as having his followers kissing his shoes, attributing him as equal to God (New Vision TV, 2017; Daily Monitor, 2017).

Pastors have also sold personal products to believers, which is both wrong practice and theology. Where this has been done, congregants are promised prosperity, God’s favor, love, God’s forgiveness, and many other things if they do what they have been told to do. In

Uganda, Prophet Samuel Kakande grew rice on a large scale and when it came to selling it, he branded his packed rice “holy rice” and he sold it at a premium to his followers, saying it would help them prosper (Alex, 2017). The late Prophet TB Joshua is another famous pastor in Nigeria who was reported to be selling so-called “Morning Water” to his followers. He would tell them that by using that water, they symbolically set themselves apart for Jesus Christ’s special attention if they pray in faith (Mumera, 2017).

Ejesgist (2019) records Professor PLO Lumumba referring to pastors of these mega-churches as peddlers and business people with pyramid schemes. They have exploited Jesus’ ministry using church money, including tithes, for personal development. They abuse biblical authority, all the while using the name of Jesus Christ, performing and selling fake miracles to the people, acquiring money from their followers, and buying themselves properties while living extravagant lives (SihlemkhizeZA, 2018).

Church leaders have abused this authority while misinterpreting scripture in their favor. Phrases like “do not touch my anointed ones” (Psalm 105:15), are used not just to promote the true fear of the Lord but the fear of *the Man (or Woman) of God*. Here, church leaders have missed the point of recognizing that it is not they that have the ultimate authority but God. They have misused their authority by forcing people to speak in tongues, give, fast, and pray, attributing all those to gaining the love of God, which is wrong teaching and theology. Many church leaders have molested believers, encouraged divorce, polygamy, and many other issues that have led the church to lose its stature in the community.

Furthermore, by pastors claiming biblical authority unto themselves, they have performed all sorts of fake miracles and their followers have believed them. No wonder when their planned schemes to fake miracles have been revealed, believers have been forced to testify that they are not permanent miracles. They have made believers do all sorts of things

to make them believe the fake miracles performed. In a report by eNCA (2019), a South African-based Pastor, Alph Lukau, is recorded to have performed a miracle by standing over a woman lying in bed, sick. The pastor promised to deliver miracles, claiming to heal people suffering from cancer, HIV/AIDS, and diabetes. Lukau is also reported to have brought a dead person back to life, something many people believed was a staged miracle (Nehanda Radio, 2019).

Different governments have come up to intervene in this abuse of authority and manipulation of followers by church leaders. For example, the government of Rwanda ordered the closure of thousands of churches because of the incorrect theology that was going on in the country, and through which pastors manipulated the people. Pastors in Rwanda grew rich at the expense of impoverished followers (News24, 2018). Here, Charles Murinzi finds that some pastors are motivated by greed to start churches with the intention to defraud their followers. As a result, the government of Rwanda demanded that all pastors have formal theological training as a way of controlling the wrong theology around the country (News24, 2018).

The same approach is in the pipeline in Uganda and it may be adopted in the foreseeable future. Pastors in Uganda have, however, disagreed with that approach (The New Vision, 2019). They believe that as much as it is good to study and be trained to qualify to lead a congregation, not everyone can afford the costs. Making theological training compulsory means that many churches will be closed thereby affecting the body of AIC at large. They, therefore, prefer that everyone trains at his or her time of convenience (The New Vision, 2019).

Some pastors have abused their authority from God and the earthly authority given to them by their denomination heads during ordination, to be served and not to serve (Kraft,

2012). It is due to such abuse of biblical authority in some AICs that the results of this study are necessary for the church leaders.

However there are several other reasons not mentioned in this document that connect to biblical abuse of authority. This study intends to analytically use rhetorical and pragmatic analysis to analyze Mark 1:21-28, extracting lessons and insights to address the issue of the abuse of biblical authority in some AICs today.

Statement of the Problem

Even within the text of the study, Mark 1:21-28, Jesus' audience seems not to understand his authority. Their amazement about his authority and teaching signal their lack of understanding of his authority. The current hermeneutical approaches and applications to the text have not succeeded in capturing the right understanding and use of biblical authority “ἐξουσία” within an African context. This is to say that the different interpretations and applications of the text that have emerged have not effectively communicated what biblical authority is. This has affected some AIC leaders' understanding and use of biblical authority, hence, its abuse. They have claimed biblical authority as if they are the source of that authority and not God. They have usurped it in disregard of the true concept of God being the ultimate authority as reflected in Mark 1:21-28. The church leaders have, therefore, abused the biblical authority given to them by God (Carroll, 2011), aiming at establishing their perverted vision of greatness and, consequently, abusing the people they are called to serve and to lead (Mwaura, 2004). In effect, church leaders manipulate their followers financially, spiritually, physically, sociologically, and psychologically (Van, 2014; Biri, 2012). Such leaders have also controlled and treated the congregants as objects to fulfil their selfish ambitions, acquiring names, properties, and worldly respect (Öhlmann *et al*, 2020). In so doing, they have compromised the AICs through corruption and, hence, made the church

acquire a bad image in the community they are called to reach out to with the good news of our Lord Jesus. This study, therefore, will seek to propose a re-interpretation and application of Mark 1:21-28, to provide a remedial to the abuse of biblical authority by the church leaders in some AICs.

Objectives of the Study

The objectives of this study are to:

1. Analyze the rhetor' and Jesus audience's understanding of Jesus', the scribes', and the Roman authority in Mark 1:21-28.
2. Establish key aspects of biblical authority to address the misunderstanding of that authority by the church leaders in some modern-day AICs.
3. Analyze how best rhetorical criticism and pentadic analysis can be put to use to study the text of Mark 1:21-28 for a better application in the AICs
4. Propose an interpretation and application of the text Mark 1:21-28 to draw implications that address the misunderstanding of biblical authority and its abuse in some AICs today.

Research Questions

1. How did the rhetor' and Jesus' audience understand Jesus', the scribes', and the Roman authority?
2. What are the key aspects of biblical authority to address the misuse of that authority by the church leaders in some modern AICs?
3. How best can rhetorical criticism and pentadic analysis be put to use in the study of the text of Mark 1:21-28 for a better application in the AICs?
4. How can Mark 1:21-28 be interpreted and applied drawing implications to address the misunderstanding of biblical authority and its abuse in some AICs today?

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to exegete Mark 1:21-28 using rhetorical criticism (pentadic criticism) and pragmatic analysis (Speech act theory) for a better interpretation and application to the abuses of biblical authority in the AICs. This is portrayed in the text by Jesus to his audience, the Jews, and by Mark to his audience, the Romans. Some lessons will be attained for the church leaders to apply to enhance their perspectives/understandings of biblical authority so as to correct the abuse in some AICs.

Significance of the Study

This research will contribute to academia by helping the readers understand Jesus' authority better as well as biblical authority at large. On a wider scale, this study will also help add knowledge in the theological space concerning the abuse of biblical authority in some contemporary AICs, while also suggesting a remedy to the situation. The study will also act as an eye-opener to boost the use of rhetorical criticism among other theoretical approaches in the study of the text. Furthermore, it will help the Church in Africa develop a biblical understanding of authority, taking the text as a portrait to know how biblical authority has been abused and misunderstood.

The Scope of the Study

The pericope under study contains verses that have rhetorical aspects and therefore need to be exegeted with a rhetorical lens. At the same time, the pericope also has verses that are best interpreted using pragmatic analysis. To have a complete understanding and right exegesis of the pericope, this research will apply both rhetorical analysis and pragmatic analysis, concentrating on speech act theory (Watson, 2019).

Mark 1:21-28 is the pericope under study and the guiding text to be analyzed in this research. It has been chosen because its main emphasis is on Jesus' authority, an aspect that

can be used to rectify the abuse of biblical authority, which is an issue of concern in some AICs. This study will therefore exegete the pericope in depth, focusing on the authority of Jesus and what makes it different from that of the scribes, as well as the Roman authorities in the context of Mark and his readers.

Assumptions of the Study

This study assumes that the Bible is the authoritative inspired word of God by the Holy Spirit and that all that is written is true and from God (Rogerson, 2014). The researcher will also assume that the text, from which the topic of study is derived, is very clear, understandable, and accurate as printed in the final form, not considering how information was gathered together narratively and historically. This research also assumes that there are many ways this pericope of study could be exegeted, not only considering the narrative form that Mark used to record. The researcher will also assume that the historical data provided about the gospel is correct and accurate.

Methodology

This research will study the text of Mark 1:21-28. From this, it will answer the questions this study seeks to address. This research is thus a documentary study and will not necessitate going to the field to acquire the same results. The documents to be used in this study will be accessed through the university online library and other free online libraries. Using the APA writing style, this research will interact with different documents referencing the authors of the documents used as a way of recognizing their contribution and at the same time avoiding plagiarism. With this, the general ethics related to this methodology will be addressed. This research will focus its study on using two methods of analysis, namely:

(1) Rhetorical criticism, through which rhetorical messages and statements made by the rhetor can be discussed as rhetorical artefacts, rhetorical discourse or rhetorical texts, and

rhetorical acts leading to a reasonably accurate meaning, interpretation, and application of the text (Stoner & Perkins, 2004).

(2) Pragmatic analysis will also be considered. This is the study of factors that govern the choice of words and language, and how sense is made out of statements in the text while making meaning from them (Aitchison & Crystal, 2001). From a pragmatic analysis, speech act theory will then be used to help understand the force behind words uttered and how words are used and understood, other than just making statements (Austin, 1975). This is also supported by Saeed (2003) and Tate (2008). Under this approach, three main aspects of speech act theory will be put to use, namely illocutionary, locutionary, and perlocutionary.

Rhetorical criticism combines effectively with speech act theory, since, according to Kennedy (2014), rhetoric originates in a speech act, not a text. As an example, the Bible in the early Christian times, was being read out loud to the people over and over again, for the people to understand the orality of the text. These methods will help bring out the most accurate meaning of the text, interpretation, and application to better address “the abuse of biblical authority in some AICs” in a different way, as methods like rhetorical criticism are relatively new in the study of the New Testament. This is confirmed by Hans Frei (2013) who finds that scholars embracing rhetorical criticism as a New Testament practice have come a long way (in Iverson 2014).

Conclusion

Biblical authority has been abused in some AICs today by church leaders in many different ways. This is because the interpretation and application of the text have failed to explain what biblical authority is, using the current hermeneutical approaches and applications to the text of study, Mark 1:21-28. These leaders have abused this authority by exploiting their congregants financially, spiritually, physically, sociologically, and

psychologically. In summary, this chapter has provided a background to the study, the statement of the problem, objectives of the study, as well as research questions that have been derived from the objectives. Also discussed are the scope of the study and the methodologies to be used in conducting the study. In the next chapter, the researcher will look at the definition of authority in depth, the understanding of biblical authority, Jesus' authority, and the understanding of authority from the perspective of Romans, Jews, and Africans. The researcher will also give scholarly perspectives on the text under study, Mark 1:21-28.

Chapter Two

Literature Review

Introduction

This chapter will address the different conceptions of authority as understood from the Bible, by the Jews and the Romans. This is necessary because, in this pericope, we have two different life situations. Jesus was active in the Jewish world teaching and performing miracles (*sitz im Leben Jesu*) and yet Mark recorded the life and ministry of Jesus when writing to the Roman world, which was his audience (*sitz im Leben der Kirche*), about what Jesus did in the Jewish world. It is therefore these two life situations put together, as well as the African world, which is the context of the AICs, that will provide information to better understand, interpret and apply the text to solve the main problem of study. As such, this chapter will focus on two worlds: the world behind the text (Jewish and Greco-Roman) and the world in front of the text (the African world).

This chapter will also examine the efforts of other scholars in studying Mark 1:21-28 using traditional methods, and explore the findings of some scholars regarding the text under study. The analysis will also include scholarly insights on significant interpretative issues of the text.

Definitions of Authority

The term translated authority is from the Greek root noun ἐξουσία which is derived from the verb ἐξεστίν (Strong, 2010; Bromiley, 1995). The noun ἐξουσία expresses the first meaning as the power to do something, which power is based on extrinsic considerations while δύναμις “power” is based on intrinsic ability (Youngblood, 2014). Carroll (2011) further explains ἐξουσία in the human relations spectrum as the freedom to act or decide.

According to Reid, Linder, Shelley, Stout, and Noll (2002), however, the term is derived from the Latin word *auctoritas*, which originated from the social world of Western Europe, and means power to author, command or sanction certain forms of life.

This term can also be used to mean authorisation, i.e. “authorised power”, in which case the power is conferred by a superior power, court, political entity (kings and rulers), the law (judicial), and many others, either through corporate means, individual, or through a constitutional right (Reid et al., 2002). Wondra (2002) asserts that authority granted to any person or thing is related to power, through which it may be expressed by force, coercion, domination, or manipulation.

Furthermore, Weber (2016), mentions three types of authority, namely legal authority, traditional authority, and charismatic authority. These three do not occur in pure forms in the experiential world of today (Popitz, 2017).

Similarly, Youngblood (2014) views authority as occurring in two forms, namely intrinsic authority (which belongs to one’s essential nature) and derived authority or “extrinsic authority”, which is given to someone from another source or because of what he or she owns or possesses.

Biblical Authority

Within the biblical and Christian faith, Reid et al. (2002), trace the source of authority to God. This is in line with Bromiley (1995) who says that God is the only ultimate source of all other authorisation and power. Youngblood (2014) agrees with the above authors when he says that God’s authority is absolute and unconditional.

Understanding Jesus' Authority

The use of the term ἐξουσία in Mark refers to the authority of Jesus, either used directly or indirectly (Edwards, 2002). The term is found nine times in Mark, six times reflecting Jesus, two times reflecting the apostles, and once referring to a man who gave authority of his house to his servants. Edwards (2002) further explains that ἐξουσία was used predominantly to reflect supernatural powers and authorities from God and his works in the LXX and Intertestamental literature.

Edwards (2002) further defines Jesus' "ἐξουσία" as sovereign freedom and majestic authority, with which he asserts that this ἐξουσία as used by Mark does not derive from human origin but from God. Moreover, ἐξουσία constitutes Jesus' divine sonship and confidence to act on his father's behalf.

Jesus' authority is the power granted from God. Since Jesus is God, his authority is divine and self-grounded (Bromiley, 1995). Through his authority, he has power over nature and disease, the power to forgive sin, teach, carry out exorcisms, and also to judge. That power is from his sovereignty in performance with that of the father.

Many scriptures in the Gospels have been recorded to emphasize Jesus' authority. Authority over nature is seen in Mathew 8:23-27, Mark 4:36-41, and Luke 8:22-25, in which Jesus shows control and authority over the storm. This control and authority is not only over the storm, but also the sea, for when he rebuked the storm, the sea also calmed down. In Mark 11:12-14 (NASB), Jesus curses a fig tree on his way from Bethany. The fig did not have any fruit and yet it was a season of figs. Jesus said, "May no one ever eat fruit from you again!" Immediately the tree started to wither right from the roots.

Jesus also has authority over demons. Demons are evil spirits under the control of Satan (Elder, 2021). In the New Testament, many verses show Jesus' authority over these

demons, rebuking, silencing, and commanding them to obey (Twelftree, 2011). This is reflected in some of these verses, namely Mark 1:21-28, and 5:6-7.

Jesus has the authority to forgive sins. Various verses (see for example, Matthew 9:1-8; Mark 2:1-12; and Luke 5:17-26 all talking about a paralytic healed) tell the story of Jesus forgiving the sins of the paralytic man. The teachers of the law and the Pharisees, who were his audience, termed it as blasphemy (see in Matthew 9:3-5). Jesus is also recorded defending his authority to forgive sins and in Matthew 9:6-8 (NASB), he demonstrates his authority to forgive sin. He says to them, “But so that you may know that Son of Man has authority on earth to forgive sins...” - then he said to the paralytic man, “Get up, pick up your bed, and go home”.

He also has authority over sickness and infirmity. There are many stories in the Gospels of Jesus healing sicknesses. This is something that no other man could do in his or her power, but only through Jesus Christ. Jesus was recorded healing leprosy in Matthew 8:1-7; Mark 1:40-45; Luke 17:11-19; blindness in John 9:1-7; Mark 8:22-25; Matthew 9:27-30; deafness in Luke: 50-51; Mark 7:31-37; and many other sicknesses.

Authority over death is another aspect of Jesus’ authority. Three cases are recorded in the Gospels showing Jesus demonstrating authority over death. Examples are John 11:43-44 for the case of Lazarus, Luke 7:11-15 for the case of a widow’s son, and Matthew 9:18-26; Mark 5:21-43 for the case of Jairus’ daughter. Furthermore, Jesus’ resurrection from the dead is itself the ultimate sign to show he has authority over death (cf. John 2:19).

That said, Jesus’s authority and biblical authority are considered the same since they are all attributed to God as the sovereign/divine /ultimate authority.

This research is limited to the text of study in Mark 1:21-28 to bring out the understanding of Jesus' authority. As noted above, in this pericope, two worlds are visible that show how authority was perceived, namely the Jewish conception of authority and the Roman conception of authority. But for this study to be meaningful and applied accurately in the right context, an African conception of authority as the third world has to be considered in explaining how authority was conceptualized. These three worlds are discussed in detail in the sections that follow.

Jewish Conception of Authority

The Jews believed that authority was founded in the four major sources below.

Tanakh is an acronym for the Hebrew Bible, referred to as the written law. It is believed to have been dictated to the writers by God word by word. The acronym points to three divisions that includes the law, i.e. "Torah" which is the most important of the Jewish authorities. It refers to the first five books of the Bible written by Moses. These books are referred to as Pentateuch (Ska, 2006). It also includes the prophets (Nevi'im) and the writings (Ketuvim).

Mishnah is referred to as the Oral law. It is believed that it was given to Moses by God at the same time as the giving of *Tanakh*. This oral law was not written but yet fully believed to be a source of authority as *Tanakh* (Herford, 2006; Ska, 2006).

Talmud is another source of authority, which is a documented commentary made for *Mishnah*, not only as a literary product, repository of law and rituals, but also as an account of the Jewish religious experience and wisdom acquired through the ages. It is considered next to the sacred scriptures, giving insights, inspiration, and practice of scripture to mankind (Herford, 2006; Hayes, 2006).

Finally, the *Rabbinic laws* are the rules of the *rabbis* in the *Tanakh* and *Midrash* put together to form a ritual, which was believed to help maintain the message unchanged. Midrash is an oral commentary of the Hebrew Bible, “the written law.” Rabbinic laws were, therefore, also considered a source of authority in the Jewish world (Halberstam, 2010; Hayes, 2006).

The above were the main religious sources of authority in the Jewish world. According to Halberstam (2010), authority was a central matter since it involved regulating different individuals, groups, and classes. Authority reached the deep parts of Jewish society, thus the Jewish life was confined to these authorities since it was inclusive of the religious sphere. Ska (2006), notes that the Jews also believed that God was the ultimate source of authority who gave them the written law. All the Jewish people were supposed to follow the written law, namely *Tanakh* and the *Midrash*, which gave detailed information and guidance about the written law. This was to better the understanding and application of the law, since it was directly from God. The Jews were also supposed to follow and respect the *Talmud* and *Mishnah*. Failure to comply with the religious sources of authority meant that punishment awaited them. The Jews were therefore made accountable to the religious authorities as the primary source of authority in the Jewish world (Halberstam, 2010; Ska, 2006).

It is important to note that honor was an important aspect of the Jewish conception of authority (Fishbane, 2009). For instance, God commanded people in society to honor their father and mother. Exodus 20:12, “Honor your father and your mother...,” is a commandment to all the people in Israel. Through this command, the human authority of parents was taken very seriously. Blidstein (2005), supports the idea that honor in the Jewish culture was embedded in the *Tanakh*. This command was well detailed in the *Talmud* and *Mishnah* which every Jew was to follow and respect. This was intensified in teaching, for

man was to honor his parents as he honors God (Fishbane, 2009). This was, however, not a source of authority but was embedded in the sources of authority in the Jewish culture.

Roman Conception of Authority

According to Sifuentes (2019), authority in Rome was complex. Rome was full of traditions, myths, and the awareness of its history. Romans believed authority was in four forms, namely *Imperium*, *potestas*, *auctoritas*, *paterfamilias*. These four are discussed in the paragraphs that follow.

Imperium was the ultimate authority that came with the power to command the army (Sifuentes, 2019). It was held by the magistrates and pro-magistrates who commanded the army for the twelve months elected into office (Goldsworthy, 2013). This supreme form of legal power was given to someone elected. *Imperium* was of two types, namely the formal and the delegated authority. The magistrates formally had the authority to command the army as the executive authority, holding the political office and taking care of the big legion. They were responsible for solving issues in the area they controlled (Ando, 2000). Some people had the delegated *imperium* - the pro-magistrates were given authority by the elected magistrates. They helped to govern the provinces which they were given to lead with the same *imperium* to command the army that they were given to oversee, and also solve issues that affected the provinces they were given to lead. This power was to be laid down by anyone who owned it before entering the boundaries of Rome (Sifuentes, 2019; Goldsworthy, 2013).

Potestas was legal power that belonged to groups in the political arena. This authority was defined in the law of Rome. The magistrates who had this authority were not elected but appointed yearly by the popular assembly (Wacher, 2013). While in this office, they could propose laws, have command over the legion, and at the same time chair over the senate. The

magistrates with this authority had to be 42 years old and above, serving for a term of one year in the office (Sifuentes, 2019). They were not supposed to be voted in to hold office consecutively. Any person at this level automatically also attained the *auctoritas* authority (Wasson, 2015).

Auctoritas was the social authority connected to the reputation and status of a person, or the respect due to a person's or family's achievements (Goldsworthy, 2014). This kind of authority was either earned or inherited. This authority could be earned by someone's bravery or courage, most especially during the war after earning a title of a victorious commander, which came after winning several battles. Another way one could acquire that authority was by obtaining the most prestigious political magistrate post (Goldsworthy, 2014). A person could also attain that authority through inheritance. For someone to inherit that authority, they had to be in the bloodline of a noble person, have an ancient family name, and be well-connected socially and politically (Goldsworthy, 2013). This authority could exist only when it was recognized by other people around the person.

Paterfamilias was another form of authority that the Romans respected. It was that authority that comes from being the father in the household. This was considered a supreme authority in every Roman household. According to Goldsworthy (2014), the father in a home was given authority over his home by the Roman tradition. He not only presided over the wife and the children, but also the grandchildren, the slaves, and anyone else who stayed with him. He was given the power to the extent of deciding life or death, if need be, in that homestead. The father in the home was to help groom the next generation to become great men in Rome right from the family setting (Sifuentes, 2019). Also, the father had to walk and work with the boy child, meeting different people in offices, and in due course, the child would know and get connected to the influential people in society and the Senate. This

authority was so important and honored that the highest honor they could give to the magistrate was the title of a father of the country (Sifuentes, 2019; Wasson, 2016).

Honor is an aspect attributed to authority. It was very important in the Roman culture. In ancient Rome, honor was bestowed upon victorious generals, namely those that commanded legions of about 5000 men, and who had won in war (Encyclopaedia Britannica, 2019). This honor was paid for and granted by the senate. For a man to be honored during the republican times, he had to be a magistrate belonging to the *imperium*, holding supreme and independent command (Encyclopaedia Britannica, 2019). Honor was also considered a virtue inspiring the moral life of the statesmen, Roman soldiers, and philosophers, as the mark of life attributing it to integrity and dignity (Barton, 2001).

African Conception of Authority

The African conception of authority is very key to this study since the application of the text is done in the African context. The way these leaders perceive authority was influenced by the African understanding of authority, which affected not only their contextual interpretation and application of the text, but also their understanding of biblical authority. Understanding how authority is perceived in Africa, therefore, helps to illuminate if the abuse of biblical authority is influenced by their context.

In Africa, authority is a complex issue. African communities believed in a hierarchical form of kinship. Mbiti (1990) believes that authority in Africa ranges from God to the youngest child. Those in authority could not be questioned at any point in time. They were always considered correct and their verdict always stood to be final and unchallenged.

Some of the different attributes that traditionally contribute to giving someone authority in Africa are discussed below. These include tradition, religion, and ethnicity.

Tradition is one source of authority. These traditions are the different customs and beliefs, rules and norms, governing a particular tribe or society. These help to organise the life of people at all levels, from the very highest to the grassroots (Ubink, 2008). Different offices, like the chieftdom, were put in place to help in leading the people in the community. Where kingdoms apply, these chiefs were appointed by the king based on their having a good reputation and respect in the kingdom, and to the king.

Mbiti (2015) believes you cannot understand African tradition without understanding the African religion in which authority is embedded. The African chiefs have acted as intermediaries between the government and the local people (Ubink, 2008; Ayittey, 2006). These kings and/or chiefs are seen as foremost authorities and at the same time considered spiritual leaders in the African religion.

Religion is another source of authority. Africans also attribute authority to their religions. Stückelberger & Mugambi (2007) argue that religion is a source of loyalty. The loyalty to leaders witnessed in Africa is therefore a result of authority embedded in religion. Mbiti (2015) further believes that religion is in all the African people and therefore it belongs to the people. Mugambi (2002) supports the idea that African traditional life reflected their religious life. Africans believed that God was the creator and maker of the universe. In African myths, God is seen as supreme and the ultimate source of authority (Mbiti, 1990). Sacrifices are made to secondary divinities considered to be intermediaries between the people and God. The ancestors are considered to be custodians of moral order in the community. It is through their religions that the African communities are encouraged to be in a harmonious relationship with one another, and at the same time respect those in authority (Mugambi, 2002). This is possible with the divine power helping to fulfil the rituals as a way of being in good relationships with fellow brothers and sisters in the community, as well as

with the ancestors and the spirits. Anything that anyone could do, therefore, had to be done through religion to have that needed authority (Encyclopaedia Britannica, 2018).

Ethnicity is a third source of authority. Authority in Africa is also attached to which family someone originally comes from because it is believed that authority starts right from the grassroots. Ethnicity brings to the African peoples a communal origin and identity, a communal culture, and a link with the historical homeland. A person who is traced to a well-known community, tribe, family, culture, and language among others, can be attributed to having authority in Africa (Tina, 2017; Ayittey, 2006).

Scholarly Perspectives on Mark 1:21-28

The gospel of Mark has been a subject of historical and narrative criticism. Historical critical scholars have looked at the Gospel of Mark by focusing on the historical Jesus, the early church, and the community of the evangelist, while narrative critical scholars, have looked at Mark as story by studying the setting, characters, and events of imagination (Wiersbe, 2002; Schweitzer, 2001). Many other traditional forms have also been deployed in studying the text, for instance redaction criticism, but there has been a shift of focus from how they are composed to the rhetorical impact of the text. Below are the three books reviewed using different methods while studying the text of Mark 1:21-28. The aim is to expose some of their shortcomings, particularly for the African context.

A Historical Literary Approach:

Word biblical commentary (by Robert A. Guelich)

The historical-literary approach focuses on the fundamentals for a successful interpretation of the text of study. That is, the historical, generic, cultural, ideological, grammatical, and geographical. It is through this approach that the characteristics of the community addressed in the passage, their history, beliefs, and practices, are clearly

explained to provide a clear understanding and interpretation of the text. It analyzes ancient events, political realities, places, customs, and values, and helps to better explain the roots of the text, through which information about the situations that led to the writing of the text is viewed and understood by the reader (Gorman, 2008; Tate, 2008).

This historical-literary approach is used in the Gospel of Mark by Guelich to study the text in depth, to analyze the text of study (Mark 1:21-28), and extensively discuss the literary aspects of the text. Key words in the text are identified and studied, giving some historical information to better understand the text. The paragraphs that follow highlight the scholarly perspectives of various aspects of Jesus' authority that Guelich succeeds in uncovering through this method.

Mark 1:21-22 includes a summary of the teaching of Jesus. Guelich observes that the characteristics of the gospel of Mark, including the thematic, lexical, and stylistic characteristics, portray the setting of Mark 1:21-22. Within this setting, a classic exorcism in verses 23-28 takes place. Mark uses the verb εἰσπορεύονται (they went) to show that Jesus and his four disciples went to Capernaum on a Sabbath into the Synagogue and on entering, Jesus, whose teaching was authoritative, was allowed to teach.

Emphasis is put on his teaching (διδάχῃ αὐτοῦ). Jesus' fame as a teacher in Mark is not only dependent on the three times he refers to his teaching in this text of study, but also in the other parts of his writing in the gospel. The redactional expansion on Mark 1:21c – 22 and the location of the text of study Mark 1:21-28 at the beginning of Jesus' public ministry, shows Mark's interest in Jesus as a teacher.

According to Daube, as cited by Guelich, the phrase ὡς ἐξουσία ἔχων (as having authority) relates to ἐξουσία, which has to do with having a license to teach the law as an ordained rabbi at a higher level, and not at the elementary level like the scribes who were

simply qualified by tradition. Jesus is considered as one who had authority, which meant that he was a rabbi at a higher level as compared to the elementary-level scribes. The exorcism in 1:23-28 and the obedience of the unclean spirit in 1:27 shows Jesus' startling, authoritative nature and the difference between Jesus' and the scribes' teaching. From the text, Jesus is considered as the Holy One from God who can heal, teach and exorcise.

The “οἱ γραμματεῖς” (scribes) were a special group of people that considered themselves professional in regard to the law. They developed and interpreted the law, taught the law to the students, and when needed, acted in judicial situations Poon (2020). In many cases, they counteracted Jesus as to other various groups such as the Sadducees, the Pharisees, and the Essenes. A big section of scribes belonged to the Pharisees. The scribes in Mark 1:22; 2:6; 3:22, were always at loggerheads with Jesus, and throughout Mark, they spoke in opposition to Jesus, as did the Pharisees in Mark 2:16; 7:15, the chief priests in Mark 10:33; 11:18; 14:1 and the elders in Mark 8:31; 11:27.

The phrase τὰ πνεύματα τὰ ἀκάθαρτα (the unclean spirit), is a Jewish expression meaning demons (δαιμόνια). Mark uses the term “unclean spirit” eleven times in his gospel. Six of those occur in two stories: that is Mark 1:23, 26, 27 and 5:2, 8, 9. These texts reveal yet another aspect of Jesus' authority.

The unclean spirit spoke out to Jesus τί ἡμῖν καὶ σοί (Mark 1:24; “what do we have in common?”). This is a rhetorical, formulaic question with an Old Testament background. It is always used by someone inferior or one in an inferior position/state to the superior, putting the superior in a position of responsibility to determine what to answer. In this particular case, the demon posed a question that showed Jesus as superior to the unclean spirits since it spoke in the plural. The question had a defensive function in which the unclean spirit put a

gap between the two. It also showed that the unclean spirit recognized its status with regards to Jesus' authority.

Here, it can be argued that the unclean spirit referring to Jesus as "The Holy One of God" (ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ), acknowledges the true identity of Jesus. The demon first addressed Jesus as "Jesus, the Nazarene", which was a defensive mechanism, and an apotropaic device used to gain power over Jesus. Koch, as quoted by Guelich (1989), believes the mention of the name of Jesus by the demon was to show that it recognized and acknowledged the deity of Jesus and subordinated itself to Jesus. It is important to note, however, that Jesus was superior to the unclean spirit. With the question "What do we have in common?" and the address of Jesus as the Holy One of God, the demon shows its awareness of who Jesus is and recognizes Jesus' superiority.

The use of the two words "Nazareth" and "Holy one" is also key, designating Jesus' background, which leads to the true identity and the one consecrated by God and set apart by God. It also shows that Jesus has a unique relationship with God.

After the utterance of the unclean spirit Jesus "subdued him" (ἐπετίμησεν αὐτῷ). Kee, as quoted by Guelich (1989), believes that by using the verb ἐπιτιμᾶν, Mark wishes to show the commanding force behind it. The demon is subdued and responds to the command from God. Through this phrase, Jesus was seen as one through whom God was overcoming Satan, his rule, and his kingdom.

Jesus then commands the demon saying, "Be silent." This was a standard procedure for exorcism. Φιμοῦν literally meant to tie, to shut, or to muzzle. This command supports Mark's messianic secret. Mark wanted to show that Jesus commanded the demon to be silent because it was not his time to be recognized and was also a way for Jesus to rebuke the challenge posed by the unclean spirit. The use of "Son of God" by Mark, follows the tradition

referring to Jesus as “Holy son of God”, a title that affirms Jesus’ authority. The statements made by the demon were not just mere statements but had an additional meaning pertaining to Jesus’ true identity. The following phrase “Come out of him” (ἐξέλθε ἐξ αὐτοῦ), is a ritual of exorcism that Jesus uses to command the demon to come out of the man. The amazement of the crowd again attests to the authority he possessed.

Immediately “The unclean spirit ... came out of him”, that is, after Jesus’ command. The unclean spirit that was causing the man to convulse, came out of him. This was the final abuse that the possessed man faced from the unclean spirit. And his crying “with a loud voice” (φωνῆσαν φωνῇ μεγάλῃ), was a death wail signaling the fact that the spirit had been defeated by Jesus and God.

This was disturbing to Jesus’ audience. Mark writes that ἐθαμβήθησαν ἅπαντες ὥστε συζητεῖν (All were so astounded that they argued). The response to the astonishment was in the form of a question, a traditional setting as portrayed in the pericope. The theme of the argument is characteristic of Mark. For, example, “What is this?” (τί ἐστὶν τοῦτο?) in verse 27. The focus here is on Jesus and this question is an underlying traditional question that means “Who is this?”, which Mark adopts to let the audience know that he is the Holy Son of God.

The presence of the phrase following, “A new teaching with authority” (διδασχὴ καινὴ κατ’ ἐξουσίαν), stresses Jesus’ surprising teaching with authority. The use of the adjective new “Καινή”, highlights Jesus’ amazing teaching character with authority. In terms of eschatological basis, Jesus’ character did not only threaten the unclean spirit but also foretold the eschatological destruction of satanic forces in the new age, showing the coming of the Kingdom. Here, the adjective “new” does not only qualify “teaching” but Jesus’ teaching

with authority evidenced by the obedience of the unclean spirit to Jesus' command and the eschatological destruction of the evil powers in this new age.

After this new teaching with authority, "His fame spread" (ἐξῆλθεν ἡ ἀκοὴ αὐτοῦ). This was to support the missionary setting of the tradition. Guelich (1989) records Pessch explaining this phrase as supporting the tradition of the missionary setting though Jesus' fame was affected and limited by the addition of "Galilee" in the text. This is because, in the tradition, the location of Galilee would help him align his material to Capernaum where Jesus' teaching with authority happened with exorcism. The phrase was used to mean that the news about Jesus went beyond Capernaum.

In conclusion, in this historical-literary approach, Guelich (1989) shows how Mark emphasizes Jesus' teaching and authority. The new teaching is attributed to Jesus' authority, the authority acquired from God. Its nature is attributed to Jesus being the Holy One from God, as informed by the utterance of the unclean spirit, comprising of teaching, healing, and exorcising. According to Guelich (1989), Mark, in this text, wanted to show Jesus' astonishing authoritative teaching expressing itself in an exorcism, a miracle by Jesus the Holy Son of God.

Jesus' authority is not limited in any way and this is reflected by Mark showing Jesus as superior to the possessed man and putting him in a position of doing anything he wanted at that time. He wanted his audience to know that this story marked the beginning of Jesus' public ministry and focused on Jesus' authority, teaching, and mission. He also wanted to emphasize that Jesus was unique and a Rabbi ordained by God as compared to the elementary scribes by tradition. Through the text, therefore, the Christological purpose of Jesus is reflected through his teaching and the relationship he had with his disciples, while the eschatological purpose is reflected in his exorcism in this new age.

A Historical-Critical-Linguistic Approach:

The New International Greek Testament Commentary: The Gospel of Mark (By France R.T)

Under the historical-critical-linguistic approach, the historical background of the text under study is considered seriously. France (2002) points out the historical aspects such as the authorship of the text and the book at large, the date of writing, the audience addressed, and the purpose of writing, which are all considered to be “behind the text” information. The “critical” use of this approach is to bring the reader to an understanding of what the witnesses say or what the text says. Similarly, the linguistic idea in this approach brings out the right syntax of the text, namely the right interrelationships of sentences brought together to have the right meaning of a text in a language. These three aspects of this approach provide a complete theological interpretation of the text (Kyomya, 2010).

In this historical-critical-linguistic approach, attention is given to the historical, linguistic, and textual context of the text, studied verse by verse. Here, as in the previous section, the researcher will attempt to highlight the various scholarly perspectives and aspects of Jesus’ authority as uncovered by France (2002).

France notes that Καπερναούμ (Capernaum) is a later form of the name. It was a significant lakeside town, a custom port, with its population estimated at that time to be 10,000. Its synagogue, therefore, was believed to have a big Sabbath congregation. The phrase by Mark, καὶ εὐθὺς τοῖς σάββασιν ἐδίδασκεν (and straightway on the Sabbath he taught), might suggest that Jesus of Nazareth imposed himself on the congregation. Given the fact that the right to teach in the synagogue was controlled by the leaders, however, Jesus was allowed an opportunity to teach, which suggests that he had already been in the community

long enough to be noticed and respected as a teacher. This reflects his authority not from being a native, but from God.

The phrase ἐδίδασκεν εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν, (into the synagogue he taught), therefore, has the idea of Jesus entering and then teaching in the synagogue. The use of the preposition εἰς (into) is key in this phrase. Mark uses the verb διδάσκω (I teach) to describe Jesus' distinctive activity from which the title διδάσκαλος (teacher) is derived. Jesus' teaching is key to Mark and essential for Jesus' messianic mission. Within the text, it is Mark who recognises Jesus as a teacher, unlike the other gospels where it is the audience that recognised Jesus as a teacher.

His audience was ἐκπλήσσομαι (astonished), at his teaching/doctrine, a verb commonly used by Mark to record the reaction of Jesus' audience and his disciples, to the deeds and words of Jesus. It indicates something extraordinary about Jesus' teaching that is not mentioned in the text through which Jesus' authority is compared with that of the scribes. The text does not show the content of the teaching that led to the astonishment, amazement, or surprise. What is clear, however, is that his teaching expressed radical ideas that challenged the accepted teaching of the scribes. The γραμματεῖς (scribes) are noted as always opposed to Jesus in Mark. They were considered as those that recognized theological authority and they characterized the old regime that confronted the new teaching of Jesus Christ. It is only in Mark 12:28-34 that the scribes are recorded positively in the Gospel.

The phrase ἦν διδάσκων (he was teaching) is a periphrastic construction in Mark with no difference in regards to the meaning of the simple imperfect ἐδίδασκεν (he was teaching), but a stylistic variation between the two words that is very common in the Semitic Greek. Both words mean "Jesus was teaching".

In verse 23, Mark used καί εὐθύς (and straightway) to introduce a specific dramatic event within a general scene of Mark 1:21-22. In the phrase ἄνθρωπος ἐν πνεύματι ἀκαθάρτῳ (a man with an unclean spirit), the preposition ἐν (with) signifies being under the impact of the spirit. Mark describes the relation of the unclean spirit to its human host by the use of this preposition. Mark uses these two terms πνεύματι ἀκαθάρτῳ (unclean spirit) and δαιμόνιον with equal frequency. According to France (2002), the emphasis in Mark, therefore, is on the language spoken by the demon. The said exorcism is not mental illness since Mark carefully uses two distinct terminologies for Jesus' ministry of exorcism and healing to send a message to his audience. The significance of this phrase therefore was to differentiate between the man possessed and the unclean spirit as two different entities, one subduing the other, in this case the unclean spirit subduing the man.

Τί ἡμῖν καί σοί (What have we to do with thee?) is a question that the unclean spirit asks. According to France (2002), the phrase is an Old Testament formula for disassociation. When this question is addressed to the potential aggressor, there is a force of enmity in this case between the unclean spirit and Jesus. Hence the phrase “go away and leave me alone”. The unclean spirit did not want to associate with Jesus Christ. Without any word yet from Jesus, the unclean spirit knows that Jesus intends to destroy them (ἀπολέσαι ἡμᾶς). The unclean spirit speaks in plural form, speaking on behalf of the entire legion of demons in the man. The purpose behind the unclean spirit addressing Jesus as Ἰησοῦ Ναζαρηνέ (Jesus of Nazareth) was to add formality and to confirm that it knew who Jesus was. This is verified by the following phrase οἶδά σε τίς εἶ (I know thee thou art), the Holy One of God (ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ). The unclean spirit openly speaks out the supernatural insight about Jesus “the Holy One of God” that is denied to human actors in the story. This was to gain control over Jesus, a reverse method to what exorcists used, that is, knowing and mentioning the name of the unclean spirit. The use of ἅγιος (holy) by Mark is astonishing for it has a contrasting element

of Jesus' Holy character and that of the unclean spirit character (France, 2002). It links Jesus with the Holy Spirit, whose presence in Mark is Messianic, and the basis of his power and authority over the unclean spirit. The Holy One of God (ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ), is a title phrase not recognized and used in Jewish literature. So, by using this phrase, "the Holy One of God", Mark shows that the unclean spirit knew that it had encountered the supernatural power.

The exorcism in this text lacks a technique as compared to the extra-biblical exorcism accounts. In this text, Jesus does not follow the formal, traditional format of exorcism. There is no incantation, rituals, or props of any kind - just an authoritative command by Jesus, and the exorcism happens. The term ἐπιτιμάω (rebuked), is used in some exorcism accounts in Mark 9:25 and 3:12, yet according to Kee (1967), it is not a technical term in exorcism since it is used in the exorcism literature outside the New Testament. Mark, however, uses this verb to indicate Jesus' authoritative power to silence the demon, connecting the verb to φιμώω (hold thy peace). This, therefore, explains the use of the verb ἐπετίμησεν (he rebuked) to describe the effective command of Jesus to the demon.

The term Φιμώω (be silent) literally means to muzzle but, in this case, it is considered a metaphor that can be used to silence someone. It has some force of making the demon speechless. Muzzling the demon in this verse was necessary to stop the demon from protesting. When this kind of rebellion happens, muzzling becomes a necessary part of exorcism.

After Jesus silences the unclean spirit and commands it to come out, the unclean spirit "tears" the man. The term σπαράσσω is used literally to refer to tear or medically to refer to convulsions (France, 2002). In Mark's account of this exorcism, the resident demon did not only affect the thinking and wording of the possessed man, but also the physical conduct of

the person possessed. The “crying out in a loud voice” (ανακράζω) marks the unclean spirit as being frantic, incompetent, and resistant. In the text, therefore, there is no physical condition of the victim that has been mentioned by Mark apart from the tearing and crying in the loud voice that happened after Jesus’ command of ἐξελθε ἐξ αὐτοῦ.

The crowd reacted with amazement. The use of the verb θαμβέομαι (amazed) suggests that exorcisms were not common, and more so, Jesus’ way of exorcism was different from those that were done by other people. The phrase κατ’ ἐξουσίαν ἐπιτάσσει ...ὁπακούουσιν (with authority he commands and they do obey) differentiates Jesus’ authoritative command in exorcism from those exorcisms by the magicians that had been witnessed before, which were full of struggle and doubt. The verb συζητέω (questioned) means to discuss with a hostile connotation of dispute. Πρὸς ἑαυτούς (among themselves) gives more light on the verb which showed intense discussion between Jesus’ audience there and then. In using the phrase διδαχὴ καινὴ κατ’ ἐξουσίαν (with authority), Mark was emphasizing the terms in 1:22, whose basis of surprise was διδαχὴ (teaching). Yet for this verse, the basis is exorcism. Here, the term ἐξουσίαν (authority) denotes Jesus’ authoritative teaching and his authoritative exorcism. The use of adverbial καὶ (even) indicates that the power over demons stands out in this aspect of Jesus’ authority.

Jesus’ fame goes to Galilee and the phrase πανταχοῦ εἰς ὅλην τὴν περίχωρον (everywhere into all the surrounding region) used by Mark in the text is so expansive but is limited to only Jesus’s home province. If τῆς γαλιλαίας (Galilee) is used as an epexegetical genitive, then Jesus’ fame spread to the neighboring region of Galilee, not the region around Galilee or a part of Galilee around Capernaum.

The teaching is very key to Jesus’ messianic mission and it is uniquely given to him by God, France (2002) finds that using a historical-critical-linguistic exegesis focuses on that

teaching. Jesus' ἐξουσία (authority) has both authoritative teaching and authoritative exorcism. In this pericope, Jesus' audience is astonished at the manner of his teaching. An unclean spirit manifests through a man detaching from him, this showing Jesus' separation of interests. Jesus' audience is astonished at his authoritative teaching and exorcism. The unclean spirit, thus, sees Jesus as a destined tormenter and destroyer with supernatural powers, through which Mark emphasizes Jesus' identity as the Son of God and the Holy One of God.

France (2002) also puts more emphasis, not on the human nature of Jesus as one from Nazareth, but as one considered to be the Holy One of God. Here, he shows that his nature of authority has both power to teach and also exorcise. Jesus is contrasted with the possessed man as one Holy and linked to the Holy Spirit, who symbolizes the start of the messianic ministry and the basis of the power over demons that Jesus possesses. The statement, "the Holy One of God" reveals that Jesus is considered to be in a very close relationship with God. The manifestation of Jesus' authority is evidenced in the power over demons and teaching the people authoritatively.

A Literary Approach:

Mark: Commentary on His Apology for The Cross (By Robert H. Gundry)

A literary approach interprets the text as literature. In this approach, Gundry (1993) uses different wordings to bring out the imaginative, creative, and structural elements that create literature. Literary devices like the order of words, chiasms, similes, hyperboles, metaphors, symbols, myths, understatement, parallelism, personification, and synecdoche are employed in this approach.

Gundry (1993) uses the lenses of this literary approach to study the gospel of Mark, disbursing special attention to the literary devices and historical present tenses to have a clear

understanding of the text and the gospel at large. This helps to change the straightforward apology for the shameful manner of Jesus' death to the glorious death of Jesus on the cross. In the section below, the researcher attempts to highlight the various scholarly perspectives of Jesus' authority as unveiled by Gundry (1993).

In the phrase, Καὶ εἰσπορευονται εἰς καφαρναοὶμ (and they went into Capernaum), the indefinite marker "they" reflects Simon, Andrew, James and John going with Jesus into Capernaum. Without reference to those disciples in Mark 1:20, the indefinite marker would have been useless. Mark switches to a historical present tense to underline the effect of Jesus' choosing of disciples while at the same time highlighting the start of a new 36eriscope in a new environment. He also switches from "they" to "he" to attract attention to Jesus. The use of εὐθύς (immediately) shows how quickly Jesus took charge. His authority widened from just calling disciples to teaching a general congregation. ἐξουσία (authority) stands out first and this is supported by the conjunction γὰρ (for) in Mark 1:22b, 27. Here, the focus is on the manner of Jesus' authoritative teaching, not what he taught. This is evident in the fact that Mark does not tell the content of Jesus' teaching.

ἐδίδασκεν is translated (he began to teach) - because it is taken as inceptive. Mark uses the phrase ἐξεπλήσσοντο (they were astounded) as a hyperbole to reflect the awesome power of Jesus' authority, literally emphasizing his audience being knocked out. Mark did not emphasize the content of Jesus' teaching but his authoritative manner while teaching. This supports the phrase τῇ διδαχῇ αὐτοῦ (his doctrine), a phrase which is translated with an inceptive, meaning to emphasize *his activity of teaching* and not just *what he taught*. So the astonishment of the audience connects with his activity of teaching and not being astonished because he taught.

In this, Mark exalts Jesus portraying him as a teacher. Since teachers were highly respected, as expressed in the phrase οὐχ ὡς οἱ γραμματεῖς (not as the scribes), Mark uses the comparative “as” to put Jesus higher than the scribes. The scribes appealed to authority in their teaching while Jesus assumed authority in his teaching. Mark is interested in letting the audience know that the scribes’ teaching did not have authority yet Jesus’ teaching had authority. This is why Mark exalts Jesus as a person who had the overpowering authority with which he was teaching in the synagogue when compared to the un-authoritative teaching of the scribes.

Mark combines the two stories of the authoritative exorcism and the authoritative teaching of Jesus in this same pericope of Mark 1:21-28. This is not to subordinate one to the other but to have the two stories supporting each other because they equate to each other. This is supported by Mark using the conjunction γὰρ (for) and the phrase “even the unclean spirit he commands and they obey him”, which is an independent sentence. Concerning the narrative, Jesus taught authoritatively and then exorcised authoritatively. With the use of another εὐθύς (immediately), Mark wanted to stress how fast Jesus was in exercising authority over the unclean spirit in the synagogue. ἀνέκραξεν (shouted out) is a verb that Mark literally uses to show that the unclean spirit cried out. The use of this verb is to emphasize the force of the unclean spirit in a man defending itself against Jesus, and to show that Jesus with the Holy Spirit has power greater than the unclean spirit.

Mark contrasts the spirit within the man (by calling it unclean) to the Holy Spirit in Jesus that constituted Jesus as God’s Holy one, empowering him in calling disciples, authoritatively teaching, and exorcising in the synagogue. The question “why are you interfering with us, Jesus of Nazareth?” was to show that Jesus was on the opposite side of the unclean spirit. The use of “us” shows that the unclean spirit was referring to all the other

unclean spirits and not the man-possessed and the single unclean spirit. By this, Mark wanted to show that Jesus's power and authority is greater than that of all unclean spirits. The knowledge of the unclean spirit about Jesus' biodata, who he was, knowing his name "Jesus", his home town "Nazareth", the purpose of his coming "to destroy" and his title "God's Holy One", have an upper hand over the unclean spirit in this exorcism. The knowledge and mention of that information by the unclean spirit, therefore, was seen as a defensive mechanism or a backhanded confession, for the spirit showed how much it knew Jesus. The unclean spirit continues to show that it knew who Jesus was. Taking "ἤλθες ἀπολέσαι ἡμᾶς" (have you come to destroy us?) as a question signified fear on the part of the unclean spirit. The verb ἦλθον (came) literally carries a divine origin with which Mark wanted to show Jesus as one with divine origin from God. This was not only related to his coming into the synagogue but also to his coming onto the scene/picture.

The phrase οἶδά σε τίς εἶ, ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ (I know you, who are you, the Holy One of God) is used by the unclean spirit for defensive means. But for Mark, the phrase "the Holy One of God" showed the contrast between Jesus and the unclean spirit. Jesus, being holy, does not in any way associate with the unclean spirit, and at the same time it affirms the true identity of Jesus. The unclean spirit uses the phrase above to gain control over Jesus. And so, according to Gundry, Mark was saying to his audience never to let Jesus' crucifixion mislead them to make a false identification but that they should know that Jesus of Nazareth is the true Holy Son of God.

φιδώθητι (Be muzzled) literally means "shut up". The command is not voluntary obedience but obedience imposed on the unclean spirit by a superior. Jesus stops the disruption of the unclean spirit during his teaching. He bypasses the man who spoke out, rebuking the unclean spirit within the possessed man, telling it to shut up. The rebuking of the

unclean spirit was to stop the attempts of the unclean spirit to reduce Jesus to hopelessness by uttering his name, hometown, intentions, and title. The shutting up of the unclean spirit starts the process of exorcism, showing Jesus' superiority over the demon. This is witnessed by the immediate flowing of the command by the unclean spirit to come out. Both shutting up and commanding defines the rebuke.

The verb ἐπετίμησεν (rebuke) affects the leaving of the evil spirits. By using the phrase σπαράξαν αὐτὸν καὶ κράξαν μεγάλη φωνῇ (torn him and cried out with a loud voice) after the command, Mark highlights the visible audible demonstration to literally show that the authoritative command of Jesus worked and, hence, the defeat of the unclean spirit. Convulsing and crying out before the command reflects the man being possessed while using it after the command is proof of exorcism. The shouting with a loud voice no doubt shows the effectiveness of Jesus' command.

The people were amazed. ἐθαμβήθησαν (amazed) is a synonym of ἐξεπλήσσοντο (astonished). The adjective "all" emphasizes that everyone was amazed and impressed at Jesus' exorcism. With the exorcism causing such amazement, Mark further wants to show that it had an impact on the audience given the fact that they started to talk amongst themselves. The phrase τί ἐστὶν τοῦτο (what is this?) is an interrogative phrase, a question concerning Jesus' teaching, which also shows their amazement. In other words, their amazement prompted the question. Mark's recording of the words, "teaching" and "authority" uttered the second time by Jesus' audience completes the framing of exorcism to support Jesus' authority as a teacher. The preposition "with" in κατ' ἐξουσίαν (with authority) is used with a sense of adding more emphasis on the manner Jesus taught. This supports the authoritative teaching being the activity of Jesus' teaching and not the subject matter. The

new teaching of Jesus is in the awesome authoritative manner that his audience had never heard or seen.

The emphasis on Jesus' authority is carried forward through the report about him, the immediate spread of the report, into the surrounding region of Galilee, the whole surrounding region, and going out everywhere with no part missed. To Mark, Jesus proved powerful with his authoritative teaching and authoritative exorcism.

In conclusion, Gundry (1993) demonstrates how the contrast between Jesus, as a high-profile teacher with authority from God through the Holy Spirit, and the scribes with authority in regard to tradition is emphasized in Mark. It is as a result of the authoritative teaching of Jesus that he is referred to as a teacher. Here, Mark wanted to portray Jesus as highly respected, putting him higher than the scribes. The scribes appealed to authority yet Jesus assumed authority in his teaching. It is also the case that Jesus taught authoritatively and, therefore, Mark wanted to emphasize how he taught, and not what he taught. For Mark, Jesus' authority has a divine origin attached to God and the Holy Spirit, thus, making Jesus holy and showing the contrast between Jesus and the unclean spirit. His nature of authority assumes authority rather than appeals to authority; that authority is expressed in the power over the unclean spirit and authority to teach. Jesus' manifestation of authority physically was through Jesus commanding the unclean spirit through the power of the Holy Spirit to come out of the possessed man so that he could be spiritually clean.

In this pericope, Mark also wants to emphasize that Jesus does not connect and will never at all connect with the unclean spirit. He is superior to the demon and this is witnessed by its obedience to the commands of Jesus. Combining these two stories of Jesus' authoritative teaching and authoritative exorcism, Mark helps his audience to shift focus from the shameful death of Jesus at the end of his life on the cross, to look at Jesus' death as

glorious on the cross as one powerful with authoritative teaching and authoritative exorcism, the Holy Son of God.

Conclusion

The three approaches used by the different scholars for this text focused on the ideas and understanding of Jesus' authority and teaching in the text. The researcher employing the two approaches of rhetorical and pragmatic analysis expects to unveil additional (and perhaps even different) insights from the text since the researcher will use approaches that focus on the use of statements, the performance of words spoken, and the effectiveness of the words spoken. This serves to clarify the understanding of the message in the text of the study, which Mark wanted to communicate to the audience. It will also show how the text under study, Mark 1:21-28, connects to the entire message of the gospel of Mark and how it can be applied in some contemporary AICs. Some of these conclusions are not captured in the approaches reviewed above, yet they are key to facilitating proper understanding and application of the text in the present-day African context.

Chapter Three

Research Methodology

Introduction

This chapter explains the research methodology employed in conducting this study. It presents the rhetorical and pragmatic approaches in depth and how they will be used as compared to the findings of the three scholars in chapter two. In this chapter, therefore, the historical background of both approaches is given, as well as how both are used in the text and the value of both approaches being used in the analysis of the text.

Rhetoric

For this study, rhetoric is defined “as messages that rely on verbal and nonverbal symbols more or internal influence of social attitude, value, beliefs, and action” (Stoner & Perkins, 2004, p. 6). With that, we can say that rhetoric is purposeful, responding to address the public audience, creating less misunderstood social concerns, and shaping people to think, act, believe, and feel. Rhetorical messages are discussed as rhetorical artefacts, rhetorical discourse, rhetorical texts, or rhetorical acts (Stoner & Perkins, 2004).

Other scholars define rhetoric differently. Foss (2018), for example, concurs with the definition of rhetoric as the human use of symbols to communicate. Foss breaks his definition into three including people being the creators of rhetoric, the symbol being a medium of rhetoric, and communication as the purpose of rhetoric. This researcher agrees with this definition since people use symbols to communicate.

Billings, Birdnow, and Parsons (2001) cite Whately (1867) who finds rhetoric to be an argumentative composition. This is considered to balance between those that consider

rhetoric as a composition in phrase and those that limit it to only persuasive speaking. This is true since in some cases, rhetoric is seen in arguments. Additionally, Cornelius (2000) quotes Thurén (1992) who considers rhetoric as a form of persuasion in general. Thurén also describes rhetoric as seeking to study what is the purpose of any discourse, hence, analysing the means used in a text to lead to persuasion. Similarly, Kuypers (2009) defines rhetoric as a strategy used in communication both orally and written to achieve a specific goal. Burke (1969), a key scholar in dramatic criticism defines rhetoric as the use of words by human agents to form attitudes and induce action in other human agents.

Rhetor

This is a term used to refer to the person creating a message, the speaker, pointer, musician, blogger, website writer, filmmaker, etc. (Foss, 2018). These rhetors are very key as they help create the rhetorics that are used in any piece of work.

Elements of Rhetoric

It is important to fully understand these elements, as presented by Richard Whately (1867), one of the greatest rhetorical theorists and scholars as demonstrated in his book ‘elements of rhetoric’. The elements are key in the use of rhetorical criticism in the study of any text given. The critic should distinguish these elements in a text for better application of the method. Some of these elements are analysed in the criticism methods discussed in the sections that follow.

Audience

This refers to the listeners/public audience, passive spectators to a performance or speech, or the intended readers of a written piece (Kjeldsen, 2018; Porter, 1996). The audience is an important concern of rhetoric since the fifth century. The idea to consider the audience as a key factor in rhetoric has been a long-time suggestion to writers and speakers (Enos, 2011).

Author

An author is a creator who can either be a person, a group of people, or an organization, who helps in the composition of a text for their audience. An author can also be referred to as a rhetor, speaker, or writer (Gagich & Zickel, 2018; Jeffrey & Zickel, 2017).

Purpose

The purpose is the reason why the rhetor writes a particular piece of text. In other words, it is the intended or expected outcome of the writing (Gagich & Zickel, 2018; Jeffrey & Zickel, 2017).

Voice

This is a distinctive style in which an author writes his work or the manner in which an author expresses himself or herself. Voice attracts and at the same time communicates to the reader. Voice includes different stylistic techniques and literary devices such as syntax, diction, semantics, dialogue, tone, character development, pacing, etc. (Phelan, 2014).

Medium

This refers to the way in which the message is sent out. Medium, is also the delivery mode used and this differs from the type of text or message. As per Nordquist (2020), this can either be through:

- a) Alphabetical text, like written speech, newspapers, essays, and others.
- b) Images, for example, television channels.
- c) Sound, for example, radios.
- d) Multimedia texts like YouTube, performances among others.

Context

This refers to the circumstances surrounding the text during its original writing and delivery. Context can also refer to the information that helps one understand the historical background/circumstance of an event, a person, or an idea, including the time, place, purpose, audience, and content (Gagich & Zickel, 2018; Jeffrey & Zickel, 2018).

Content

This refers to what is being written about by the rhetor. Content includes choosing and maintaining the right topic and the grade of details for a particular purpose and audience considered in the writing.

Rhetorical Criticism

According to Kuypers (2009), rhetorical criticism is the process of putting much attention or focus on human efforts to be persuasive. According to Foss (2018), however, rhetorical criticism is a strategic investigation and explanation of symbolic rhetorical acts and artefacts whose purpose is to facilitate the understanding of rhetorical processes. Foss further breaks his definition into three parts, namely, systematic analysis of the act of criticism, acts and artefacts being the objects to be analyzed in the criticism, and the rhetorical process to have the purpose of criticism.

Furthermore, Wilder (1964) cited in Thiselton (2009) refers to the term rhetorical criticism as a transhistorical approach, focusing on the literary at the expense of the historical and theological approaches. This helps in the understanding of the text by extracting the right

message and defining how it can be applied. This observation is also supported by Kennedy (2014), who argues that rhetorical criticism is about being persuasive and convincing.

Historical Background of Rhetorical Criticism

Cornelius (2000) cites Hughes (1989), who acknowledges rhetorical criticism as a method that is more and more becoming recognized as a method of interpretation of the Pauline letters and the rest of Biblical literature.

Park (2009), for example, believes that when studying the communicative nature of the gospel of Mark, serious consideration should be given to the 1st century rhetorical culture in which the gospel was written. Dunn (2000) and Iverson (2009) support this view by considering the 1st century Mediterranean world, which was about moving from oral to manuscript culture, with the oral supporting the manuscript culture (Markan textuality). Park (2010), however, asserts that the gospel of Mark as a text originates from the oral and manuscript culture. It is difficult to differentiate between the written speech and the delivered speech, given that the written speech comes from the delivered speech. Park (2010) further supports the idea that in the 1st century Mediterranean world, both orality and textuality took place and would have been employed by the evangelist in the gospel. Park (2010, pp. 46) further argues that it was a rhetorical culture such that “Writing ... imitates both speech and writing and speech ... imitates both speech and writing.”

After a long time of using narrative and historical criticism in biblical interpretation, a new shift to focus on rhetorical criticism and the impact that comes with it took place.

It is important to understand that rhetorical criticism approaches ancient writings in the light of rhetorical patterns. It strives to understand the way any given work would affect a given audience in understanding the message (O’Gorman, 2005). As such, the Greek rhetoricians recognized many patterns that speaking and writing followed. They, however,

generally recognized three species of rhetoric: *Judicial*, which is designed to persuade the audience to make judgments about events occurring in the past; *deliberative*, which encourages the audience to take some action in the future; and *epideictic*, which celebrates or denounces some person or some quality (O'Gorman, 2005; Montagne, 2016; Epideictic, 2009).

Stoner and Perkins (2004) believe rhetoric has had a negative connotation for a long time. In the 5th century B.C., it was considered a flowery language, meaning hearing words without meaning with no real substance. Here, substance means rhetorical words without action. Zarefsky (2006) also commented that recent works have shown rhetorical criticism to be problematic. This has led to the understanding that rhetorical criticism is only in two forms: One, as a criticism of rhetoric that goes beyond oral and written texts including non-verbal and non-discursive representation and actions; Two, rhetorical criticism denoted as a type of criticism meaning that anything can be applied to rhetorical criticism.

Furthermore, important aspects of rhetoric have been overlooked in biblical studies because of historically focused studies (Incigneri, 2003). This has reinforced the rejection of the rhetorical context by the second stream of scholarship which tended to focus on the literary critical methods. Incigneri (2003) continues to argue that rhetorical criticism has not been given a chance. This can only be solved when rhetorical criticism as a theory is given a chance in the scholarly space in order to allow the text to achieve its meaning. He notes that by the time the text is translated through all those other processes, the insights of the gospel in the text are already lost. This is to say that the coherence, interconnections, allusions, irony, mood, and the intended meaning to the reader are achieved when rhetorical criticism is applied.

In addition, Classen (2002) asserts that rhetorical criticism as an instrument of interpretation of the biblical text was not shared in all quarters. For this reason, some scholars simply ignore the method and others feel so uneasy about their doubts that they cannot ask for advice or assistance from the classicists.

Value of Rhetorical Criticism

Arguably, biblical scholarship has come a long way toward improving the rhetorical forces of the biblical materials as a standard for New Testament biblical practice. As such, many scholarly works have taken for granted the surface meaning and impact of the text as either written as narrative or epistolary rhetoric (Schweitzer, 2001), hence, missing the point of taking a rhetorical position, which focuses on its impact on the audience.

Using rhetorical criticism, this theoretical approach will enlighten the understanding of the text under study by looking closely at the style of writing and the use of the figures of speech, determining the speaker, the context, the audience, the purpose, and the subject addressed in the pericope.

Rhetoric helps to present a creative strategy for dealing with the situation at hand, while also solving the problem inherent in the situation identified. It also offers commands and instructions, helping individuals go through life and helping them feel at home (Foss, 2018). In this regard, Iverson (2014) believes that rhetorical education helps improve the memory capacity of the people living in an oral culture. Similarly, Maxwell (2014) is cited by Iverson (2014) highlighting that accurate communication is needed in a rhetorical culture. She also notes that the audience's common memory and experience of the text does not come from the written text but from the oral tradition.

Furthermore, Zarefsky (2006) argues that rhetorical criticism helps one understand the processes by which both the speaker and audience adapt to understand each other. According

to Runesson (2010), by using a rhetorical approach, the text derives its function and power. It considers the context of the text, which includes events, the setting of the authors, time periods, audience, social attitudes, and many other things. Whatever message is being communicated in the text, therefore, can then be better understood if the context is considered, which makes the text have its function and power. Having said that, it is important to note that rhetorical criticism helps us know that rhetoric abounds in the day-to-day life experience and that the rhetorical message influences how people perceive and respond to the world (Stoner & Perkins 2004).

Bible texts written today are solidified. Considering this, therefore, we need to task ourselves with trying to understand the biblical text as the ancient rhetorical culture would have understood it. This approach emphasizes how the text would have originally been interpreted, coming up with indigenous theology and speaking beyond the traditional approaches. This approach, in this twenty-first century, will make the entire Bible more appropriate for a new audience, facilitating the eternal life-changing aspects attributed to the Bible at large.

By use of this approach, wisdom and understanding of the text will increase, because the meaning is found behind words, which are used to communicate a message to the audience. Exegeting the text with the rhetorical approach brings more clarity to the message communicated to the audience and how it can be best applied today. The unpacking of the figures of speech helps us have a better understanding of the text. The mood, tone, and intonation are also very key in rhetorical criticism.

It is also important to note that rhetorical criticism offers biblical teachers and pastors a lively forum to discuss the complex dynamics of religious discourse. This makes it easy for

the pastors and teachers of the word of God to understand and easily interact with the text (Black, 2013).

Hirsch Jr. (2014) cited in Kuypers, et al. (2014, p. 121) says that “the critic is right to think that the text should speak to us. The point which needs to be grasped clearly by the critic is that a text cannot be made to speak to us until what it says has been understood.” Considering this view, the reader of the Bible has to try reading the text and understanding it. Kennedy (2014) asserts that rhetorical criticism can also be used as a tool to complement the other forms of Bible interpretation, including form criticism, redaction criticism, historical criticism, literary criticism, narrative criticism, and many others. This is to say that in order to have an accurate result of Bible interpretation, rhetorical criticism cannot be used alone.

Cornelius (2000) records Wuellner (1995,) who sees rhetorical criticism as helping to understand the logic for judgments of values that are crucial for the analysis of the text. This leads away from traditional message or content-oriented reading of scriptures, to a reading that leads to generating and strengthening personal, social, and cultural values.

Methods of Modern Rhetorical Criticism

Modern rhetorical criticism has sub-methods that can be employed in the analysis of the text. Foss (2018) suggests the following methods: cluster criticism, ideological criticism, metaphoric criticism, narrative criticism, and pentadic criticism as sub-methods to modern rhetorical criticism. These are explained briefly below. For this study, pentadic criticism will be applied in the analysis of the text. This is because the information in the text presented by Mark is fit to be studied as a drama using language to constitute action through which different insights can be got (Foss, 2018).

Cluster Criticism

This is a method formulated and proposed by Kenneth Burke (Burke 1984) to help the critic identify and understand the motive of the rhetor. Under this method, the critic examines word relations and meanings to evaluate the perspective and worldviews of the rhetor (Burke, 1969). Keywords are identified in an artefact by the critic and other words that explain or bring more clarity to the keywords. All these are clustered to identify the right message, meaning, and idea communicated by the rhetor in the artefact.

This method brings together the meaning that the key symbols have for the critic to discover when grouping the associated words to the key symbols in the artefact. This criticism helps to give light to the meaning, in that the key terms bring out the subject and the main idea that the rhetor is trying to communicate in the artefact. It is also important to note that when cluster criticism is employed on someone's artefact, it can reveal something beneath the author's official front (Foss, 2018). It excavates far deeper into the artefact than a mere reading of the text can achieve. Thus, cluster criticism helps provide insights from the keywords used by the rhetor in an artefact to have a clear understanding of the message.

Foss (2018) explains further Burke's (1969) ideas of cluster criticism in the three steps used when analysing any artefact as follows:

1. Selecting of an artefact: Either a discursive or a non-discursive artefact can be selected for study under this method. Short artefacts in the form of adverts or poems are not good for this method. Longer artefact are advisable since this method is all about identifying key terms and clustering other words that associate around the key terms to have a clear message communicated by the rhetor.

2. Charting the clusters: Under this step, key terms are selected. When selecting, one looks at the words repeated most often and those with great impact. The terms that relate to

the key terms are clustered. These can be identified depending on the proximity, those that affect the key term, and also the use of the conjunctions. These words may include verbs, adverbs, and adjectives (Foss, 2004).

3. Explaining the artefact: This is achieved by looking at the linkage and pattern of the key terms and the associated words, either in the opposing or proposing way. Looking at the idea that comes out of the linkage, the associated term either modifies or influences the meaning of the key term in the artefact to provide the explanation of the message the rhetor is trying to put across (Foss, 2018).

Metaphoric Criticism

This is another method used under rhetorical criticism. Burke (1969), a theorist, mentions that metaphors demonstrate worldviews. This idea is further developed by Lakoff, Frisch, and Johnson (Lakoff & Frisch, 2006; Lakoff & Johnson, 2008), who argue that evaluating metaphors helps one understand the message better. By analysing the text, therefore, the critic locates metaphors, evaluating them to better understand the message the rhetor is addressing to the audience. According to Foss (2018), metaphors are analogies that allow us to map one experience in the terminology of another experience. A key concept is explained and understood better in relation to a situation in another concept. This, therefore, means communication is resolved by making a comparison (Gibbs, 2006).

Shelestiuk (2006) explains the two parts of a metaphor, namely the tenor, which is the topic or subject being explained, and the vehicle, which is the lens through which the tenor is being viewed. There are also two other terms used to differentiate the two parts of metaphor, namely target and source. The target here refers to the concept or the idea being understood while the source is the lens we can use to view the target (Shelestiuk, 2006).

Foss (2018) explains in detail the two steps that are key to achieving this method. Firstly, selecting the artefact: the artefact being selected has to have metaphors used in the writing of the text. This will make metaphoric criticism easy to use. Secondly, analysing the artefact. Here, the following four steps are considered,

1. Examining the artefact: This helps to give a general sense of the artefact context, considering the setting, occasion, audience, and rhetor. By examining the artefact, the critic gets familiar with the text or the elements of the artefact, and the context, so as to have a complete experience of the artefact.

2. Isolate the metaphors in the text: Under this, you can consider looking for metaphors where tenor and vehicle are used, or even in those circumstances where only the vehicle is used. This is done considering both the verbal and visual metaphors in the artefact.

3. Sort the metaphors: In this step, metaphors are sorted into groups in consideration of the tenor and the vehicle, looking for patterns in the artefact.

4. Explanation of the artefact: The artefact is explained according to the groupings of the metaphors used, explaining key aspects of the artefact (Foss, 2018).

Ideological Criticism

This is a method in rhetorical criticism used to discover the values and ideologies of the rhetor by reviewing the artefact written (Rowland, 2006). Under this method, the critic looks beyond the surface structure of the artefact to discover the beliefs, values, and assumptions it provides (Davies, 2013). Ideology, therefore, refers to a system of ideas, or patterns of belief that determine a group's interpretation of some aspect of the world (Foss, 2018; Bygrave, 2012). Ideology can also be a doctrine of belief, myth, and value that guides a person to act.

Under this method, Foss (2018) suggests an analysis of the artefact selected to be done in four steps as below

1. Identifying the elements presented in the artefact: By doing this, the critic is identifying the assumptions, the beliefs behind the artefact, that is to say, the signs that point to ideological tenets.
2. Identifying the suggested elements: This step points out ideas, themes, references, concepts, and allusions that lead to the presented elements in the artefact which serve as the basis of the ideological tenets.
3. Formulate the ideology: In this step, the suggested elements are grouped according to categories and organized into a comprehensible framework that constitutes the ideology suggested to be implicated in the artefact.
4. Identifying the function served by the ideology: This helps to uncover how the ideology developed functions for the audience addressed and the consequences that come with the new ideology in the world (Foss, 2018).

Narrative Criticism

This is another method that is also used in rhetorical criticism. Iversen (2014) quotes Fisher (1985), who defines narrative as words that have sequence and meaning for those that interpret them. Other scholars have also defined the term (see for example Carroll, 2001; Klapproth, 2009; Shen, 2013). This method helps organize and shape the stimuli of the experiences that can be faced so that we can have a sense of the places, people, actions, and events people encounter in their day-to-day lives. This method is inclusive of four characteristics (Foss, 2018). A good narrative should have at least two of these characteristics (Foss, 2018; Clandinin, & Connelly, 2000).

- 1) The event signals change, either actively expressing an action or statively expressing a condition or a state.
- 2) The events in the narrative should be organized according to time order,
- 3) The narrative should include some underlying or contributing relationships among events in the story.
- 4) Narratives should have a unifying subject.

The consideration of these characteristics in narrative criticism makes this method different from the others because it creates, for both the rhetor and the audience, personal involvement and immersion in the narrative and the narrated world.

According to Foss (2018), three steps are to be followed in this method:

1. Selecting the narrative: The narrative should at least have two of the characteristics mentioned above.
2. Analysing the artefact: In this step, the critic has to identify the objectives of the narrative, and identify the features of a narrative to discover how these features accomplish the objectives including setting, characters, the narrator, events, structure, audience, and so forth. These are also explained further by Rhoads, Dewey, & Michie (2012) and Resseguie (2019).
3. Assessing and evaluating the narrative: This is either done by inspecting the objectives to see if the narrative has achieved the intended message or assessing the strategies in the narrative to see if they have achieved the objectives and allowing the narrative to speak to the intended audience (Foss, 2018).

Pentadic Criticism

This is a method that is rooted in dramatism. It was developed and explained by Burke in his book 'Rhetoric of motives' explaining how and why humans use rhetoric

(Burke, 1969). Dramatism underlies two assumptions 1. The language uses constituting action and not motion. 2. Humans develop and present messages in the same way a play is presented (Foss, 2018; Westerfelhaus, 2017). This method will be used to analyse the selected artefact following through the first three steps and levelling out the fourth for further study.

1. Labelling the five terms of pentadic *are* explained below (Hart, 2012; Anderson, & Althouse, 2010): These include agent (the group or individuals who are the main character), act (the presentation of the major action by the agent), purpose (what the agent tends to accomplish by performing the act), scene (the grounds, location or situation the act is said to take place) and agency (the means to perform the act or the instrument used to accomplish the act) (Burke, 1969; Wess, 2001).

2. Applying the ratios of the terms to identify the central term: This is done to determine the most central, dominant, or important term of the pentadic. By identifying the most important term, it will then be easy to identify the rhetor's motive for writing (Weiser, 2007).

3. Identifying the motive: This is achieved after determining the dominant term. It is from the term that is determined to be most dominant that the motive is identified (Weiser, 2008).

4. Performing a pentadic cartography: Applying this stage is optional. The critic may decide to end the method by identifying the motive of the rhetor or taking a further step to perform the pentadic cartography. Under this section, Anderson and Prelli (2001) observe that the critic assesses the pentad written by the rhetor to see if it is open or closed. Open in this case means whether, in the writing, the rhetor comprises all the different perspectives on issues that have been considered and fully engaged, on the one hand. Closed, on the other hand, means the different perspectives in the writing are validated and others excluded (Westerfelhaus, 2017).

Pragmatic Analysis

Definition of Pragmatics

Bardovi-Harlig (2018) quotes Crystal (1987) who defines pragmatics as the study of factors that govern the choices of language that we use in our social interaction and the effect of our choices on others. This can also be understood as the study of how to do things with words (Austin, 1975), a great theorist in pragmatics. Bardovi-Harlig (2010) also quotes Crystal (1987) who defines pragmatics as the use of language in context. Similarly, Gonzalez (2012) quotes Levinson who defines pragmatics as the study of language use. Thomas (2014) also agrees with Levinson's definition of pragmatics as the study of language, focusing on the users and the context of language use, rather than the truth, grammar, and reference.

Another scholar, Bach (2004), defines pragmatic information as extra-linguistic information that comes from the actual utterance, which is important to the hearer's determination of the speaker's communication. This is also supported by Ossom-Batsa (2006). For the purpose of this study, however, pragmatics is defined as the study of language use to communicate doing what we want the language to do (Korta & Perry, 2011). Pragmatics is divided into two parts, namely: classical pragmatics and contemporary pragmatics. These are further explained and subdivided into other sections as follows.

Classical Pragmatics

Classical pragmatics is broken into two categories, a. Far-side pragmatics, which is concerned with what happens beyond saying something. b. Near-side pragmatics which concerns the nature of facts that are relevant in determining what is said (Korta & Perry, 2006).

Far-side Pragmatics

Austin and Searle focus on speech acts. Austin, a philosopher, came up with the idea of how words can be used to do different things, either through asserting, suggesting, promising, persuading, arguing, and many others. This depends not on the literal meaning of words and what one intends to do with them. This is also determined by the institutional and social setting in which the speaking is done (Korta & Perry, 2006). Austin (1975) emphasized illocutionary acts through which the importance of social facts and doing things with words is emphasized. Austin further explained and distinguished between constatives, which is merely saying something true or false, and performatives, which is doing something by speaking. Austin also introduces the idea of locutionary acts and perlocutionary acts. Searle (1965), a student of Austin, further developed the illocutionary acts into five subsections, namely representatives, directives, commissives, expressives and declaratives. All Austin and Searle's ideas were to lead beyond saying.

Levinson, Stephen, and Levinson (2000) refer to Grice's theory emphasizing conversational implicatures, which focus most on what goes beyond what is said. This is also supported by Davis (2009), who observes that conversational implicature arises from contextual factors. Grice (1957), a theorist, emphasizes the dissimilarity between what words mean (i.e. what the speaker means when saying them) and what speakers mean (i.e. intend to communicate using words), maxims, implicatures, and communicative intentions, hence going beyond words. In Grice's theory, he studies what someone says and what someone implicates by uttering a sentence. In his theory, what someone says is determined by the conversational meaning of the sentence spoken out (Leah, 2010).

Acheoah and Olaleye (2017) reflect on the combination of Austin-Searle's and Grice's theories by Bach (2003) and Harnish (2009) to come up with the unified theory of

linguistic communication and speech act theory. Under this, they further elaborate on the locutionary acts, the taxonomy of illocutionary acts, and the speech act schemes (Bach, 2003; Harnish, 2009).

Near-side Pragmatics

Stalnaker and Stalnaker (1999) and Kaplan (1989) are the main proponents of near-side pragmatics. They developed a two-paired approach to the content in utterances of the sentence containing indexicals. Here, Stalnaker focused on the propositional concept while Kaplan focused on context, character, and content (Korta, & Perry, 2008).

Contemporary Pragmatics

Under this type of pragmatics, many theorists have concurred with Grice's theory (Korta and Perry, 2006; Carston, 2005), thus adopting his three main concepts, including:

1. The fundamental distinction between what the speaker says and what he or she implicates.
2. Rules and principles are from general principles of rationality, cooperation, cognition, etc.
3. The notion of communicative intention. That is, the intention that is recognized by the addressee.

Speech act theory will be considered and applied in the study of the text. This aspect of pragmatics is further explained below in the sections that follow.

Speech Act Theory

Since the twentieth century, speech act theory has been influential in philosophy, linguistics, legal theory, psychology, literary theory, etc (Mitchell, 2014). The speech act theory refers to the use of statements rather than making statements. It studies the use of

words to present information and carry out actions. Under speech act theory, things are accomplished through the use of words, hence, the performance of words (Tate, 2008; Saeed, 2003). Statements are always made when making requests, invitations, warnings, apologies, promises, etc. (Mitchell, 2014). Austin (1975) argued that all utterances should be viewed as actions of a speaker. In other words, all utterances are equivalent to actions (Oishi, 2006; Fann, 2011).

Locutionary

This is the act of saying something in the full normal sense of saying something (Austin, 1975). Similarly, Kissine (2013) defines a locutionary act as an act of making a meaningful utterance. In other words, a spoken language that is preceded by silence and followed by silence. According to Austin (1962), locutionary is further divided into two types, namely utterance act and propositional act. Here, utterance acts refer to words said that do not have any meaning while propositional acts are those words that make a particular reference. They are clear and express a definable point (Kissine, 2013; Korta & Perry, 2011). In addition, Austin (1962) suggests three perspectives from which an utterance can be viewed, namely:

One. Phonetic act, which is the act of uttering some noises;

Two. Phatic act, which is merely the utterance of words, and

Three. Rhetic act, which is the uttering of words with a more or less clear sense or reference.

These perspectives are also explained further in Austin (1975).

Illocutionary

This is an act performed in saying something, or an utterance performed in doing something. Alston (2000) simplifies the term as an act of issuing a locution with some force. Under this aspect, Austin (1975) and Searle (1985) introduced and further developed five categories to better explain the illocutionary aspect, namely:

One. Verdictives/Representatives: Where a speaker gives a verdict, for example, in giving an acquittal. The speaker also uses verbs like affirm, conclude and believe etc, to assert a proposition.

Two. Exercitives/Directives: Speakers here exercise power, influence, and right, for example, when excommunicating someone. The speaker can also give directives to the hearer by use of words like beg, ask, command, challenge, etc.

Three. Commissives: Speakers commit themselves to a course of action through promising, betting, etc. Other verbs of action are also used as pledge, swear, guarantee, vow, etc, to show the commitment of the speaker.

Four. Behabitives/Expressives: these are concerned with the attitude and the social behavior of the person, for example, when apologizing. Other verbs can also be used as congratulations, detest, appreciate, deplore, regret, etc.

Five. Expositives/Declaration: Under this, speakers clarify how their utterances fit in the lines of reasoning, for example in postulating, defining, etc. In other words, the speaker's utterance alters the external status/condition of an object or situation (Austin, 1975; Searle, 1985). This is also supported by (Vanderveken & Kubo, 2002; Igoshev, 2016; Oishi, 2016), who explains illuctionay act on the basis of the five categories developed by Austin and Searle.

Perlocutionary

This is an act performed by saying something (Austin, 1975). Martinich (2012) adds to Austin's definition of perlocutionary as an act performed by saying something and not in saying something. Alston (2000), with a similar definition, considers perlocutionary acts as producing a result on some audience by an utterance. This is also supported by (Sbisà, 2013), who defines perlocutionary as an act performed by saying something, that is to say, by performing a locutionary act. Here, Allott, (2010) suggests words like inciting, persuading, comforting, and angering as indicating perlocutionary acts.

Conclusion

This chapter has given detailed information about the two methods, rhetorical criticism and pragmatic analysis that the researcher will use to study the text in order to have a deeper interpretation and application as compared to the other approaches and to provide a remedial to the abuse of biblical authority in the AICs.

The following chapter will now use these two approaches mentioned in this chapter to exegete the text under study, Mark 1:21-28.

Chapter Four

Analysis of the Text

Introduction

In this chapter, rhetorical criticism and pragmatic analysis are further applied to the text of the study, Mark 1:21-28. Considering the use of language in this study, exegetical and syntactical analysis is also applied. The purpose of this chapter is, therefore, to demonstrate fresh interpretations through rhetorical and pragmatic analyses that are not captured in the methods reviewed in chapter three of this study. The chapter is divided into three parts, namely rhetorical criticism using pentadic criticism, pragmatic analysis using speech act theory, and a conclusion of what has been presented. The translated Greek text in this chapter is the researcher's.

Text of study in Greek: Mark 1:21-28

²¹καὶ εἰσπορεύονται εἰς Καφαρναούμ. καὶ εὐθὺς τοῖς σάββασιν εἰσελθὼν εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν ἐδίδασκεν.

²²καὶ ἐξεπλήσσοντο ἐπὶ τῇ διδαχῇ αὐτοῦ. ἦν γὰρ διδάσκων αὐτοὺς ὡς ἐξουσίαν ἔχων καὶ οὐχ ὡς οἱ γραμματεῖς.

²³καὶ εὐθὺς ἦν ἐν τῇ συναγωγῇ αὐτῶν ἄνθρωπος ἐν πνεύματι ἀκαθάρτῳ καὶ ἀνέκραγεν

²⁴λέγων, Τί ἡμῖν καὶ σοί, Ἰησοῦ Ναζαρηνέ; ἤλθες ἀπολέσαι ἡμᾶς; οἶδά σε τίς εἶ, ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ.

²⁵καὶ ἐπετίμησεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς λέγων· Φιμώθητι καὶ ἔξελθε ἐξ αὐτοῦ.

²⁶καὶ σπαράξαν αὐτὸν τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἀκάθαρτον καὶ φωνῆσαν φωνῇ μεγάλῃ ἐξῆλθεν ἐξ αὐτοῦ.

²⁷καὶ ἐθαμβήθησαν ἅπαντες, ὥστε συζητεῖν πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς λέγοντας· Τί ἐστὶν τοῦτο; διδαχὴ καινὴ· κατ' ἐξουσίαν καὶ τοῖς πνεύμασι τοῖς ἀκαθάρτοις ἐπιτάσσει, καὶ ὑπακούουσιν αὐτῷ.

²⁸καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ἡ ἀκοὴ αὐτοῦ εὐθὺς πανταχοῦ εἰς ὅλην τὴν περίχωρον τῆς Γαλιλαίας.

My own translation of the text

²¹And they went into Capernaum, and then on the Sabbath, he entered into the synagogue and began teaching.

²²And they were astonished at his teaching, for he was teaching them as one who had authority and not as the scribes.

²³And immediately there was in their synagogue a man with an unclean spirit; and it cried out.

²⁴Saying, “What do you have to do with us, Jesus of Nazareth? Have you come to destroy us? I know who you are, the Holy one from God.

²⁵But Jesus rebuked him saying, “You be silent and come out from him.”

²⁶And [by] convulsing him and crying with a loud voice, the unclean spirit came out from him.

²⁷And they were all being amazed, so that they questioned within themselves saying, “What is this? A new teaching with authority, he even commands the unclean spirits and they obey him.”

²⁸And at once news about him spread everywhere throughout all the region of Galilee.

Rhetorical: Pentadic criticism

Below is the analysis of the text according to the above method. In this method, the text of study/artefact is analysed in three stages as discussed below.

Stage two. Labeling the five elements/terms in the artefact.

These are identified from the perspective of the rhetor in the text/pericope.

Agent: Jesus (Ἰησοῦς)

Ἰησοῦς (Jesus) is the main character in this pericope, on whom everything in the pericope rotates as narrated by the rhetor. This is the person who performed the act and is referred to as the Agent.

Act: Teaching and Rebuking

Teaching and rebuking, which leads to an exorcism, are the major actions in the pericope by the agent as presented by the rhetor. This stage names what took place in the pericope. Teaching and rebuking are what took place in the pericope as narrated by the rhetor. These two acts come from two Greek words ἐδίδασκεν (an imperfect active indicative third person singular being used with an ingressive imperfect force) and ἐπετίμησεν (an aorist active indicative third person singular used as a constative aorist) respectively.

Agency: Authority (ἐξουσίαν)

ἐξουσίαν (authority) is the agency named by the rhetor of the pericope. The agency is the means through which the act is performed. It is through the authority that Jesus taught his audience and at the same time rebuked the unclean spirit from a man.

Scene: The synagogue (τὴν συναγωγὴν)

Τὴν συναγωγὴν (the synagogue) is the place where the act of teaching and rebuking took place. In this pericope, the scene is identified as the synagogue. This synagogue was located in Capernaum according to the rhetor.

Purpose

The purpose is the agent's intention in completing the act in the pericope. In other words, this is the reason for the action. As such, the purpose has to do with why the agent performed the action. In this case, the purpose is to show that Jesus was not a mere person

from Nazareth but the Son of God, and indeed God, who had the authority to teach and authority over the unclean spirit. This is seen through how Jesus teaches and exorcises demons in this pericope.

Stage two. Identify the dominant/central term

The identification of the dominant/central term requires the application of a ratio system to the elements in the pericope. It is from these ratio groupings that the dominant term/element is identified. The dominant term is the most important term of the five identified above, namely agent, act, agency, scene, and purpose. This is the term that all the other terms/elements depend on or through which everything in the pentad depends. Below are the different groupings of the ratio elements to discover the relationship between them and how they influence each other as well as how the first term controls/influences the nature of the second term/ element.

Scene ratio

Scene - Act: YES (Scene “synagogue” influences the act “Teaching and rebuking” making the act effective since teachers of the law/the scribes always met in the synagogue).

Scene - Agent: YES (Scene “synagogue: the place” influences Agent “Jesus” in that he goes to the synagogue on Sabbath to pray, hence, performing the act “teaching and rebuking” , which shows that he is influenced by the synagogue).

Scene - Agent: NO (Scene “synagogue: the people” here do not influence the agent’s “Jesus” behavior for what he did in the synagogue, the Act he could do elsewhere not compromising).

Scene - Agency: NO (Scene does not influence the Agency “Authority” Jesus has or uses to teach and rebuke the unclean spirit leading to exorcism).

Scene - Purpose: YES (Scene influences the purpose, “Jesus showing himself as the Son of God”, just as Luke showing his readers Jesus as the Son of God). This was contrary to what Jesus’s audience believed.

Act ratio

Act - Scene: YES (The Act “Teaching and rebuking” influences the scene “Synagogue”. It was in the synagogue that the scribes and other believers met. The act made the audience amazed).

Act - Agent: NO (Act does not control/influence Agent “Jesus” since Jesus is the main character performing the acts of teaching and rebuking).

Act - Agency: NO (Act does not influence Agency “Authority” because Jesus’ authority is from God and not based on his teaching and rebuking).

Act - Purpose: YES (the act influences the purpose of “Jesus being received as the Son of God”. The act helps to achieve the purpose directly, that is, Jesus is the Son of God, whose teaching and rebuking leads to exorcism).

Agent ratio

Agent - Scene: YES (Agent “Jesus” influences Scene “synagogue” in that through his act, the teachers of the law/scribes and the entire audience in the synagogue are amazed at his teaching and rebuking, which led to exorcism).

Agent - Act: YES (Agent influences/controls the act “teaching and rebuking” for it was Jesus who was teaching and rebuking).

Agent - Agency: YES (Agent influences Agency “Authority” since it is Jesus using the authority given to him to teach and rebuke, which amazes his audience).

Agent - purpose: YES (Agent controls Purpose “Jesus being received as the Son of God”, thus, his teaching and rebuking of the unclean spirit amazes the audience and determines the purpose).

Agency ratio

Agency - Scene: YES (Agency “Authority” influences Scene “synagogue,” it is through the authority that Jesus teaches and rebukes, hence, amazing the people in the synagogue. The authority influences the way Jesus’s audience perceives him and what he did).

Agency - Act: YES (Agency influences Act “teaching and rebuking”. It is through the authority that he taught and rebuked, hence, amazing his audience then).

Agency - Agent: YES (Agency influences Agent “Jesus” in the sense that it is the authority that Jesus used to teach and rebuke the unclean spirit in the synagogue. If Jesus did not have the authority, he could not have taught and rebuked the way he did).

Agency - Purpose: YES (Agency influences Purpose “Jesus being received as the Son of God”. Through authority, Jesus teaches and rebukes the unclean spirit, hence, achieving the purpose).

Purpose ratio

Purpose - Scene: YES (Purpose “Jesus being received as the Son of God” influences scene “synagogue” Jesus’s audience in the synagogue is amazed at Jesus’s teaching and rebuking hence leading the entire synagogue towards the purpose).

Purpose - Act: YES (The Act “teaching and rebuking” is influenced by purpose. For the purpose to be achieved, the act has to be in a certain way).

Purpose - Agent: NO (Purpose does not influence/control the nature of the agent “Jesus” Jesus remains who he is regardless).

Purpose - Agency: NO (Purpose does not influence/control agency “authority” for Jesus’ authority is not based on the purpose).

Conclusion on the ratios

According to the ratios discussed above, the dominant terms are Agency “authority” (ἐξουσίαν) and Agent “Jesus” (Ἰησοῦς). This is because these terms control the second term/element more compared to the other terms. It is important to note that the terms Agency “ἐξουσίαν” and Agent “Ἰησοῦς” dominate *scene* “συναγωγήν” in a way that the leaders in the synagogue respected Jesus as the teacher who had disciples and, hence, gave him an opportunity to teach as a visitor. They respected the authority in his life as a teacher with which he changed the order of service, including an exorcism. Here, Warren (1996) finds that it was customary to all visitors, and rabbis to read and teach scripture and it was through that culture that Jesus was able to teach when he went into the synagogue.

The dominant terms also control the *act* of “teaching and rebuking” in the artefact/pericope. Jesus “Agent” was able to teach in an extraordinary way with authority “Agency” and, at the same time, carry out an exorcism. The authority “Agency” influenced the teaching of Jesus’ audience and rebuking of the unclean spirit, hence, their amazement at Jesus’ authority.

The terms *agent* “Jesus” and *agency* “authority” also control each other in a way that the agent “Ἰησοῦς” is able to teach and exorcise through the authority given to him by God. Jesus does not carry out the act of teaching and rebuking on his own but through the authority given to him by God. In the same way, agency “ἐξουσίαν” controls/influences the nature of

the agent in that Jesus could not have taught and rebuked the unclean spirit leading to exorcism, the way he did without the authority “ἐξουσίαν” from God. The authority Jesus possesses from God contributes a lot to how he behaves in this pericope as he teaches and rebukes the unclean spirit.

Both the terms *agency* “ἐξουσίαν” and *agent* “Ἰησοῦς” control the element “Purpose” in that through authority from God, he teaches and rebukes the unclean spirit leading to exorcism. The purpose of Jesus, who is not considered just a mere person from Nazareth but a Son of God, Holy with authority and power over the unclean spirit, is achieved in this pericope by Jesus the agent and the rhetor, Mark.

Stage three. Identifying the motive from the dominant term

The motive of the rhetor is identified based on the dominant terms agent “Jesus” and agency “authority”. Since the dominant terms are agent and agency, pragmatism comes into play (Burke, 1985). The motive of the rhetor (Mark) is, therefore, identified based on the dominant terms agency and agent. As such, Mark is motivated by Jesus’ authority, thus, putting his emphasis on showing his audience that Jesus was the true Son of God, the Holy One of God, who had the authority and power from God over the unclean spirit and through which he was able to teach and exorcise differently from the scribes. The motive here is established from the dominant terms agency “authority” and agent “Jesus”. Everything is done to reflect Jesus as the Son of God, Holy with authority and power over the unclean spirit.

Pragmatic analysis: Speech Act Theory

Introduction

Speech Act Theory puts more emphasis on the use of words/statements rather than just making statements. In other words, all utterances are equivalent to actions (Oishi, 2006;

Fann, 2011). Under this method, the utterances in the text of the study will be explained further using these terms; locutionary, perlocutionary, and illocutionary. These terms are explained in the sections that follow.

Locutionary

The act of just saying statements in the normal sense of saying something (Austin, 1975). Under this, the utterances made are viewed in three perspectives, namely, phonetic act, which is an act of uttering some noises, phatic act, which is the utterance of words, and rhetic act, which is uttering words with a more clear sense.

Perlocutionary

This refers to an act performed by saying something and not in saying something (Martinich, 2012). To Moore (2001) these are the effects of the utterance on the listener.

Illocutionary

This is defined as an act performed in saying something. This involves five categories, namely vindictive, exercitives, commissives, behabitives, and expositives as theorised by both Austin (1975) and Searle (1985) and applied to the text of study to see how words are used by the rhetor.

This method is applied to the pericope of study as follows.

Verse-by-verse study

Verse 21

Καὶ εἰσπορεύονται εἰς Καφαρναούμ. καὶ εὐθὺς τοῖς σάββασιν εἰσελθὼν εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν ἐδίδασκεν.

And they went into Capernaum, and then on the Sabbath, he entered into the synagogue and began teaching.

This verse is a rhetic act under the locutionary act. As such, the rhetor is basically uttering statements informing his audience of what happened to Jesus and his disciples, going to Καφαρναούμ “Capernaum” where immediately on the Sabbath “σάββασιν” Jesus entered the Συναγωγὴν “synagogue” and began to teach the audience.

Καὶ a logical connective conjunction, connects an additional idea or grammatical element in the pericope. In this sense, Mark was connecting the previous activities of Jesus in Galilee where he began his public ministry preaching the gospel of the kingdom of God. “The time has come; the kingdom of God is near. Repent and believe the good news” (Mark 1:14-15). It is during this time that Jesus started calling his first disciples. καὶ at the beginning of this section of the pericope, therefore, is for Mark’s audience to easily and logically connect this section to the previous one. Εἰσπορεύονται, which is a present deponent indicative third person plural, is used in this verse as a historical present.

Rhetorically, Mark’s emphasis is on Jesus and his disciples going to Καφαρναούμ “Capernaum” from Galilee. It is important to note that Jesus and his disciples coming to Capernaum from Galilee was due to the persecution that was going on at that time even if the text does not show this. The fact that John the Baptist was then arrested probably accelerated the going to Capernaum for Jesus and his few disciples even when he had not yet finished identifying all his disciples.

Εὐθὺς (immediately) is an adverb modifying the verb εἰσελθων (he entered) putting more emphasis on Jesus and his disciples entering the συναγωγὴν “synagogue”, not with only the sense of immediacy but also next in sequence using “then.” The change from the plural “they went” to singular “He entered” is worth noting. Could it be that the disciples did not go

into the synagogue? This is unlikely. If not, then why does Mark change from plural to singular referring to Jesus alone entering the synagogue? With this observation, perhaps Mark wants to put more emphasis on Jesus, helping his audience know Jesus better as the Son of God. It is important to note that the attention moved from “Jesus and the disciples” to Jesus alone throughout the pericope.

Σάββατον (sabbath) a dative used as temporal expresses time to emphasize when Jesus entered the synagogue and began to teach. Mark is not emphasizing Sabbath as an event, but the time when Jesus entered the synagogue. Here, Henry (2008) notes that Jesus regularly observed the Sabbath day, although not tying himself to the tradition of the elders.

Συναγωγὴν (synagogue) is an accusative direct object relating to a place into which Jesus and his disciples entered to pray. It connects to the transitive verb ἐδίδασκεν (began teaching), which is an imperfect active indicative third person singular. This verb is used as an ingressive imperfect indicating that Jesus began teaching when he entered the synagogue, as observed by Warren (1996). The emphasis is on Jesus beginning to teach after he entered the synagogue. Jamieson, Fausset, and Brown (1997) expound on the ingressiveness of the verb ἐδίδασκεν (began teaching) saying, it indicates Jesus’ beginning to teach in the synagogue since they had just come into Capernaum, but also continuing to teach after that activity.

Mark is keen on Jesus’ teaching in the synagogue. He wanted to show that it was unique and full of authority. This is supported by the amazement of Jesus’ audience later in verse 27 referring to it as new teaching. This verse is, therefore, rhetoric since it is just giving the audience a clear sense/reference of what happened in the text, basically informing Mark’s audience that Jesus and his disciples went to Capernaum on Sabbath, where Jesus was given an opportunity to teach.

Verse 22

καὶ ἐξεπλήσσοντο ἐπὶ τῇ διδαχῇ αὐτοῦ. ἦν γὰρ διδάσκων αὐτοὺς ὡς ἐξουσίαν ἔχων καὶ οὐχ ὡς οἱ γραμματεῖς.

And they were astonished at his teaching, for he was teaching them as one who had authority and not as the scribes.

Verse 22 is a perlocutionary act. Mark records Peter uttering statements as a reference to what happened to Jesus' audience during and after his teaching in the synagogue on Sabbath. This is done to basically inform his audience (Mark's) that Jesus' audience was astonished/ overwhelmed, wondering at his teaching; since he was teaching them as one who had ἐξουσίαν "authority" and not as the οἱ γραμματεῖς "scribes". The word ἐξουσίαν is an accusative used as a direct object which is translated as authority to rule, jurisdiction, symbol of authority, ruler, control and power, supernatural power, and right to judge. From all these meanings, we can get to know how the Jews understood ἐξουσίαν (authority) relating it to Jesus and the scribes.

In other words, Jesus had exactly what that word means (Swanson, J. 2001). οἱ γραμματεῖς "the Scribes" can also be known as teachers of the law, Greek grammateus, secretaries, and clerks, taking the title of high official. This term carried the meaning of Jewish experts, and scholars in the law, who were also representatives, with the high priests, elders of the Jews, and the Pharisees making up the Jewish council of the Sanhedrin (Mare, 2004).

Ἐξεπλήσσοντο "they were astonished" is used by Mark as a descriptive imperfect describing to his audience the continuous amazement of Jesus' audience "at his teaching." The imperfect connects Jesus' audience to the astonishment, overwhelmed, or wondering at

his teaching. ἐπὶ (at) is a causal preposition translated as, because of, on the basis of, which Mark uses to point to the astonishment about Jesus' teaching. It is, therefore, because of Jesus' teaching that his audience was amazed.

τῇ διδαχῇ “his teaching” was characterized with the authority Jesus had. It is not clear whether the amazement was because of the way he taught, the boldness he had, or the content of his teaching. I propose both could have led to the amazement of his audience since Jesus was physically there teaching them in the synagogue (France, 2002).

Γὰρ (for) an adverbial causal conjunction gives the reason for the amazement of Jesus' teaching. “He was teaching” (ἦν διδάσκων) is a progressive imperfect. Since Jesus was there and then teaching in the synagogue, ἦν διδάσκων (he was teaching) is used as a periphrastic construction. Mark here is stressing Jesus continuing to teach in the synagogue. Vincent (2001) expounds further saying the finite verb with the participle denotes something continuous and that is why we translate it as *was teaching*.

Zuck, Walvoord, and Barbieri (2000) further assert that Jesus' authoritative teaching was a spoken word from God with supernatural power to evoke decisions. Owing to that authority, Henry (2008) finds that Jesus taught as one who knew the mind of God, who was commissioned to declare his mind out to the people. The people, therefore, recognized that authority and, at the same time, differentiated it from that of the scribes.

Ὡς (as) is comparative comparing Jesus' teaching to something else. This is very important because it lets us know that the Jews had a picture of some people who they thought had authority, that is, “*the scribes*”. Compared to the scribes, Jesus' teaching was authoritative, thus, leading to continuous amazement, astonishment/wondering by Jesus' audience. They knew what it meant to have authority and that is why they could make a clear

distinction between Jesus and the scribes. Right from the beginning of chapter 1:16-20, when Jesus calls his first disciples, Mark is keen to show the authority that Jesus possessed.

Jesus calls Simon and Andrew while they are casting their nets, “...follow me and I will make you fishers of men” (Mark 1:17). He finds James and John mending their nets and calls them and immediately, and they both followed him (Mark 1:19-20). Indeed, this could only be done by someone who had authority, someone who is superior to the person being addressed. Jesus possessed this authority; the divine power from God. Jesus’s authority, therefore, was not comparable to that of the scribes. It was superior.

The scribes “οἱ γραμματεῖς” used the authority that was attained through studying the law, which can also be termed/recognized as a theological authority not divinely from God as compared to that of Jesus. Mark, therefore, refers to the scribes in this text because his audience could easily compare and differentiate Jesus and the Scribes. The Scribes based their authority on other rabbis and expounded the law of Moses though they did not get acquainted with it (Henry, 2008). Painter (1997) observes that the Scribes were experts and teachers of the law, who did not belong to any sect or party. Some were Pharisees by conviction and others were Sadducees. These were aristocratic and wealthy, belonging to the high priestly family.

In this verse, Mark wants his audience to know that Jesus’ teaching was full of authority/supernatural power/divine authority from God. The Scribes did not have such authority but that from man, authority acquired through the law and being taught. From this verse, therefore, we can deduce that the authority Jesus had was directly from God.

Verse 23

καὶ εὐθὺς ἦν ἐν τῇ συναγωγῇ αὐτῶν ἄνθρωπος ἐν πνεύματι ἀκαθάρτῳ καὶ ἀνέκραξεν

And immediately there was in their synagogue a man with an unclean spirit; and it cried out.

This verse is rhetic under locutionary act, that is, Mark recording a man in the synagogue with an unclean spirit. This verse is, therefore, taken as a reference, giving more clear sense/informative to both Jesus' and Mark's audiences, that the man possessed with unclean spirit was in the synagogue when Jesus was teaching with authority.

Εὐθὺς (immediately) modifies ἦν (was) and Mark using εὐθὺς (immediately), was either to maintain the dramatic movement which carries a message “immediately after Jesus had finished teaching” or serving a transition purpose using “then.” I propose that Mark's intention to use this verb εὐθὺς (immediately) was to bring out both effects. Mark wants his audience to see these two uses the immediacy and sequence showing a man in the synagogue possessed and crying out. Mark also wants to show this man “ἄνθρωπος” was possessed with an unclean spirit. The 1st preposition ἐν “in” is spatial, thus, Mark emphasizes the synagogue because it is in that synagogue the exorcism that follows takes place in what is considered a religious place of instruction and study, which in itself is startling. Mark uses this personal pronoun αὐτῶν (their) to refer to Jesus' audience in the synagogue. The possessive genitive in the personal pronoun could also reflect that Jesus and his disciples usually attended that synagogue.

The second preposition ἐν “with” is used as a thing possessed. With this, Mark is indicating that the Man was possessed with an unclean spirit. He, therefore, wants his audience to know that this young man was possessed with an unclean spirit and was delivered by Jesus (Vincent, 2001). This second ἐν (with) also has a force of “in the power of”. In other words, it has the force of possession. It is the unclean spirit that possessed the man, taking control over his life. ἀκαθάρτῳ “unclean” is an adjective that takes a positive normal

usage modifying the noun πνεύματι “spirit”. To grasp the right understanding, it is good to deal with these two words together as a clause πνεύματι ἀκαθάρ “unclean spirit”. ἀνέκραξεν “he cried out” the aorist here is constative. Here, Mark is looking at the whole incident, not at the internal workings of the action only. If he wanted to look at its internal working, however, the word would take an ingressive use, emphasizing the beginning of the action, in this case, the the unclean spirit beginning to cry out.

Jamieson, Fausset, and Brown (1997) assert that ἐν πνεύματι ἀκαθάρτῳ (with an clean spirit) is being entirely under demonic power and control. The man’s life was suffocated and that is why those words are followed by καὶ ἀνέκραξεν “crying out,” because the unclean spirit cried out not the man.

Zuck, Walvoord, and Barbieri (2000) plainly look at the presence of Jesus and his authoritative teaching in the synagogue, saying it was due to that, that the unclean spirit cried out. At this time, the man had already lost control of himself. Theologically, in this verse, Mark is trying to show Jesus as one who has power from God, that wherever he was, God’s presence and glory were in the midst. The fact that this possessed man can manifest, the unclean spirit speaking/crying out through him before Jesus directly identifying him publically, confirms that Jesus is, indeed, the Son of God and that hee has all the characteristics of God.

It is important to note that in our contemporary society today, interpreting and applying this verse, ἄνθρωπος “Man” can either be a man or a woman, or a child. Mark, in using this word ἄνθρωπος (man) meant a male person but in the contemporary interpretation and application, this can also mean humankind. This is because anyone can be possessed by unclean spirits, if they do not abide in God receiving Jesus as their Lord and personal savior. It is important to, therefore, note that believers in this case cannot be possessed since he who

they believed in is superior, with authority, the Son of God, as Mark portrays in this pericope. But if they allow themselves to be used by the evil spirits, they can be influenced. This interpretation gives us a glimpse of other interpretations of the text since it cannot be concluded by just one text.

Verse 24

λέγων, Τί ἡμῖν καὶ σοί, Ἰησοῦ Ναζαρηνέ; ἦλθες ἀπολέσαι ἡμᾶς; οἶδά σε τίς εἶ, ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ.

Saying, “What do we have to do with you, Jesus of Nazareth? Have you come to destroy us? I know who you are, the Holy one from God.”

The phrase by the unclean spirit “..., *Jesus of Nazareth?* ... I know who you are, *the Holy one from God,*” is an illocutionary act in the category of expositives/declaration. With these statements, the possessed man is defining Jesus, declaring him as of Ναζαρηνέ “Nazareth”, the Holy one from God, referring to Jesus as one sent from God who had come to destroy them, all demons, in this context, the kingdom of Satan. These statements uttered according to the illocutionary act, were declaring/defining who Jesus is and what he had come to do, that is, destroy them.

Mark begins this verse with the verb λέγων “saying”, which takes a redundant use of participle to express the action accompanying the use of the verb. Other translations like RSV, ESV, NIV, NLT, HOLMAN, etc. do not translate the verb. This is partly because they moved the last clause of verse 23 καὶ ἀνέκραξεν (and it cried out) to the beginning of verse 24. Those versions that translate the word λέγων (saying) at the beginning of verse 24, moved καὶ ἀνέκραξεν (and it cried out) to verse 23 hence translating λέγων “saying.” This is based

on which manuscript each version is using to translate, but either way, the λέγων “saying” is a redundant use of the participle.

Τί ἡμῖν καὶ σοί, Ἰησοῦ Ναζαρηνέ; “What do you have to do with us, Jesus of Nazareth?” Mark records this question posed by the unclean spirit within the man in verse 23 to Jesus in verse 24. From the previous verse, Mark tries to clearly show his audience that the man was possessed by an unclean spirit, and in verse 24, the unclean spirit speaks through the man. The change of number from singular to plural is key in this text. The question could also mean, go away and leave us alone; what have we and you in common? (This is a classical Greek idiomatic expression- Mind your own business; why do you interfere with us? The spirit speaks referring to ἡμῖν “us”, speaking on behalf of the other spirits.

This could also mean that the spirit and the man or numerous possessing of the spirit or the spirit and the other spirits. Ideally, if it was the man speaking in his normal sense not possessed then he would not refer himself to “us” unless when talking on behalf of some other people. In this case, the spirit changes the number from singular to plural speaking on behalf of the other spirits (all demons). The question in this verse, therefore, serves as a rhetoric act under locutionary act, the spirit just uttering out a statement in the form of a question but not expecting an answer in the form of either verbal or action from Jesus.

Ἰησοῦ “Jesus” is vocative, directly addressing the noun. Mark was, therefore, emphasizing the unclean spirit possessing a man addressing Jesus not anyone else in the synagogue. Ναζαρηνέ (Nazareth) modifies the noun Ἰησοῦ (Jesus), thus, helping to identify Jesus as one coming from Nazareth. In recording this phrase Τί ἡμῖν καὶ σοί, Ἰησοῦ Ναζαρηνέ (what do we have to do with you, Jesus of Nazareth?) to his audience, Mark was making it known that Jesus the Son of God and messiah came and lived with them in Nazareth but was ignored. Mark also wanted to let his audience know that Jesus was truly a

man from Nazareth. Jesus being God, also came to them in form of a man, born and living among them in Nazareth.

Henry (2008) also gives another explanation asserting that the possessed man could not have come to be healed or helped by Jesus in the first place. He could have been among those that meant for bad, to frustrate Jesus' plans causing doubt in his audience in the synagogue and, of course, influenced by the unclean spirit. Attributing Jesus to Nazareth was demoralizing, since the Jews believed nothing good could come out of Nazareth as John records in John 1:46. Saying this alone could have brought doubt in the hearts of the people in the synagogue and that could have been a way/move to disqualify Jesus' teaching with authority from God that the people had got amazed about in verses 22.

ἤλθες ἀπολέσαι ἡμᾶς “Have you come [with the purpose] to destroy us?” This statement is rhetic under locutionary act. It is a statement in the form of a question, asked by the unclean spirit through the man to Jesus. ἀπολέσαι “with the purpose to destroy” the infinitive expresses the purpose use. Mark is showing that Jesus' coming was with the purpose not only to destroy the unclean spirit in the man but all the demons, noted by the use of the ἡμᾶς “us” referring to all demons, which in this context refers to the kingdom of Satan. Mark still maintains the consistency of the changed number of the spirit from singular to plural by use of ἡμᾶς (...) to refer to all demons. In other words, he had come to destroy the kingdom of Satan as reflected in verse 23. The second question puts a distinction between the kingdom of God, represented by Jesus, and the kingdom of Satan, represented by the unclean spirit. A clear distinction is given in Mark 1:13, where Jesus is tempted by Satan in the wilderness but through all these temptations, he gained victory over Satan.

Mark presents the unclean spirit recognizing Jesus saying οἶδά σε τίς εἶ, ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ “I know who you are, the Holy one from God.” This is a mere rhetoric statement under locutionary act, the unclean spirit just uttering words with clearer meaning.

This is confirmed by the last clause “The Holy one from God” ὁ ἅγιος “The Holy one” is a substantival adjective. τοῦ θεοῦ (God) is a genitive of separation, referring to Jesus as one sent from God. But it can also be as the genitive of source or origin, the genitive reflecting the sense that Jesus is the holy one coming from God. This could also be a genitive of relation reflecting title, because this genitive is a proper name, therefore, the phrase could be intended to be a title “Holy one of God”. It could also be a genitive of relationship reflecting that Jesus is the Son of God. This accords with Mark’s emphasis (Mark 1:1). Mark’s use of this genitive is, therefore, to imply all four uses of the genitive, Jesus as one sent from God (separation), one coming from God (origin/source), as Holy one of God (title) and the Son of God (relationship).

Verse 25

Καὶ ἐπετίμησεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς λέγων· Φιμώθητι καὶ ἔξελθε ἐξ αὐτοῦ.

But Jesus rebuked him saying, “You be silent and come out from him.”

ἐπετίμησεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς λέγων “Jesus rebuked him saying,” ὁ Ἰησοῦς “Jesus” the grammatical subject in this verse acts on the verb ἐπετίμησεν “rebuked” used as a constative. In using this verb, Mark wanted to view the action of Jesus rebuking as a whole, not taking an interest in when and how he rebuked the unclean spirit. Here, Mark was just describing the action in summary for his audience to have a clear understanding of the verse. The dative in the pronoun αὐτῷ takes a direct object use pointing to the unclean spirit according to the context. It is interesting to note that Mark refers to the unclean spirit as “him.” This could be

because the unclean spirit spoke through the possessed man. With this, we learn that Jesus did not rebuke the man but the unclean spirit within him.

The phrase Φιμώθητι καὶ ἔξελθε ἐξ αὐτοῦ “You be silent and come out from him.” Φιμώθητι “You be silent” can also be translated to mean be muzzled, be quiet, hold your tongue (DeMoss, 2010). This takes a command use of the imperative showing the command coming from Jesus, who is the superior to the inferior unclean spirit. It is also important to note that the passive voice in this verb shows that it is the unclean spirit receiving the command.

The term Φιμώθητι “you be silent” portrays an illocutionary act; in particular, as a directive in which Jesus makes the unclean spirit perform the directive given through a command. After the command “*You be silent*”, the unclean spirit acted as commanded and was silent. The unclean spirit being silent was a result of the command from Jesus the Superior. Mark records this term to show Jesus full of authority since he could command the unclean spirit to be silent and it immediately kept silent.

ἔξελθε “come out” also portrays an illocutionary act, particularly, the directive category. ἔξελθε “come out” takes a command use of the imperative in which the command still comes from Jesus as the subject. This is a command from Jesus, the superior, to the unclean spirit. The active voice in this verb indicates the subject performing the verbal command. The voice in use means Jesus taking the unclean spirit out of the possessed man. Both terms ἔξελθε (come out) and Φιμώθητι (you be silent) belong to the illocutionary act, in particular, the directives category in which Jesus commands the unclean spirit to be silent and come out of the possessed man by the use of a command. The unclean spirit coming out of the possessed man was a result of the directive part of a command under an illocutionary act. With this clause Φιμώθητι καὶ ἔξελθε ἐξ αὐτοῦ (you be silent and come out from him), Mark

wanted to show that it is Jesus himself full of authority who gave the directive command and, at the same time, made the unclean spirit silent and came out of the possessed man.

ἐξ αὐτοῦ “from him” is a preposition where ἐξ (from) takes a separation use. By its use, Mark was not only emphasizing the commanding of the unclean spirit but also the unclean spirit coming out of the possessed man after the command. The third personal pronoun αὐτοῦ “him” refers to the man possessed, hence, confirming that αὐτῷ (him) in the first clause relates to the unclean spirit not the man for if it was the man, then it would not make sense αὐτῷ “him” coming out of αὐτοῦ “him.”

Jesus making the unclean spirit quiet can be connected to the messianic secrecy because it was not yet time for Jesus’ identity to be revealed to the people as they would not still understand it. Wiersbe (2002) believes Jesus did not want nor did he need the unclean spirit to help the people identify who he was. This is not just because the message was coming from the unclean spirit that Jesus would be connected to the demonic realm by the audience then, but the most important reason is that the time had not yet come for him to be revealed as implied in Mark 3:22.

In this verse, it is important to note that Jesus gave directives through a command to the unclean spirit in which he made the unclean spirit to be silent and, at the same time, came out of the possessed man. In all this, Mark wants to show Jesus as powerful with authority over the powers of darkness.

Verse 26

Καὶ σπαράξαν αὐτὸν τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἀκάθαρτον καὶ φωνῆσαν φωνῇ μεγάλῃ ἐξῆλθεν ἐξ αὐτοῦ.

And [by] convulsing him and crying with a loud voice, the unclean spirit came out from him.

This verse is a perlocutionary act showing the outcome of Jesus' directive command in verse 25 to the unclean spirit. *σπαράξαν* "convulsing" is a verb with a participle used as manner to answer the question of how and referring to the emotion of convulsing, torn apart, and shaking. The participle in the verb can also be taken to be temporal being used as an antecedent with which Mark wants to show his audience that after convulsing, shaking the man, the unclean spirit cried with a loud voice and left him. *αὐτόν* (him) a third-person pronoun accusative acts as an object referring to the possessed man, which modifies *σπαράξαν* (convulsing). With the verb *φωνῆσαν* (crying), Mark still employs manner use to accentuate that the crying was the manner in which the unclean spirit left the possessed Man. *μεγάλη* (loud) is an adjective used as a positive normal to modify the noun *φωνῇ* "voice."

Here, Mark is emphasizing the act of the unclean spirit shouting loudly. The adjective *τὸ ἀκάθαρτον* "unclean" is connected *τὸ πνεῦμα* (spirit). This adjective takes a positive normal usage with which Mark just wanted his audience to know that the spirit in the man was of the evil one, unclean, from the kingdom of Satan not from God. Since an adjective describes a noun, this adjective helps to shift the attention to the noun, in this case, *τὸ πνεῦμα* "spirit", which takes a subject use in this verse.

In the phrase, *ἐξῆλθεν ἐξ αὐτοῦ* "came out of him" *ἐξῆλθεν* (came) takes a constative aorist. Most of the Bible versions interpret *ἐξῆλθεν ἐξ αὐτοῦ* as "came out of him". I have also noted Mark's use of the aorist tense throughout this verse was to help his audience to have a broader view of the action; the unclean spirit leaving the possessed man after making him convulse and crying out with a loud voice. The unclean spirit was separated from the man. The theological analysis of this verse can be linked to the previous verse in that

whatever happened in this verse is a result of what happened in the previous verse. This helps us to know that the authoritative command of Jesus comes with power from God that the evil spirits cannot withstand. The evil spirits are powerless, and from what we read, they have no authority over human beings. This verse shows that Jesus possesses victory over the unclean spirit and in the contemporary world, every believer possesses that same power as Jesus.

Verse 27

καὶ ἐθαμβήθησαν ἅπαντες, ὥστε συζητεῖν πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς λέγοντας· Τί ἐστὶν τοῦτο; διδαχὴ καινὴ· κατ’ ἐξουσίαν καὶ τοῖς πνεύμασι τοῖς ἀκαθάρτοις ἐπιτάσσει, καὶ ὑπακούουσιν αὐτῷ.

And they were all being amazed, so that they questioned within themselves saying, “What is this? A new teaching with authority, he even commands the unclean spirits and they obey him.”

This verse partly falls under perlocutionary act and locutionary act, particularly rhetoric act. The first two clauses in this verse are under perlocutionary act where Mark records the outcome/effect of verses 25 and 26 to Jesus’ audience.

They are amazed and question themselves about the teaching and exorcism of Jesus. All those who were in attendance in the synagogue listening to Jesus’ teaching were being amazed. By this, Mark wanted his audience to know that Jesus’ audience was amazed at His teaching and exorcism.

In this clause, καὶ ἐθαμβήθησαν ἅπαντες, ὥστε συζητεῖν πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς λέγοντας· (and they were all being amazed, so that they questioned within themselves saying), Mark starts with the logical connective conjunction καὶ (and) to help his audience to connect from the previous verse to verse 27 to have that constant flow of the story. ἅπαντες (they were all) here

is used as an adjective functioning substantively representing the entire audience of Jesus in the synagogue who were listening to Jesus' teaching and being amazed. ἐθαμβήθησαν (being amazed) takes a constative aorist use, with which Mark wanted to stress the whole action of being amazed/astonished and not stressing the beginning or the end of the action. Mark just wanted his audience to know that the people were amazed at Jesus' exorcism. The passive voice makes it clear that Jesus' audience got amazed by Jesus' exorcism, hence, articulating strong emotions.

In the phrase ὥστε συζητεῖν πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς λέγοντας (so that they questioned within themselves saying), Mark goes ahead to use ὥστε (so that) a conjunction taking an adverbial result use, to emphasize the result of their amazement due to the questioning within themselves about his exorcism. Mark also uses the verb συζητεῖν "questioned" a present tense within it used as a historical present to describe the past event portraying the action vividly. In doing this, Mark wanted to accentuate the questioning of Jesus' audience and also make his audience feel as if they were in the midst of the scene. The pronoun "they" is supplied to continue with the flow of the persons from the first clause and also to connect with the pronoun ἑαυτοὺς (themselves). πρὸς (within) is a preposition that is translated as "with", taking an association use. Mark uses this preposition to show that the questioning was not just within one person but amongst many people, which is confirmed by the use of ἑαυτοὺς a reflexive pronoun "themselves," which refers to Jesus' audience.

The second clause, Τί ἐστὶν τοῦτο; διδαχὴ καινὴ· κατ' ἐξουσίαν καὶ τοῖς πνεύμασι τοῖς ἀκαθάρτοις ἐπιτάσσει ("What is this? A new teaching with authority, he even commands the unclean spirits and they obey him."), a quote recorded by Mark, is under locutionary act particularly rhetic act, recorded for a clear sense/reference of what happened in the story. Jesus' audience questioned within and amongst themselves emphasizing the result of their

amazement due to his teaching and exorcism. The questioning was not just within one person but many people all those that attended the synagogue and heard Jesus' teach and witnessed his exorcism. Mark's emphasis on this quote, "Τί ἐστὶν τοῦτο; διδασχὴ καινὴ· κατ' ἐξουσίαν καὶ τοῖς πνεύμασι τοῖς ἀκαθάρτοις ἐπιτάσσει" ("What is this? A new teaching with authority, he even commands the unclean spirits and they obey him."), was on Jesus' audience asking within themselves after being amazed by Jesus' teaching. Τί (what) is used as an interrogative pronoun without expecting an answer because this is a rhetorical question. The verb ἐστὶν (is) transforms the demonstrative pronoun τοῦτο (this), which is representing διδασχὴ (teaching) and ἐξουσίαν (authority). Mark uses this adjective Καινή (new) as a positive normal use for modifying the noun διδασχὴ (teaching).

The way Jesus exorcised was different from the usual incantation and action. This was with a different style and command full of authority, for example, when he says *I say unto you* other than saying *thus says the lord*. This was different from the usual exorcism experienced then. It was a new approach and understanding of authority to the Jews that had never seen such a thing happen. Henry (2008) says the Jewish exorcists were using charm and invocation when driving out evil spirits. But Jesus' experience was another that they witnessed all together, another way of using authority that they had not known.

The preposition κατ' (..with) takes a standard use and with this, Mark was looking at ἐξουσίαν (authority) as a standard by which Jesus commands the unclean spirit out of the possessed man. This second καὶ Mark uses it as an emphatic adverb particle which is translated as "even" to modify the verb ἐπιτάσσει (commands) in an emphatic way, attributing to the same word.

Through this adverb, Mark is putting emphasis on the way Jesus commanded the unclean spirit and also further focusing on Jesus' identity as the Son of God, the messiah

teaching and exorcising authoritatively. ἐπιτάσσει (commands) is under narrow band present tense being used as an instantaneous present, with which Mark shows that when Jesus commands, things happen at the moment of speaking. τοῖς ἀκαθάρτοις (the unclean) an adjective here takes a first attributive position, by which Mark wants to emphasize the fact that the spirit was unclean, from the devil's kingdom. This adjective also takes more emphasis than the noun πνεύμασι (spirit), which is being used as a dative indirect object.

In this last clause, καὶ ὑπακούουσιν αὐτῷ (and they obey him), the verb ὑπακούουσιν “obey” embeds a third person plural “they” which refers to the “spirits.” The verb, therefore, takes an instantaneous present use with which Mark wanted to stress the unclean spirit obeying Jesus’ command there and then at the time of the command. In this verse, therefore, Mark wants to let his audience know that Jesus’ audience was amazed asking among themselves if it was a new teaching with authority since Jesus could command the unclean spirits and they obey him there and then. With this verse, Mark also wants his audience to know that, indeed, it was a new teaching, with authority that comes from God not man, unlike the authority of the scribes, the teachers of the law, which is just acquired through reading and being taught.

Verse 28

Καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ἡ ἀκοὴ αὐτοῦ εὐθὺς πανταχοῦ εἰς ὅλην τὴν περίχωρον τῆς Γαλιλαίας.

And at once, news about him spread everywhere throughout all the region of Galilee.

This verse is a perlocutionary act showing the outcome/effect and impact of Jesus’ teaching and exorcism in the synagogue on Sabbath. In recording this verse, Mark wants to show the impact, effect, the outcome of Jesus’ teaching and exorcism in the synagogue, moreover on the Sabbath, in the regions of Galilee.

Mark uses this temporal adverb εὐθὺς (at once) in this verse to modify the verb ἐξῆλθεν, to show how quickly the news spread about him. Mark, therefore, wanted his audience to simply know that after the teaching and exorcism, news about Jesus spread fast in the region of Galilee. αὐτοῦ is a third person pronoun genitive that refers to Jesus by context taking an objective genitive use with which Mark wanted to stress the news about what Jesus had done spreading. ἐξῆλθεν (spread) takes a constative aorist use and Mark merely wanted his audience to know that the news spread, while not being detailed about it. Mark uses the adverb πανταχοῦ (everywhere) to modify the verb ἐξῆλθεν (spread) for the audience to know how far the news spread, which is “everywhere”.

This is supported by the spatial use of the preposition εἰς (throughout) to accentuate the news being spread everywhere. ὅλην (all) is an adjective modifying the adjective περίωρον (region), which Mark uses to show his audience that news spread in all the region. It is also this same adjective that modifies the noun Γαλιλαίας (Galilee) which takes the genitive of simple apposition. Through this, Mark wanted to accentuate the fact that it was to Galilee as the region the news spread, not elsewhere. I can, therefore, say that in this verse, Mark wants his audience to simply know that after Jesus’ authoritative teaching and exorcism, news about Him spread in the region of Galilee. Mark also wants to let his audience know and understand that the news about Jesus thereafter moved everywhere so fast in and outside the region of Galilee. As far as the element of time can be embedded in this verse, Mark could also have wanted to let his audience know that it took a short time for the news to go all over the region of Galilee.

Conclusion

Mark, in a broader picture rhetorically presents the text identifying Jesus as the *agent* in the pericope, the *act* being teaching and exorcism while authority being presented as *agency*. The Synagogue is presented as a *scene* in Capernaum where the teaching and exorcism took place and the *purpose* presented by Mark is to show Jesus not as a mere person from Nazareth, but as the Son of God, the messiah, with authority, having power over the unclean spirit. The *motive* was to show Jesus as the true Son of God, the Holy One of God, who had the authority and power from God over the unclean spirit and through which he was able to teach and exorcise not in any way compared to the scribes.

With speech act theory in play, rhetic acts have been identified in the text, giving reference/information about what happened in this scene. Illocutionary acts, particularly declaratives, declaring him as of Nazareth, with perlocutionary acts showing the outcome. Jesus commanded and things happened there and then, the unclean spirit was commanded to be silent and it was. It was commanded to come out and it, indeed, came out.

Chapter Five

Summary of Findings, Recommendations, and Conclusion

Introduction

Summary of the first four chapters

Biblical authority has been abused in some of the AIC's today by church leaders in many different ways. This is because, when using the current hermeneutical approaches and applications to the text of the study, Mark 1:21-28, the interpretation and application of the text that emerges has failed to explain what biblical authority is. These leaders have abused this authority by exploiting their congregants financially, spiritually, physically, sociologically, and psychologically. In the three methods reviewed in chapter two, the central role played by Jesus' authority is not as emphasized as in chapters three and four above, where authority has been explored in detail. This exploration covers definitions of authority, the understanding of biblical authority, Jesus' authority, and the perspectives of authority by the Romans, the Jews, and Africans. Scholarly perspectives of the text under study, Mark 1:21-28, have also been covered in depth.

In this study, three approaches used by different scholars for this text focused on the understanding of Jesus' authority and teaching without emphasizing the role of his authority. The researcher, employing the two approaches of rhetorical and pragmatic analysis, unveils additional (perhaps different) insights from the text since the researcher has used approaches that focus on the use of statements, the performance of words spoken, and the effectiveness of the words spoken.

This has clarified the understanding of the message in the text of the study, which Mark wanted to communicate to his audience. It has also shown how the text under study, Mark 1:21-28, connects to the entire message of the gospel of Mark and how it can be applied

in some contemporary AIC's. Some of these conclusions are not captured in the approaches reviewed in chapter two above yet they are key to facilitating a good understanding and application of the text in the African context.

Chapter three has given detailed information about the two methods, rhetorical criticism and pragmatic analysis that the researcher used to study the text to have a deeper interpretation and application. The two approaches are different from the other approaches where the central role played by Jesus' authority is not as emphasized. This is done to provide a remedy to the abuse of biblical authority in the AICs.

In a broader picture, Mark rhetorically presents the text identifying Jesus as the *agent* in the pericope, the *act* being teaching and exorcism, and authority being presented as an *agency*. The Synagogue is presented as a *scene* in Capernaum where the teaching and exorcism took place and the *purpose* presented by Mark is to show Jesus not as a mere person from Nazareth but as a Son of God the messiah with authority having power over the unclean spirit. Here, the *motive* was to show Jesus as the true Son of God, the Holy One of God who had the authority and power from God over the unclean spirit and through which he was able to teach and exorcise in a way that was different from the scribes.

With speech act theory in play, rhetic acts have been identified in the text, giving reference/information about what happened in this scene. Illocutionary acts, particularly declaratives, declaring statements are used in the texts, declaring him as of Nazareth, and perlocutionary acts showing the outcome. Jesus commanded and things happening there and then like the unclean spirit was commanded to be silent and it was. It was commanded to come out and it indeed came out.

Summary of findings

Objective one: Analyze the rhetor' and Jesus' audience understanding of Jesus', the scribes', and the Roman's authority in Mark 1:21-28.

Finding one

Jesus' authority is divine/ heavenly, and a dominant term that influences the teaching of Jesus' audience and the rebuking of the unclean spirit in the synagogue. Jesus' audience had trouble understanding his “ἐξουσίαν” (authority) given the fact that his authority in teaching and in rebuking and exorcising the unclean spirit, relates to the divine authority which controls/influences his nature. The rhetor understood Jesus' authority as divine since he knew who Jesus was - the Son of God, God the author of that authority.

Finding two

The scribes, in this context of the text, are considered teachers of the law, Greek grammateus, secretaries, and clerks, with the title of the high official Jewish experts in the matters of law. They used authority attained through studying the law, which is also termed/recognized as theological authority different from that which Jesus had in terms of quality and influence.

Finding three

The Romans did not believe Jesus' authority was divine since they did not believe in Jesus as the Son of God with authority from above. This is because they perceived authority to be from the four forms, namely *imperium*, the authority to command the army; *Potestas*, the power belonging to groups; *auctoritas*, the social authority connected to reputation and respect someone has in the community; and *paterfamilias*, authority connected to family, e.g,

someone being a father in a home presiding over the wife and the children, but also the grandchildren, the slaves and anyone else who stayed with him.

Objective two: Establish key aspects of biblical authority to address the misunderstanding of that authority by the church leaders in some modern African Initiated Churches.

Finding one

Jesus had authority not only at the time of his teaching and exorcism, but even after his teaching and exorcism. It is from this divine authority that he was teaching his audience. In chapter two, the three methods reviewed did not emphasize the central role played by Jesus' authority in the way pragmatic and rhetorical criticism methods used in this study did. According to the translation of the term ἐξουσίαν (authority), the Jews referred to Jesus as one having authority. In other words, they were saying Jesus has authority over the law, power/control in making legal decisions/judgments, rule, supernatural power, and right to judge. Since Jesus is God, he owns that authority. It is important, therefore in some AICs, for every pastor/leader to know that the authority they possess is delegated authority, which authority comes from God, and those that do possess it are accountable to Him.

Finding two

Jesus' audience was amazed at his teaching, not at Jesus as a person. Ἐξεπλήσσοντο "they were astonished", because his teaching was characterized by Jesus' authority. The African church leaders, therefore, ought to know that biblical authority comes from God and hence ask God for the Holy Spirit to empower them in teaching his word with authority. With the authority, they teach in boldness with grace and favor from God.

Finding three

Jesus taught confidently and divinely, when you teach authoritatively using the authority given to you by God, taking the example of Jesus, whatever you speak/ command has the supernatural power to evoke whatever you have spoken. Sometimes, God does not allow whatever the spiritual leader has spoken. This means that all who believe and put to practice the authority given to them, can speak and at the same time command and things happen according to the will of God. This is not only limited to the church leaders/pastors but to every believer in this context the African believers. Church leaders must give an account to God who assigned those positions of authority to them. Those leaders/pastors in authority, therefore, ought not to use the authority given to them to abuse those they serve for their advantage as rampantly witnessed in some AICs.

Finding four

Theologically, in this text, Jesus as one who has power from God; wherever he was, God's presence and glory were in the midst. Taking an example of this text in the synagogue, he taught authoritatively and exorcised evil spirits that had possessed a man. In the same way, the contemporary African church/leaders and believers have to know that it is not only in one place/church that God works but rather in any place at any time. When allowed to work, he works in our lives because he has the authority.

Finding five

Mark is making Jesus' identity to his audience clearer in verse 24. He presents Jesus as a man from Nazareth, divine, and the Holy one from God. The contemporary African church ought to know that Jesus is fully man born and lived in Nazareth and, at the same time, fully God sent from God. This is a great example to the AICs that God can use anyone regardless of where he or she is coming from. He gives authority to everyone who believes not only to the pastors/men of God.

Objective three: Analyse how best rhetorical criticism and pentadic analysis can be put to use to study the text of Mark 1:21-28 for a better application in the African Initiated Churches.

Finding one

Under pragmatic analysis, speech act theory is put to use considering how the different terms in this text are used while emphasizing the inner use of words and statements. As such, locutionary acts are recognized in the text, specifically rhetic acts, giving clear sense/information on what happened in the text, which supports its meaning to the rhetor's audience and the African context. In the Christian contemporary context, verse 21 informs the African contemporary believers that Jesus and his disciples went to Capernaum close to the start of the Sabbath and He began to teach. Verse 23 informs the audience that a man possessed with the unclean spirit was in the synagogue during Jesus' teaching and cried out. In verse 24, the spirit cries out not expecting questions "What do you have to do with us Jesus of Nazareth?" And in verse 27, the rhetor emphasizes the audience's amazement about his teaching and exorcism.

Similarly, illocutionary acts are identified in Verse 24, particularly the declaration category. In the statement "*Jesus of Nazareth and the holy one from God,*" the possessed man is declaring Jesus as one from *Nazareth and the holy one from God*. Verse 25, which is a directive category is identified, in which Jesus commands/directs the unclean spirit to be silent and come out of the man. In the African context, this informs the reader that Jesus is not only from Nazareth but also Holy and from God with authority to command/give directives.

Perlocutionary acts in the text are also identified. In verse 26, the perlocutionary act is identified showing the outcome of Jesus' command in verse 25. The unclean spirit that was

causing the man to convulse, crying out in a loud voice and coming out of him demonstrates perlocutionary acts. In Verse 27, a perlocutionary act is also recognized, where Jesus' audience is amazed and questioning among themselves. The amazement and questioning in this verse is as a result of the perlocutionary act in verse 25, which in the African context demonstrates Jesus as one with authority from God.

Finding two

Pentadic analysis is put to use for a clear understanding and application of the text. Jesus “Ιησοῦς” and authority “ἐξουσίαν” are the dominant terms in this text, according to this analysis. Here, emphasis is put on these two terms, showing Jesus as the Son of God, presented as one not only from Nazareth but also Holy from God. Knowing that Jesus the Son of God is holy and from God, who came to us in human form with authority from God is greatly significant in the African context as authority himself that through his name, all believers are to teach and exorcise.

It is through this authority that Jesus can teach and exorcise. These are the dominant terms because without them, that is, teaching and exorcism that lead to the amazement of Jesus' audience would not have happened. This is because these two terms dominate all the other terms in the text and help to bring out the motive of the text, which is revealing Jesus as the Son of God Holy and from God with authority to teach and exorcise. This approach, therefore, brings out a clear meaning of the text where the rhetor shows Jesus as the Son of God Holy and from God with divine authority

Objective four: Propose interpretation and application of the text Mark 1:21-28 to draw implications that address the misunderstanding of biblical authority and its abuse in some AICs today

Finding one

In our African context, teaching is very key and cannot be separated from our daily living. Right from childhood, stories were told by the elders with the purpose of teaching concepts that influenced life positively. So, every word from an elder was taken as very key and full of wisdom. With that, therefore, Mark in the text points at the act of Jesus' teaching, as a key point in this text. Something pastors and leaders in some AICs can grasp is emphasizing the teaching of the word of God to the believers, while helping them to grow spiritually in the knowledge of God and not being deceived or taken away by any teaching that may come their way.

Finding two

In this text, Mark wants his audience to know that Jesus' teaching was full of authority/supernatural power/divine authority from God. In the text, rhetorically, this authority is used as an instrument/a means to teach. The theological context of this text in the contemporary is that biblical authority comes from God. From this text, therefore, we know that the authority Jesus possessed was directly from God. So, when we receive and possess the authority from God as believers, we use it as an instrument/means to teach the word of God for the benefit of the body of Christ and not being Lord over others as it has been implied by some AICs today.

Finding three

Believers in any situation/circumstance they may be going through need Jesus' presence and utilizing the authority they possess from God as an instrument/means to have victory over Satan and his kingdom schemes. Just as Jesus used the authority he had to exorcise the unclean spirit. This is observed in the Pentecostal churches where they carry out

deliverance and, in the process, the manifestation of the evil spirits is witnessed, thus, men, women, and children are delivered. In the same way, the contemporary AICs can put this to practice using the authority given to them commanding situations to change in their lives.

Finding four

Just as the example we get from Jesus exorcising, believers in AICs should know that they do have the same authority as Jesus. When authority is used as agency/means, anyone that receives Jesus receives the authority over the powers of darkness and can do exactly what Jesus did to the powers of darkness and the kingdom of Satan. Believers in AICs, therefore, should know that at their receiving Jesus as Lord and savior, they also received the authority not only over the powers of darkness but also to do all things through Jesus Christ, within the will of God, and under his sovereign power.

Finding five

The authoritative command of Jesus comes with power from God that evil spirits cannot withstand. The evil spirits are powerless and from what we read, they have no authority over man. This text shows Jesus' victory over the unclean spirits and, in the contemporary context, every believer possesses the same power as Jesus over every situation he or she may be going through. The believers in the AICs should, therefore, use the authority they possess through Jesus and not always look to the man of God.

Jesus' authority is the power that comes as a means with a force for the evil spirits to obey. For any believer, commanding in the authority given to him or her by God having faith in his or her heart, whatever they speak happens according to the will of God. This is not only to the leaders as it is portrayed today in the AICs but to all believers having the authority and power to command situations to change in their lives.

Authority is taken as the means through which Jesus taught his audience in the synagogue and also exorcised unclean spirits from a man. In the contemporary, we are also encouraged that we can teach Jesus being our help and, at the same time, exorcise with authority if we believe. All things can be done in the name of our Lord Jesus in the contemporary for a believer.

Recommendation

Leaders/pastors should, teach the true word of God to the people in its entirety not picking out phrases that may support them to achieve their goal/motive but teaching the word of God in its entirety for it is God-breathed. Through this text, Jesus is portrayed as a teacher, teaching with authority that his audience was amazed. His teaching was not only in words but with actions, the exorcism that is witnessed thereafter.

Believers in the contemporary AICs should be encouraged to exercise the authority that is given to them through Jesus Christ. What Jesus did, they too can do, if they believe. This is not only for the men of God but also for all who believe and have faith in the Lord. Both leaders/pastors and believers should learn and know that Jesus' authority is granted from God to every believer full of power over nature and diseases/infirmity, power to teach, exorcise demons, authority over death, etc.

I recommend the use of divine authority as means for believers to have faith in Jesus, through whom they can do all things according to his will. Believers should not look to pastors for everything, but through reading and being taught the word of God, they can learn and experience the power of God in their lives to do great things, miracles, etc. Believers, through faith, should speak to situations in their lives and their surroundings just like the example we get from Jesus in this text.

Believers should stop looking to the man of God/pastor for everything in life, but be encouraged that all that the man of God can do, they too can do through Jesus Christ. He gave them the authority which they need to exercise and not always run to the man of God to be prayed for, be told what to do, prophesy in their lives, pray for healing, etc., but know that all those things they too can do if they believe.

Pastors and leaders in the AICs should teach and encourage their congregants not to look to them for solutions in their lives but to look to God for any answer they may be seeking God for. Believing and trusting God to do miracles, signs, and wonders in their lives. Through this research, authority is received as means that anyone believing in Jesus can use just like any other man of God. In the long run, there can be the maturity of believers and a reduction of the misuse of biblical authority by leaders in some AICs today.

Further studies using other methods in rhetorical criticism like Cluster criticism, Metaphoric criticism, and ideological criticism are recommended to be used in the study of the text to gain more insights into the interpretation of the text, and the word of God at large.

Conclusion

This research study has demonstrated that the message of the text, Mark 1:21-28, applies to the contemporary AICs in our African context. The methods used in this study show God as the ultimate divine authority, who has given that authority to Jesus, who then passes it to every believer - not only the man of God but to all who have faith in him. Just as Jesus taught and exorcised, every believer too can do the same, and not only the man of God as it is portrayed in some of the AICs. This research has shown that Jesus has authority over the powers of darkness and that through the authority he teaches and also commands the demons and they obey.

These two methods combined have brought about a clear interpretation of the text, focusing on the use of words, and the meaning behind them to have a right interpretation and application of the text. The text has also been analyzed as a drama focusing on the main terms in the text using a pentadic criticism. The dominant terms have also been expounded on to bring out a clear meaning and application of the text of study.

In this study, both Jesus' teaching and exorcism are emphasized as well as the motive of the rhetor's writing "showing Jesus of Nazareth as the true Son of God, Holy and from God with divine authority to teach and to exorcise." Pentadic criticism of the text of study identifies Jesus as the main actor in the text showing everything happening in the text attached to Jesus and not his disciples. This is portrayed in the same text using speech act theory in verse 21, where the emphasis shifts from Jesus and his disciples to Jesus alone.

Using these two methods together brings out a clearer interpretation and understanding of the text compared to the other methods reviewed. Here, the text is analyzed as a drama to bring out the flow of the message, meaning, and clarity. At the same time, speech act theory brings out the use of words, hence, a clearer interpretation of the text.

List of References

- Acheoah, J. E. & Olaleye, J. I. (2017). Reflections on Bach and Harnishi's Pragmatic Theory. *International Journal of Innovative Studies in Sociology and Humanities*, 2 (2), 1-34.
- Aitchison, J. & Crystal, D. (2001). What is pragmatics?
- Alex, T. (2017, February 22). Uganda: Pastor sells 'Holy Rice' to Followers at U.S. \$14 a kilogram. AllAfrica Global Media. <https://allafrica.com/stories/201702220606.html>
- Allott, N. (2010). Key Terms in Pragmatics. A&C Black.
- Alston, W. P. (2000). Illocutionary acts and sentence meaning. In *Illocutionary Acts and Sentence Meaning*. Cornell University Press.
- Anderson, F. D. & Althouse, M. T. (2010). Five fingers or six? Pentad or hexad? *KB Journal*, 6(2).
- Anderson, F. D. & Prelli, L. J. (2001). Pentadic cartography: Mapping the universe of discourse. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 87(1), 73-95.
- Andile, S. (2019, August 29). Shepherd Bushiri fraud case postponed: This is what we know. <https://www.thesouthafrican.com/news/shepherd-bushiri-fraud-case-postponed-why/>
- Ando, C. (2000). Imperial ideology and provincial loyalty in the Roman Empire. In *Imperial Ideology and Provincial Loyalty in the Roman Empire*. University of California Press.
- Andrews, J. R. (1990). *The practice of rhetorical criticism*. Addison-Wesley Longman Limited.
- Austin, J. L. (1975). *How to do things with words* (Vol. 88). Oxford university press.
- Austin, J. L. (1975). *How to do things with words*. Oxford university press.
- Authority. In *The Merriam-Webster.com Dictionary*. January 20, 2020. <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/authority>
- Ayittey, G. B. N. (2006). The Indigenous Legal Institutions. In *Indigenous African Institutions* (pp. 67-104). Brill Nijhoff. <https://ebookcentral.proquest.com>
- Bach, K. (2003). Speech acts and pragmatics. *Blackwell. Guide to the philosophy of language*, 147-167.
- Bach, K. (2004). Pragmatics and the philosophy of language. *The handbook of pragmatics*, 463, 487.
- Bardovi-Harlig, K. (2010). Exploring the pragmatics of interlanguage pragmatics: Definition by design. *Pragmatics across languages and cultures*, 7, 219-259.
- Bardovi-Harlig, K. (2018). Teaching of Pragmatics. *The TESOL Encyclopedia of English Language Teaching*, 1-7.
- Barilan, Y. M. (2013). *Jewish bioethics: Rabbinic law and theology in their social and historical contexts*. Cambridge University Press.
- Barton, C. A. (2001). *Roman honor: The fire in the bones*. Univ of California Press.
- Beall, T. S. (2004). *Josephus' Description of the Essenes Illustrated by the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Vol. 58). Cambridge University Press.
- Beavis, M. A. (2011). *Mark. Paideia Commentaries on the New Testament*: Grand Rapids, Mich.: a division of Baker publishing group.

- Berger, M. S. (1998). *Rabbinic authority*. Oxford University Press.
- Billings, A. C., Birdnow, J. & Parsons, C. S. (2001). Applications of Rhetorical Criticism: An Analysis of Individual Event Speeches (1993–2000). *Argumentation and Advocacy*, 38(2), 98-105.
- Biri, K. (2012). The silent echoing voice: Aspects of Zimbabwean Pentecostalism and the quest for power, healing and miracles.
- Black, E., Black, J. E., Cloud, D. L., Condit, C. M., Hogan, J. M., King, A. A., ... & Young, M. J. (2014). *Purpose, practice, and pedagogy in rhetorical criticism*. Lexington Books.
- Blidstein, G. J. (2005). *Honor thy father and mother: Filial responsibility in Jewish law and ethics* (Vol. 1). KTAV Publishing House, Inc.
- Boring, M. E. (2006). Black, C. C. (2013). *The Rhetoric of the Gospel: Theological Artistry in the Gospels and Acts*. Presbyterian Publishing Corp.
- Borsch, F. H. (Ed.). (1999). *The Bible's Authority in Today's Church*. A&C Black.
- Briggs, R. S. (2008). Speech-act theory. *Words & the Word: Explorations in Biblical interpretation & literary theory*, 75-110.
- Bromiley, G. W. (Ed.). (1995). *The international standard Bible encyclopedia*. Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing.
- Burke, K. (1969). *A grammar of motives* (Vol. 177). Univ of California Press.
- Burke, K. (1969). *A rhetoric of motives* (Vol. 178). Univ of California Press.
- Burke, K. (1984). *Attitudes toward history: With a new afterword*. Univ of California Press.
- Burke, K. (1985). Dramatism and logology. *Communication Quarterly*, 33(2), 89-93.
- Bygrave, S. (2012). *Kenneth Burke: Rhetoric and Ideology*. Routledge.
- Carroll, J. W. (2011). *As one with authority: Reflective leadership in ministry*. Wipf and Stock Publishers.
- Carroll, N. (2001). On the narrative connection. *New perspectives on narrative perspective*, 21-41.
- Carson, D. A. & Moo, D. J. (2005). New Testament introduction. 2nd edition. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.
- Carston, R. (2005). Relevance theory, Grice and the neo-Griceans: a response to Laurence Horn's 'Current issues in neo-Gricean pragmatics'. *Intercultural pragmatics*, 2(3), 303-319.
- Clandinin, D. J. & Connelly, F. M. (2000). Narrative inquiry: Experience and story in qualitative research.
- Classen, C. J. (2002). *Rhetorical criticism of the New Testament*. Brill.
- Conrad, A. (2019, July 11). No way back! Pastor Bugingo insists on divorce, offers to share UGX2b property with estranged wife. PML Daily.
<http://www.pmldaily.com/news/2019/07/no-way-back-pastor-bugingo-insists-on-divorce-offers-to-share-ugx2b-property-with-estranged-wife.html>
- Cornelius, E. M. (2000). Rhetorical criticism and the hermeneutics of the New Testament. *In die Skriflig/In Luce Verbi*, 34(2), 253-274.
- CRL Rights Commission. (2017). Report of the Hearing on the Commercialisation of Religion and Abuse of People's Belief Systems. *Johannesburg: Commission for the*

- Promotion and Protection of the rights of Cultural, Religious and Linguistic Communities. Introduction*, 27.
- Crystal, D. (1987). *Cambridge Encyclopedia Of Language* David Crystal., The. Cambridge University Press.
- Da Silva, J. (1993). African Independent Churches Origin and Development. *Anthropos*, 88(4/6), 393-402.
- Daily Monitor (2017, September 5). Check cultic tendency of Phophet Mbonye. <https://www.monitor.co.ug/OpEd/Editorial/-cultic-Prophet-Mbonye-Kololo-Airstrip-Kyadondo-Rugby-Ground/689360-4082948-h3p61n/index.html>
- Daily Monitor (2020, February 2). 20 killed in Tanzania church stampede. <https://www.monitor.co.ug/News/National/20-killed-Tanzanian-church-stampede/688334-5441156-w0608iz/index.html>
- Davies, E. W. (2013). *Biblical criticism: a guide for the perplexed*. A&C Black.
- Davis, W. (2009). Implicature. *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*.
- De Bruyn, T. (2008). Appeals to Jesus as the one 'who Heals every Illness and every Infirmary' (Matt 4: 23, 9: 35) in Amulets in Late Antiquity. In *The Reception and Interpretation of the Bible in Late Antiquity* (pp. 65-81). Brill.
- DeSilva, D. A. (2018). *An introduction to the New Testament: Contexts, methods & ministry formation*. InterVarsity Press.
- Dodo, O., Banda, R. G. & Dodo, G. (2014). African Initiated Churches, pivotal in peace-building: a case of the Johane Masowe Chishanu.
- Dowd, S. & Malbon, E. S. (2006). The significance of Jesus' death in Mark: Narrative context and authorial audience. *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 125(2), 271-297.
- Dunn, J. D. (2000). Jesus in oral memory: The initial stages of the Jesus tradition. In *Seminar papers* (Vol. 136, No. 39, pp. 287-326).
- Edwards, J. R. (1994). The Authority of Jesus in the Gospel of Mark. *JOURNAL- EVANGELICAL THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY*, 37, 217-217.
- Edwards, J. R. (2002). *The gospel according to Mark*. Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing.
- Ejesgist. (2019, May, 10). Churches With Husband And Wife Pastors Are Pyramid Scheme – Professor PLO Lumumba. <https://ejesgist.com/churches-with-husband-and-wife-pastors-are-pyramid-scheme-professor-plo-lumumba.html>
- Elder, N. A. (2021). Scribes and Demons: Literacy and Authority in a Capernaum Synagogue (Mark 1: 21–28). *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, 83(1), 75-94.
- Elwell, W. A. & Yarbrough, R. W. (2013). *Encountering the New Testament (Encountering Biblical Studies): A Historical and Theological Survey*. Baker Books.
- eNCA. (2019, April 29). VIDEO: Another Lukau controversial miracle claim. <https://www.enca.com/news/another-lukau-controversial-miracle-claim>
- Encyclopaedia Britannica (2018, February, 23). African Religions. Encyclopaedia Britannica. <https://www.britannica.com/topic/African-religions>
- Encyclopaedia Britannica (2019, April, 12). Triumph Ancient Roman Honour. Encyclopaedia Britannica. <https://www.britannica.com/topic/triumph-ancient-Roman-honour>
- Enos, T. (Ed.). (2011). *Encyclopedia of rhetoric and composition: Communication from ancient times to the information age*. Routledge.

- Epideictic, J. D. (2009). *Rhetorical Criticism. Criticism: University of North Carolina Press*, 1984, 39, 72.
- Fann, K. T. (Ed.). (2011). *Symposium on J.L. Austin*. Routledge.
<https://ebookcentral.proquest.com>
- Fear, A., Urbiña, J. F., Marcos, M., & Sanchez, M. M. (2013). *The role of the bishop in Late Antiquity: conflict and compromise*. A&C Black.
- Firth, D. G. & Grant, J. A. (Eds.). (2008). *Words and the Word: Explorations in Biblical Interpretation and Literary Theory*. InterVarsity Press.
- Fishbane, M. D. (2009). "Honor your father and your mother": Intergenerational values and Jewish tradition. In F. Walsh (Ed.), *Spiritual resources in family therapy* (p. 174–193). Guilford Press.
- Fisher, W. R. (1985). The narrative paradigm: An elaboration. *Communications Monographs*, 52(4), 347-367.
- Flathman, R. (1989). *Toward a liberalism* (p. 252). Cornell University Press.
- Fletcher-Louis, C. (2007). Jesus as the high priestly messiah: Part 2. *Journal for the Study of the Historical Jesus*, 5(1), 57-79.
- Foss, S. K. (2004). Cluster criticism. *Rhetorical criticism: Exploration and practice*, 4, 63-67.
- Foss, S. K. (2018). *Rhetorical criticism: Exploration and practice*. Waveland Press.
- France, R. T. (2002). The new international Greek testament commentary: The gospel of Mark. *Grand Rapids: Eerdmans*.
- France, R. T. (2002). *The Gospel of Mark: A commentary on the Greek text* (Vol. 2). Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing.
- Frei, H. W. (2013). *The Identity of Jesus Christ, Expanded and Updated Edition: The Hermeneutical Bases of Dogmatic Theology*. Wipf and Stock Publishers.
- Gagich, M. & Zickel, E. (2018). *A Guide to Rhetoric, Genre, and Success in First-Year Writing*. MSL Academic Endeavors.
- Garland, D. E. (2015). *A Theology of Mark's Gospel: Good News about Jesus the Messiah, the Son of God*. Zondervan Academic.
- Gathogo, J. (2011). The challenge of money and wealth in some East African Pentecostal Churches.
- Gibbs Jr, R. W. (2006). Cognitive linguistics and metaphor research: past successes, skeptical questions, future challenges. *DELTA: Documentação de Estudos em Lingüística Teórica e Aplicada*, 22(SPE), 1-20.
- Givens, A. (1994). Fostering greater analysis in rhetorical criticism: A reexamination of Whately's views on rhetoric. *National Forensic Journal*, 11(2), 29-36.
- Goldsworthy, A. (2013). *Caesar: The life of a colossus*.
- Goldsworthy, A. (2014). *Augustus: First Emperor of Rome*. Yale University Press.
- González-Lloret, M. (2012). Pragmatics: overview. *The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics*.
- Gorman, M. J. (2008). *Elements of biblical exegesis: A basic guide for students and ministers*. Baker Academic.
- Grice, H. P. (1957). Meaning. *The philosophical review*, 377-388.
- Guelich, R. A. (1989). *Word biblical commentary: Mark*. Word Incorporated.
- Gundry, R. H. (1993). *Mark: A Commentary on his Apology for the Cross*. Eerdmans Publishing Company.

- Hägerland, T. (2011). *Jesus and the forgiveness of sins: An aspect of his prophetic mission* (Vol. 150). Cambridge University Press.
- Hagner, D. A. (2012). *The New Testament: A historical and theological introduction*. Baker Books.
- Halberstam, C. T. (2010). *Law and truth in biblical and rabbinic literature*. Indiana University Press.
- Harnish, R. (2009). Internalism and externalism in speech act theory. *Lodz Papers in Pragmatics*, 5(1), 9-31.
- Hart, G. (2012). The Five Ws of Online Help. *TECHWR-L*, April, 30.
- Hayes, C. (2006). Rabbinic contestations of authority. *Cardozo L. Rev.*, 28, 123.
- Henry, M. (2008). *The Complete Commentary on the Whole Bible*. Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers.
- Herford, R. T. (2006). *Christianity in Talmud and Midrash*. KTAV Publishing House, Inc.
- Hirsch, E.D. (2014), *Purpose, Practice, and Pedagogy in Rhetorical Criticism*, edited by Jim A. Kuypers, Lexington Books.
- Hooker, M. D. (1991). *Gospel according to St. Mark*. A&C Black.
- HUGHES, F.W. (1989). *Early Christian rhetoric and 2 Thessalonians*. Sheffield : JSOT Press.
- Igoshev, K. M. (2016). *Speech Act in Terms of Speech Act Theory*.
- Incigneri, B. (2003). *Gospel to the romans: The setting and rhetoric of mark's gospel*.
<https://ebookcentral.proquest.com>
- Iversen, S. (2014). Narratives in rhetorical discourse. *Handbook of Narratology*, 25, 575-587.
- Iverson, K. (Ed.). (2014). *From Text to Performance: Narrative and Performance Criticisms in Dialogue and Debate* (Vol. 10). Wipf and Stock Publishers.
- Iverson, K. R. (2009). Orality and the Gospels: A Survey of Recent Research. *Currents in Biblical Research*, 8(1), 71-106.
- Iverson, K. R., & Skinner, C. W. (Eds.). (2011). *Mark as story: retrospect and prospect* (No. 65). Society of Biblical Lit.
- Ives, E. W. (2012). *The Reformation Experience: Living Through the Turbulent 16th Century*. Lion Books
- Jamieson, R., Fausset, A. & Brown, D. (1997). *Commentary critical and explanatory on the whole Bible*. Electronic edition. Oak Harbor: Logos Research Systems.
- Jeffrey, R. & Zickel, E. (2017). *Rhetorical Situation: The Context*. *English 102: Reading, Research, and Writing*.
- Jeffrey, R. & Zickel, E. (2018). 6.2 What is the Rhetorical Situation? *A Guide to Rhetoric, Genre, and Success in First-Year Writing*.
- Johnson, D. & VanVonderen, J. (2005). *The subtle power of spiritual abuse: Recognizing and escaping spiritual manipulation and false spiritual authority within the church*. Baker Books.
- Johnston, R. M. (2015). Demon Possession and Exorcism in the New Testament. *Journal of Adventist Mission Studies*, 11(2), 17-24.
- Jost, W. & Olmsted, W. (Eds.). (2004). *A companion to rhetoric and rhetorical criticism*.
<https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/pacuniversity>
[ebooks/reader.action?docID=214214&ppg=5](https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/pacuniversity)
- Kaplan, D. (1989). Demonstratives. Themes from Kaplan, ed. by Joseph Almog, John Perry and Howard Wettstein, 481-563.

- Keck, L. E. (Ed.). (2005). *The New Interpreter's Bible Commentary*. abingdon Press.
- Keener, C. S. (2014). *The IVP bible background commentary: New Testament*. InterVarsity Press.
- Kennedy, G. A. (2014). *New Testament interpretation through rhetorical criticism*. UNC Press Books.
- Kernaghan, R. J. (2007). *Mark* (Vol. 2). InterVarsity Press.
- Kgatle, M. S. (2017). The unusual practices within some Neo-Pentecostal churches in South Africa: Reflections and recommendations. *HTS Theological Studies*, 73(3), 1-8.
- Kissine, M. (2013). *From utterances to speech acts*. Cambridge University Press.
- Kjeldsen, J. E. (2018). Audience analysis and reception studies of rhetoric. In *Rhetorical Audience Studies and Reception of Rhetoric* (pp. 1-42). Palgrave Macmillan, Cham.
- Klapproth, D. M. (2009). *Narrative as social practice: Anglo-Western and Australian Aboriginal oral traditions* (Vol. 13). Walter de Gruyter.
- Klein, W. W., Blomberg, C. L. & Hubbard Jr, R. L. (2017). *Introduction to biblical interpretation*. Zondervan Academic.
- Korta, K. & Perry, J. (2006). Pragmatics: Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy.
- Korta, K. & Perry, J. (2008). The pragmatic circle. *Synthese*, 165, 347-357.
- Korta, K., & Perry, J. (2011). *Critical pragmatics: An inquiry into reference and communication*. Cambridge University Press.
- Kraft, C. H. (2012). *I Give You Authority: Practicing the Authority Jesus Gave Us*. Baker Books.
- Kraft, C. H. (2016). *Defeating dark angels: Breaking demonic oppression in the believer's life*. Baker Books.
- Kretzschmar, L. (2002). Authentic Christian leadership and spiritual formation in Africa. *Journal of theology for Southern Africa*, (113), 41.
- Kuypers, J. A. (Ed.). (2009). *Rhetorical criticism: Perspectives in action*. Lexington Books.
- Kyomya, M. (2010). *A Guide to Interpreting Scripture: Context, Harmony, and Application*. Zondervan.
- Lakoff, G. & Frisch, E. (2006). Five years after 9/11: Drop the war metaphor. *The Huffington Post*, 11.
- Lakoff, G. & Johnson, M. (2008). *Metaphors we live by*. University of Chicago press.
- Lang, A. F. O'Driscoll, C. & Williams, J. (Eds.). (2013). *Just war: Authority, tradition, and practice*. <https://ebookcentral.proquest.com>
- Lea, T. (2003). *The New Testament: its background and message*. B&H Publishing Group.
- Leah, C. (2010). A Theoretical Approach to Linguistic Implicatures. *Scientific Journal of Humanistic Studies*, 2(3).
- Lee, N. (2014). The Motif of Jesus? Rejection in the Gospel of Mark: A Socio-rhetorical Interpretation of the Gospel.
- Levinson, S. C., Stephen, C. & Levinson, S. C. (2000). *Presumptive meanings: The theory of generalized conversational implicature*. MIT press.
- Loader, W. (2011). Jesus and the Law. *Handbook for the Study of the Historical Jesus*, 4, 2745-2772.
- Longenecker, B. W. (2005). *Rhetoric at the Boundaries: The Art and Theology of the New Testament Chain-Link Transitions*. Baylor University Press.

- Lycan, W. (1995). *Philosophy of Language*. The Cambridge Dictionary of philosophy, Cambridge. ed. by R. Audi, 586-589.
- MacArthur, J. (1997). *The MacArthur study Bible: New King James Version*. USA: Thomas Nelson, Inc.
- Mare, W. H. (2004). *New Testament background commentary: a new dictionary of words, phrases and situations in bible order*. Christian Focus Publications.
- Marr, E. R., Rogers, B., Vince, E. & Halcomb, T. M. W. (2012). *Lexham Bible Dictionary*.
- Martinich, A. P. (2012). *Communication and reference*. Walter de Gruyter.
- Maxwell, K. (2014). From Performance to Text to Performance: The New Testament's Use of the Hebrew Bible in a Rhetorical Culture. *From text to performance: Narrative and performance criticisms in dialogue and debate*, 158-181.
- Mbiti, J. S. (1990). *African religions & philosophy*. Heinemann.
- Mbiti, J. S. (2015). *Introduction to African religion*. Waveland Press.
- Mitchell, G. (2014) Speech Acts. <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/speech-acts/>
- Montagne, V. (2016). Epideictic.
- Moore, A. (2001). Pragmatics and speech acts. URL = < <http://www.teachit.co.uk/armoore/lang/pragmatics.htm>.
- Moule, C. F. D. (Ed.). (1957). *Cambridge Greek Testament Commentary: Gen. ed. C.F.D. Moule*. University Press.
- Mugambi, J. N. K. (2002). *Christianity and African culture*. Acton Publishers.
- Mumera, W. (2017, January 31). TB Joshua The prophet sells Holy goods after false prediction. <http://newsofthesouth.com/prophet-sells-holy-goods-after-false-prediction/>
- Mwaura, P. N. (2004). African instituted churches in East Africa. *Studies in World Christianity*, 10(2), 160-184.
- Nehanda Radio (2019, February 25). Pastor Alph Lukau claims to raise dead man during church service- video and pictures. <https://nehandaradio.com/2019/02/25/pastor-alph-lukau-claims-to-raise-dead-man-during-church-service-video-and-pictures/>
- New Vision Tv. (2017, September 5). Why Christians kissed prophet Elvis Mbonye's shoes. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=jKUJ5BSsQPc>
- News24 (2018, April 4). Rwanda closes thousands of churches in bid for more control. News24. <https://www.news24.com/Africa/News/rwanda-closes-thousands-of-churches-in-bid-for-more-control-20180404>
- NEYREY, J. (1998). Questions, "Chreiai", and Challenges to Honor: The Interface of Rhetoric and Culture in Mark's Gospel. *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, 60(4), 657-681. <http://ezproxy.pacuniversity.ac.ke:2067/stable/43723406>
- Nordquist, Richard. (2020, August 28). What is a Rhetorical Situation? <https://www.thoughtco.com/rhetorical-situation-1692061>
- Observer. (2017, April 22). Pastor Bugingo under fire for burning 'deceptive' Bibles. <https://observer.ug/news/headlines/52482-pastor-bugingo-under-fire-for-burning-deceptive-bibles>
- O'Gorman, N. (2005). Aristotle's Phantasia in the Rhetoric: Lexis, appearance, and the epideictic function of discourse. *Philosophy & rhetoric*, 38(1), 16-40.
- Öhlmann, P., Frost, M. L. & Gräb, W. (2016). African Initiated Churches' potential as development actors. *HTS Theological Studies*, 72(4), 1-12.

- Öhlmann, P., Gräb, W. & Frost, M. L. (2020). African Initiated Christianity and the Decolonisation of Development: Sustainable Development in Pentecostal and Independent Churches (p. 354). Taylor & Francis.
- Oishi, E. (2006). Austin's speech act theory and the speech situation. *Esercizi Filosofici*, 1(2006), 1-14.
- Oishi, E. (2016). Austin's Speech Acts and Mey's Pragmemes. In *Pragmemes and Theories of Language Use* (pp. 335-350). Springer, Cham.
- Okoye, J. (2001). *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, 63(2), 343-344.
<http://ezproxy.pacuniversity.ac.ke:2067/stable/43724458>
- Osborne, G. R. (2014). *Mark (Teach the Text Commentary Series)*. Baker Books, a division of Baker Publishing Group.
- Ossom-Batsa, G. (2006). Bread for the broken: pragmatic meaning of Mark 14: 22-25. *Neotestamentica*, 40(2), 235-258.
- Park, Y. M. (2010). Chapter Two. Mark's Written Gospel, Orality-Aurality, And Memory. In *Mark's Memory Resources and the Controversy Stories (Mark 2: 1-3: 6)* (pp. 41-70). BRILL.
- Park, Y. M. (2010). *Mark's memory resources and the controversy stories (Mark 2: 1-3: 6): an application of the frame theory of cognitive science to the Markan oral-aural narrative* (Vol. 2). Brill.
- Phelan, J. (2014). Voice, tone, and the rhetoric of narrative communication. *Language and Literature*, 23(1), 49-60. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0963947013511723>
- Poon, M. N. C. (2020). With Authority, Not as the Scribes. *Anglican Theological Review*, 102(4), 597-606.
- Popitz, H. (2017). Phenomena of power. In *Phenomena of Power*. Columbia University Press.
- Popitz, H. (2017). *Phenomena of power: authority, domination, and violence*. Columbia University Press.
- Porter, J. E. (1996). Audience. *Encyclopedia of Rhetoric and Composition: Communication from Ancient Times to the Information Age* New York: Garland, 42-49.
- Reid, D. G., Linder, R. D., Shelley, B., Stout, H. S., & Noll, C. A. (Eds.). (2002). *Concise dictionary of Christianity in America*. Wipf and Stock Publishers.
- Resseguie, J. L. (2019). A Glossary of New Testament Narrative Criticism with Illustrations. *Religions*, 10(3), 217.
- Rhoads, D. M., Dewey, J. & Michie, D. (2012). *Mark as story: An introduction to the narrative of a Gospel*. Fortress Press.
- Rogerson, J. W. (2014). *An introduction to the bible*.
<https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/pacuniversity-ebooks/detail.action?docID=1783345&query=Rogerson%2C+J.+W.+%282014%29.+An+introduction+to+the+Bible.+Routledge>.
- Rowland, C. (2006). Social, political, and ideological criticism. In *The Oxford handbook of biblical studies*.
- Runesson, A. (2010). *Exegesis in the making: Postcolonialism and New Testament studies*. Brill.
- Sabasaba (2020, January 9). Marriage vows are satanic – Pastor Bugingo.
<https://sabasabaupdates.com/2020/01/09/marriage-vows-are-satanic-pastor-bugingo/>

- Saeed, J. I. (2003). *Semantics*. 2nd ed., Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Sbisà, M. (2013). Locution, illocution, perlocution. *Pragmatics of speech actions*, 25-75.
- Schrock, D. P. (2003). Not as the Scribes: Jesus as a Model for Prophetic Preaching. *Mennonite Quarterly Review*, 77(2), 341-344.
- Schweitzer, A. (2001). *The quest of the historical Jesus*. Fortress Press.
- Searle, J. (1965). What is a speech act. *Perspectives in the philosophy of language: a concise anthology*, 2000, 253-268.
- Searle, J. R. (1985). *Expression and meaning: Studies in the theory of speech acts*. Cambridge University Press.
- Shelestiuk, H. V. (2006). Approaches to metaphor: Structure, classifications, cognate phenomena. *Semiotica*, 2006(161), 333-343.
- Shen, D. (2013). *Style and rhetoric of short narrative fiction: Covert progressions behind overt plots*. Routledge.
- Sifuentes, J. (2019, November 05). Authority in Ancient Rome: Auctoritas, Potestas, Imperium, and the Paterfamilias. *Ancient History Encyclopedia*.
<https://www.ancient.eu/article/1472/>
- Sihlemkhize, Z. A. (2018, December). PLO Lumumba on churches and the Jesus Industry.
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hI8z28Ct19g>
- Ska, J. L. (2006). *Introduction to reading the Pentateuch*. Eisenbrauns.
- Stalnaker, R. C. (1999). *Context and content: Essays on intentionality in speech and thought*. Clarendon Press.
- Stander, H. (2007). Jesus' death and resurrection in early Christian art. *Ekklesiastikos Pharos*, 89(1), 179-194
- Stein, R. H. (2008). *Mark*. Baker Academic.
- Stoner, M., & Perkins, S. (2015). *Making sense of messages: A critical apprenticeship in rhetorical criticism*. Routledge.
- Strong, J. (2010). *Greek dictionary of the New Testament*. ktab INC.
- Stückelberger, C. & Mugambi, J. N. (2007). Responsible Leadership. *Global and Contextual Ethical Perspectives*. Geneva: Globethics. Net/World Council of Churches Publications.
- Swanson, J. (2001). *Dictionary of Biblical Languages with Semantic Domains: Greek (New Testament) (CD-ROM)*. Oak Harbor: Logos Research Systems.
- Swindoll, C. R. (2016). *Insights on Mark (Vol. 2)*. NavPress.
- Takács, S. A. (2008). *The construction of authority in ancient rome and byzantium : The rhetoric of empire*. <https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/pacuniversity-ebooks/detail.action?docID=355456&query=Tak%C3%A1cs%2C+S.+A.+%282008%29.+The+construction+of+authority+in+ancient+rome+and+byzantium+%3A+The+rhetoric+of+empire>.
- Takács, S. A. (2009). *The construction of authority in Ancient Rome and Byzantium*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tate, W. R. (2008). *Biblical interpretation: An integrated approach*. Baker Books.
- Taylor, J. E. (2015). *The Essenes, the scrolls, and the Dead Sea*. Oxford University Press.
- The Kenyan Daily post (2019, January 15). You can never go to heaven and meet God except through me. The Kenyan Daily Post. <https://www.kenyan-post.com/2019/01/you-can-never-go-to-heaven-and-see-god.html>

- The New Vision (2019, September 23). Lokodo proposal on pastors to be discussed. The New Vision. https://www.newvision.co.ug/new_vision/news/1507423/president-museveni-meets-pastors-evangelists
- Thiselton, A. C. (2009). *Hermeneutics: an introduction*. Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing.
- Thomas, J. A. (2014). *Meaning in interaction: An introduction to pragmatics*. Routledge.
- Thurén, L. (1990). The rhetorical strategy of 1 Peter with special regard to ambiguous expressions. Abo Academy Press.
- Thurén, L. (1992). The rhetorical strategy of 1 Peter with special regard to ambiguous expressions.
- Thurén, L. (1993, October). ON STUDYING ETHICAL ARGUMENTATION AND PERSUASION. In *Rhetoric and the New Testament: Essays from the 1992 Heidelberg Conference* (p. 464). Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Tina. K. R. (2017, November, 01). Ethnic Conflict. Encyclopaedia Britannica. <https://www.britannica.com/topic/ethnic-conflict>
- Tuckett, C. (2002). The disciples and the messianic secret in Mark. In *Fair Play: Diversity and Conflicts in Early Christianity*: (pp. 131-149). Brill.
- Twelftree, G. H. (2011). *Jesus the exorcist: a contribution to the study of the historical Jesus*. Wipf and Stock Publishers.
- Tyler, K. L. (2013). Principles of Jesus' Healing Ministry. *Journal of Applied Christian Leadership*, 7(2), 8-20.
- Ubink, J. (2008). *Traditional authorities in Africa: Resurgence in an era of democratisation* (p. 39). Leiden University Press.
- URN. (2017, April 22). Pastor Busingo under fire for burning 'deceptive' Bibles. <https://observer.ug/news/headlines/52482-pastor-busingo-under-fire-for-burning-deceptive-bibles>
- Van Wyk, I. (2014). *The Universal Church of the Kingdom of God in South Africa: A church of strangers* (Vol. 47). Cambridge University Press.
- Vanderveken, D. & Kubo, S. (Eds.). (2002). *Essays in speech act theory* (Vol. 77). John Benjamins Publishing.
- Vincent, M. R. (2001). *Vincent's word studies in the New Testament*. Logos Research Systems.
- Wacher, J. (Ed.). (2013). *The Roman World*. Routledge.
- Wallace, D. B. (1996). *Greek grammar beyond the basics: An exegetical syntax of the New Testament*. Harper Collins.
- Warren, W. W. (1996). The Bible Exposition Commentary, vol. 1. Wheaton, IL: Victor Books, 403, 32.
- Wasson, D. L. (2015, November 29). Roman Government. *Ancient History Encyclopedia*. https://www.ancient.eu/Roman_Government/
- Wasson, D. L. (2016, February 26). Ancient Roman Family Life. *Ancient History Encyclopedia*. <https://www.ancient.eu/article/870/>
- Watson, D. F. & Hauser, A. J. (1994). *Rhetorical Criticism of the Bible: A Comprehensive Bibliography with Notes on History and Method* (Vol. 4). Brill.
- Watson, D. F. (2010). *Honor among Christians: the cultural key to the Messianic secret*. Fortress Press.

- Weber, M. (2016). The types of legitimate domination. In *Social Theory Re-Wired* (pp. 270-286). Routledge.
- Webster, L. & Mertova, P. (2007). *Using narrative inquiry as a research method: An introduction to using critical event narrative analysis in research on learning and teaching*. Routledge.
- Weiser, M. E. (2007). Burke and war: Rhetoricizing the theory of dramatism. *Rhetoric Review*, 26(3), 286-302.
- Weiser, M. E. (2008). *Burke, war, words: Rhetoricizing dramatism*. Univ of South Carolina Press.
- Weiser, M. E. (2008). *Burke, war, words: Rhetoricizing dramatism*. Univ of South Carolina Press.
- Wess, R. (2001). Pentadic terms and master tropes: Ontology of the act and epistemology of the trope in A grammar of motives. *Unending conversations: new writings by and about Kenneth Burke*, 154-75.
- Westerfelhaus, R. (2017). Dramatistic (Burkean) Criticism. *The International Encyclopedia of Communication Research Methods*, 1-9.
- Whately, R., & Ehninger, D. (1963). *Elements of Rhetoric. Comprising an Analysis of the Laws of Moral Evidence and of Persuasion, with Rules for Argumentative Composition and Elocution... Edited by Douglas Ehninger, Etc.* Carbondale.
- Wiersbe, W. W. (2002). *The Bible Exposition Commentary*. David C Cook.
- Wilder, A. M. (1964). *Early Christian Rhetoric*. Harvard University Press; London: SCM (p. 81).
- Wilkin, R. N. (2010). *The Grace New Testament Commentary*. Denton, TX: Grace Evangelical Society.
- Winn, A. (2014). Resisting Honor: The Markan Secrecy Motif and Roman Political Ideology. *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 133(3), 583-601.
doi:10.15699/jbibllite.133.3.583
- Wondra, E. K. (2002). *Introduction to theology*. Church Publishing, Inc.
- Wrede, W. (1971). The Messianic Secret, trans. JCG Grieg. Cambridge: James Clarke & Co.
- Wuellner, W. (1995). Rhetorical criticism. *The Postmodern Bible: The Bible and Culture Collective*, 149-86.
- Youngblood, R. F. (2014). *Nelson's Illustrated Bible Dictionary: New and Enhanced Edition*. Thomas Nelson.
- Zarefsky, D. (2006). Reflections on Rhetorical Criticism. *Rhetoric Review*, 25(4), 383-387.
<http://ezproxy.pacuniversity.ac.ke:2067/stable/20176744>