EXEMPLIFICATION OF MARTYRIOLOGICAL AND AUTHENTIC LEADERSHIP

VALENTIN NOVIKOV

The pericope of the apostles’ second trial before the Sanhedrin in Acts 5:27-32 was analyzed using socio-rhetorical criticism’s intertexture, social and cultural texture, and ideological texture analysis to identify the existence of possible behaviors related to the martyriological leadership theory proposed by Niewold.1 The intertexture and social and cultural texture analysis provided an understanding on the text’s background and foundational contexts. Since Avolio and Gardner contended that authentic leadership is a model that forms the basis for all other types of positive leadership models,2 the contexts were analyzed to determine the potential applicability for authentic leadership’s integration with martyriological leadership by Christian practitioners. The analysis suggests that martyriological leadership is empowered by the Holy Spirit and that there are four possible enabling behaviors. The analysis also suggests that integration of authentic leadership principles within martyriological leadership is essential.

As pointed out by Niewold, the Apostle Paul was appointed both as a servant (Huperetes) and as a witness (Martus) which constituted two equal roles.3 Consequently, Christian leadership should probably not just be limited to servant leadership but should also include martyriological leadership, which is defined by Niewold as the “act of Christian public proclamation and witness.”4 Niewold contended that martyriological leadership consists of five characteristics: the believers witness about Christ even though they may have “no personal
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knowledge of Jesus," personal testimony of the spiritual experience with Jesus leading to personal conversion, testimony on the application "of Jesus’ saving work" for all humankind, public testimony of Jesus which could lead to persecution or even death, and "a lifestyle of habitual witnessing (and suffering)." Although these five characteristics provide a starting point in describing martyrriological leadership, additional research is required to determine if there are a set of behaviors that may be directly related to this paradigm and if other forms of leadership, like authentic leadership, are somehow interrelated with martyrriological leadership.

As a result, an exegetical analysis was conducted on the pericope of the apostles' second trial before the Sanhedrin in Acts 5:27-32 to identify the existence of possible behaviors related to the martyrriological leadership theory proposed by Niewold, and to determine the potential applicability of authentic leadership's integration with martyrriological leadership by Christian practitioners. This analysis was conducted using Robbins socio-rhetorical analysis process. Socio-rhetorical interpretation illuminates multiple insights during the meticulous exegesis of Scripture. It includes inner texture, intertexture, social and cultural texture, and ideological texture which provides a multi-view of the Scripture similar to the different patterns and images found in "an intricately woven tapestry." Acts 5:27-32 was examined using the intertexture, and social and cultural texture analysis processes of socio-rhetorical criticism to provide an understanding of the foundational contexts of the pericope. Since the main theme of the pericope is the call to witness regardless of the threat of persecution, an ideological texture analysis was also conducted to identify possible behaviors related to martyrriological leadership. Lastly, because authentic leadership is considered the basis for other forms of positive philosophical leadership paradigms, an analysis was also performed to determine its potential applicability to the martyrriological leadership theory that was proposed by Niewold. The results of these analyses are presented which will demonstrate that the call as both a servant and witness is not unique to the apostles, or even the first century Christians, but is applicable to contemporary Christian leaders, who should exhibit authentic leadership as they provide witness of Christ’s light and love to an unethical world as illustrated in Acts 5:27-32. Lastly, the results demonstrate the potential applicability of martyrriological leadership not just for those leading ecclesial related organizations, but also for Christians who lead non-ecclesial enterprises.
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I. BACKGROUND OF ACTS 5:27-32

The Book of Acts, which is a sequel to the Gospel of Luke, serves as a historical monograph of the spread of the Christianity from Jerusalem to Rome in fulfillment of Jesus' instruction to not depart Jerusalem until the disciples received power after the Holy Spirit came upon them so that they can be Christ’s witnesses “in Jerusalem, and in all Judea and Samaria, and even to the remotest part of the earth.” Martus, the Greek word for witnesses, means a legal witness or a spectator of an historical event.

After being empowered with the Holy Spirit, the apostles began performing numerous thaumaturgic events (Table 1) which involved the supernatural intervention into peoples’ lives. Prior to the apostles’ trail before the Sanhedrin in Acts 5:27-32, the thaumaturgic events included the disciples speaking in tongues at Pentecost, signs and wonders through the apostles, the healing of the lame beggar, the heavenly judgment of Ananias and Sapphira, additional apostles’ signs and wonders, and the apostles supernaturally release from jail. These events served as a “demonstration of the resurrection” of Christ that the apostles claimed to have witnessed. They drew the attention of the residents and visitors in Jerusalem at the time providing the opportunity for the apostles to testify to the people about Jesus using conversionist argumentation (Table 1) after being filled with the Spirit at Pentecost, after healing the lame beggar and after supernaturally being freed from jail.

During Peter’s conversionist speech (Table 1) after healing the lame beggar, the apostles were arrested by the temple guard and confronted by the Sadducees who were disturbed that the apostles were claiming to be witnesses of Jesus resurrection from the dead. The Sadducees were predominately from the Jewish ruling aristocracy. They did not believe in the resurrection of the dead or rewards and punishment after death.

---
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Table 1. Social responses to the world in the Book of Acts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Response</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conversionist</td>
<td>Includes public preaching to address corrupted humans that have corrupted the world. Corrupted humans can be changed by supernatural transformation through salvation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thaumaturgic</td>
<td>Involves supernatural intervention into peoples’ lives that brings “healing, assuagement of grief, restoration after loss, reassurance, the foresight and avoidance of calamity, and the guarantee of eternal (or at least continuing) life after death”.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consequently, the Sadducees were devoid of any concern about the impact of their behavior on their status in eternity. Therefore their focus was on maintaining honor and societal privilege through patronage (Table 2) which was common Hellenistic behavior in first century Mediterranean culture. Additionally, the Sadducees only accepted the Torah as authoritative and viewed the prophets and writings as commentary. As a result, the Sadducees completely missed the importance of repentance and the messianic fulfillment of God’s new covenant; consequently, their view of the messianic promise was limited to just the restoration of the Kingdom of Israel.

Table 2. Common cultural topics within Acts 5:27-32

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Response</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Honor and Shame</td>
<td>“The social values of honor and dishonor were foundational to first century culture, whether Roman, Greek, Egyptian or Jewish. ... Honor comes from the affirmation of a person’s worth by peers and society, awarded on the basis of the individual’s ability to embody the virtues and attributes his or her society values.” These include the honor attributed by one’s “birth in to a particular ethnos.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patron, Client, Broker</td>
<td>The ancient Mediterranean world consisted on extremes in wealth; hence it was normal for the less advantaged to seek assistance from the well positioned resulting in a client patron relationship. “A person who received such a benefit became a client to the patron, accepting obligation to publicize the favor and his or her gratitude for it, thus contributing to the patron’s reputation.” Often an intermediary (broker) was involved in</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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facilitating the patron client relationship. “Brokerage was exceedingly common and personal in the ancient world.”

After the return from exile while Israel was occupied by foreign powers “the high priesthood was basically auctioned off to the person with the most affluent supporters.” Between “6 to 66 C.E. the high priesthood was passed between four or five of the wealthiest families whose members followed the Sadducean interpretation of faith and were distinctly pro-Roman.” The high priest, appointed by the Roman procurator, with a small group of supporters and Herod Antipas, the tetrarch of Galilee, met in violation of Pharisaic teaching on the eve of Passover to condemn Jesus and hand him over to Pontius Pilate to be put to death.

The next day after their first arrest, the apostles were questioned by the Sanhedrin, whose historical existence was spoken about by Josephus in his writings. The Sanhedrin was made up of both Sadducees and Pharisees. Unlike the Sadducees, the Pharisees believed in the resurrection of the dead and rewards and punishment in eternity. The Apostle Peter’s defense in Acts 4:8-12 included an account of God’s miraculous healing of the beggar, and “a short summary of the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus. Because of the miraculous public healing the apostles were released, after the Sanhedrin threatened the apostles to not speak or teach in the name of Jesus in an effort to try to stop the spread of the belief that the risen Jesus is the Messiah.

Later after performing many additional signs and wonders, the apostles were arrested again because of the jealousy of the high priest and the Sadducees. Because of the apostles’ disobedience to the high priest and the Sanhedrin, the Sadducees authority was threatened resulting in a challenge to their honor (Table 2). Honor in the 1st Century Mediterranean culture was foundational; honor represented a person’s rightful place in society based on one’s social standing. The high priest and the Sanhedrin had honor within Judaism based on their positions of authority. The high priest’s and Sadducees’ honor was challenged by the apostles’ disobedience and divinely inspired activities performed in the name of Jesus; these were viewed as “socially disruptive behavior” that served to bring shame and discredit upon the high priest and the Sanhedrin who had Jesus killed.

When the Sanhedrin was convened, the court officers found the apostle’s prison cells, which were under guard, locked but empty. This of course puzzled the captain of the temple
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guard and the Sanhedrin. Shortly afterwards, it was reported that the apostles were in the temple area once again teaching the “people the full message of this new life” in obedience to the direction of the angel of the Lord. The captain and the court officers, without force, brought the apostles in from the temple area to stand trial before the Sanhedrin and the full senate. Gerousia, the Greek word for senate, means the council of elders, the senate consisted of the elders who were not members of the Sanhedrin. Since a trial with both the senate and the Sanhedrin was atypical, this demonstrates that the Sadducee led Judaic leadership considered the apostles messianic message and thaumaturgic events (Table 1) a significant threat to their honor and status within the Jewish culture (Table 2).

II. INTERTEXTUAL, AND SOCIAL AND CULTURAL CONTEXT OF THE SECOND TRIAL BEFORE THE SANHEDRIN

The high priest’s interrogation of the apostles, as outlined in the historical intertexture (Table 3), began with the statement “we gave you strict orders not to continue teaching in this name, and yet, you have filled Jerusalem with your teaching and intend to bring this man’s blood upon us.” (Acts 5:28, New American Standard). Paraggelia, the Greek word for strict orders, means a command. The high priest demanded an explanation on why the apostles dishonored the Sanhedrin by disobeying the command to stop teaching in “this name.”

Table 3. Historical intertexture within Acts 5:27-32

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Christian Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peter and the apostles brought to trial before the council</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Only biblical reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanhedrin orders not to teach about Jesus</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Acts 4:18, 5:40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter and apostles filled Jerusalem with teaching about Jesus</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Acts 2, 3, 5:25, 5:42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter and apostles disobedience to the Sanhedrin in order to obey God rather than men</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Acts 4:19, 4:42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The Apostle Peter answered the High Priest "We must obey God rather than men."\[^{73}\] Peitharcheo, the Greek word for obey, means obey a ruler or superior.\[^{74}\] Obedience is a common intertextual cultural reference (Table 4) within the Jewish religious community. God told Israel that if they obey his voice and keep his covenant that they would be God’s own possession.\[^{75}\] God set a blessing and a curse before Israel; if they obey God’s commandments they will have a blessing, but disobedience brings a curse.\[^{76}\] The prophet Jeremiah reminded the people of Israel of God’s promise to be their God if they only obey his voice and his commandments so that it will be well with them.\[^{77}\] Sagi and Stein indicate that obedience is not an unconditional obligation. Prima facie, individuals are bound to comply but this obligation assumes that the sages know the Torah. If the sages are mistaken, however, one is allowed not to obey them and may even be forbidden to do so.

The binding duty of a Jewish individual is first and foremost to the Torah rather than the sages whose authority rests on their knowledge rather than on an arbitrary power to command whatever they wish.\[^{78}\] Based not only on the apostles’ eye witness of the death and resurrection of Christ, but based on their Holy Spirit enabled enlightenment\[^{79}\] that Jesus is the Messiah who fulfilled the prophecies in the Hebrew Scriptures, the apostles were obliged to disobey the Sadducee led Sanhedrin since their worldly temporal focus caused them to miss the nature of the new covenant.\[^{80}\]

The Apostle Peter told the Sanhedrin and the senate that “the God of our fathers raised up Jesus, whom you had put to death by hanging Him on a cross.”\[^{81}\] This verse began with a cultural intertexture of the common Judaic phrase “God of our fathers.” This phrase identifies the apostle’s claims that these thaumaturgic events were inspired by the God of their ancestors which was commonly understood by the Jewish people to be Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob the founders of their family.\[^{82}\]
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Table 4. Cultural intertexture of Acts 5:27-32

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ancestors</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Greek definition: “generator or male ancestor” for the Jewish people the “founder of a family” Abraham, Jacob, and David.(^{83})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council (Sanhedrin)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Greek Definition: Assembly “of magistrates, judges, ambassadors . . . convened to deliberate or pass judgement . . . deliberating or adjudicating.” The Sanhedrin, the great council at Jerusalem, consisting of seven or more members, viz. scribes, elders, prominent members of the high priestly families and the high priest, the president of the assembly. The most important cases were brought before this tribunal, inasmuch as the Roman rulers of Judea had left to it the power of trying such cases, and also of pronouncing sentence of death, with the limitation that a capital sentence pronounced by the Sanhedrin was not valid unless it was confirmed by the Roman procurator(^{84}). (Thayer &amp; Smith, 1999). This was substantiated by Josephus statement in Antiquities (Gabbe, 2008).(^{85})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forgiveness of sins</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Psalms 32:1 “Happy are those whose transgression is forgiven, whose sin is covered,” Daniel 9:9 “To the Lord our God belong mercy and forgiveness.” “Jeremiah’s prophecy of the ‘new covenant’ and forgiveness of sins contained in Jer 31:31-35.(^{86})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High priest</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>“In Judaism, the chief religious functionary in the Temple of Jerusalem, whose unique privilege was to enter the Holy of Holies (inner sanctum) once a year on Yom Kippur, the Day of Atonement, to burn incense and sprinkle sacrificial animal blood to expiate his own sins and those of the people of Israel. On this occasion he wore only white linen garments, forgoing the elaborate priestly vestments worn during the year whenever he chose to officiate at services. The high priest had overall charge of Temple finances and administration, and in the early period of the Second Temple he collected taxes and maintained order as the recognized political head of the nation. The high priest could not mourn the dead, had to avoid defilement incurred by proximity to the dead, and could marry only a virgin. The office, first conferred on Aaron by his brother Moses, was normally hereditary and for life.(^{87})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holy Spirit</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Psalm 51:11 “Do not cast me away from your presence, and do not take your Holy Spirit from me,” Isaiah 63:10-11 “But they rebelled and grieved his Holy Spirit . . . Where is the one who put within them his Holy Spirit.” Numbers 11:25 “When the spirit rested upon them, they prophesied.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obedience</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Obey in Hebrew means “to hear, listen to, and obey.”(^{88}) God commanded Israel to obey his commandments in the covenant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Prince in Greek means “chief leader, prince, one that takes the lead in anything, pioneer, the author.”(^{89})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{84}\) Ibid.
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Table 4. Cultural intertexture of Acts 5:27-32 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Savior    | 31    | Hebrew definition: “to save, be saved, be delivered” (Brown, Driver, Briggs, & Gesenius, n.d.). God was known to the Israelites as Savior (2 Sam 22:3; Psalms 17:7, 106:21; Isa 19:20, 43:3, 43:11, 45:15, 45:21, 49:26, 60:16). The Old Testament “messianic vision is a fragmented vision that becomes increasingly more cohesive as one moves towards the final stages of the formation of the Hebrew Bible.”
| Repentance| 31    | Isa 30:15 For thus said the Lord GOD, the Holy One of Israel: "In returning and rest you shall be saved, In quietness and in trust shall be your strength." Jer 31:18-20 “You disciplined me, and I took the discipline; I was like a calf untrained. Bring me back, let me come back, for you are the Lord my God. For after I had turned away I repented . . .” Repentance was a well-known cultural concept to the Jewish people as outline by Jeremiah.
| Witness   | 32    | “A witness in a legal sense” or “historical sense . . . who is a spectator of anything” or “in an ethical sense those who after his example have proved the strength and genuineness of their faith in Christ by undergoing a violent death.” (Thayer & Smith, 1999).

Verse 30 concludes with two recontextualizations (Table 5). The first is a recontextualization of Psalms 16:10 when King David said, “because you will not abandon me to the realm of the dead, nor will you let your faithful one see decay.” Since King David was not resurrected from the dead, this was a prophesy of the resurrection of the Messiah. With the recontextualization the Apostle Peter told the high priest that Jesus, the faithful one, was raised up by the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. Although disputed by the Sadducees, resurrection from death was accepted by the Pharisees based on both 1 Samuel 2:6, “The Lord kills and brings to life; he brings down to Sheol and raises up,” and Isaiah 26:19, “Your dead shall live, their corpses shall rise.”

The phrase “whom you had killed by hanging him on a tree” is a recontextualization of Deuteronomy 21:22-23. Jesus was killed by the Sanhedrin when they refused Pilate’s offer to release Jesus because he claimed to be the Son of God. Jesus, the faultless and blameless Son of God, became a curse to God when he was hung on the cross as he took upon him all the sins of mankind. Additionally, this phrase also included the social intertexture reference of crucifixion which was a common Mediterranean form of punishment. Crucifixion was not only a common means of capital punishment in the Roman Empire, but had been commonly used in the region since the 6th century B.C.E. by the Persians, Seleucids, Carthaginians, and Romans.
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Table 5. Oral-scribal intertexture within Acts 5:27-32

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Recontextualization</th>
<th>Old Testament Scripture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>“The God of our fathers raised up Jesus”</td>
<td>“Because you will not abandon me to the realm of the dead, nor let your faithful one see decay” (Psalms 16:10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>“Whom you had killed by hanging him on a tree”</td>
<td>“If a man has committed a sin worthy of death and he is put to death, and you hang him on a tree, his corpse shall not hang all night on the tree, but you shall surely bury him on the same day (for his who is hanged is accursed of God), so that you do not defile your land which the Lord your God gives you as an inheritance” (Deuteronomy 21:22-23)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Apostle Peter continued his testimony by telling the high priest that Jesus “is the one whom God exalted to His right hand as a Prince and a Savior, to grant repentance to Israel, and forgiveness of sins.”

This verse begins with the statement that the one whom the Sanhedrin had put to death was not only resurrected but also exalted to God’s right hand. Isaiah predicted that God’s “servant will prosper, He will be high and lifted up and greatly exalted” even though they will be astonished because they did not recognize him. The apostles’ statement was a significant insult to the Sanhedrin since it claimed that the Sanhedrin sacrilegiously disrespected God the Patron of Israel (Table 2). Because the ancient Mediterranean world consisted of extremes in wealth, it was normal for the less advantaged to seek assistance from the well positioned resulting in a client patron relationship. “A person who received such a benefit became a client to the patron, accepting obligation to publicize the favor and his or her gratitude for it, thus contributing to the patron’s reputation.” Often an intermediary (broker) was involved in facilitating the patron client relationship. According to DeSilva Jesus is “the mediator [broker] who secures favor from God on behalf of those who have committed themselves to Jesus as client dependents” In Acts 5:31 Peter made reference to this well-known patron, client, broker relationship when he told the Sanhedrin that it is Jesus that “God exalted with his right hand to be a Prince and a Saviour.” Peter’s announcement implied that the Sanhedrin were ungrateful to their Patron, the God of their fathers, by killing his Son the broker who provides access to God. This announcement was such an insult to the Sanhedrin’s honor that “they were cut to the heart, and took counsel to slay” the apostles had it not been for Gamaliel the Pharisee who was a “doctor of the law.”

Verse 31 also contains four common Judaic intertextual cultural references (Table 4): prince, savior, repentance and forgiveness. The Apostle Peter identified Jesus as the exalted Prince that was prophesied by Isaiah who stated that

A child will be born to us, a son will be given to us; and the government will rest on His shoulders; and His name will be called Wonderful Counselor, Mighty God, Eternal Father, Prince of Peace. There will be no end to the increase of His government or of peace, on the throne of David and over his kingdom, to
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establish it and to uphold it with justice and righteousness from then on and forevermore.\textsuperscript{107}

Oswalt posited that Isaiah’s prediction pointed to the “promise of the Davidic Messiah” since it was “something more than the birth of a normal baby” as “indicated by the stupendous language used.”\textsuperscript{108} The Apostle Peter also identified Jesus as the Savior. Throughout Israel’s history God was portrayed as the Savior.\textsuperscript{109} God saved Israel by: delivering her people from Egypt,\textsuperscript{110} providing a refuge from evil,\textsuperscript{111} and protecting King David from violence.\textsuperscript{112} Repentance is also another common theme within the Judaic culture based primarily on Jeremiah’s message of national repentance.\textsuperscript{113} Shuwbah, the Hebrew word for repentance, means withdrawal.\textsuperscript{114} Similarly the Hebrew word for repent is Shuwb which means to return or turn back.\textsuperscript{115}

Consequently, Jesus is God’s exalted One who grants Israel the ability to withdrawal from her sins by returning back to the God of her fathers. The last intertextual cultural concept in this verse is forgiveness of sins. Jeremiah prophesied of God’s new covenant for the forgiveness of sins which will no longer be remembered.\textsuperscript{116} As described by Isaiah, God’s Righteous Servant, Jesus, grants forgiveness of sins based on the fact that he took on him the inequities of mankind enabling him to “justify the many.”\textsuperscript{117} Willis contends that through Jesus’ sacrifice for the forgiveness of sins the need for the old covenant sacrifices was eliminated\textsuperscript{118} since “God merely passed over, for the time, the sins of those who died in faith under the old order, with complete and final absolution.”\textsuperscript{119} This of course put the high priest and Sadducee supporters’ positions of honor at risk since their need will have expired with the establishment and acknowledgement of the new covenant.

This pericope concludes with the Apostle Peter telling the Sanhedrin that they personally witnessed the death, resurrection and exaltation of Jesus.\textsuperscript{120} The Apostle Peter told the Sanhedrin that the Holy Spirit also bears witness to these facts and that the Holy Spirit is given to those who obey Jesus.\textsuperscript{121} This verse contains two additional intertextual Judaic cultural references (Table 4) of the Holy Spirit and bearing witness. Moses identified 70 elders from among the people of Israel to help him. The Lord placed his Spirit on the elders who then prophesied.\textsuperscript{122} The prophet Joel predicted that God will pour out His Spirit on all mankind resulting in sons and daughters prophesying and old men dreaming dreams and young men seeing visions.\textsuperscript{123} Jesus prepared his disciples during his farewell address that: the Father
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would have his Spirit abide with the disciples forever, the Holy Spirit would teach them everything and remind them of what Jesus said, and the Spirit of truth will testify on Jesus' behalf. Jesus fulfilled his promise when the Holy Spirit was poured out on the apostles and believers at Pentecost after Jesus' ascension into heaven. Jesus' promise was fulfilled again when the community of believers were filled with the Holy Spirit while they were praying after the apostles were released from their first arrest.

The second intertextual Judaic cultural reference in this verse was ed, the Hebrew word for witness, which means testimony or evidence of things. It was common knowledge from the Torah that it was not permissible to “bear false witness against one’s neighbor,” and that it takes evidence presented by two or three witnesses not just one to claim that someone has committed an “iniquity or any sin.” It was also generally accepted that “a trustworthy witness will not lie” but saves lives, while “a false witness utters lies” and is treacherous. With the apostles' witness of the exalted Jesus, many lives were saved as multitudes believed.

III. MARTYRILOGICAL LEADERSHIP AND THE IDEOLOGICAL CONTEXT OF THE APOSTLES’ DEFENSE

The pericope in Acts 5:27-32 consists of three parts: appearance of the apostles before the Sanhedrin (verse 27), interrogation by the Sanhedrin (verse 28), and the apostles’ response (verses 29-32). “The central thought of the text is that Christians are called to witness no matter what persecution they may face.” The Apostle Peter's testimony in their second appearance before the Sanhedrin was similar to the first. An examination of these complementary passages reveals key enablers required to witness.

During the Apostles first testimony before the Sanhedrin, it was cited that the Apostle Peter was “filled with the Holy Spirit.” In this pericope Peter informs the Sanhedrin that the Holy Spirit is given by God to those who obey him. Tannehill contended that this is a fulfillment of Luke 12:11-12 when Jesus taught the disciples that, "when they bring you before the synagogues and the rulers and the authorities, do not worry about how or what you are to speak in your defense, or what you are to say; for the Holy Spirit will teach you in that very hour what you ought to say." Tannehill maintained that the apostles’ two trials are a fulfillment of Jesus' prediction that the disciples will be arrested and persecuted and brought before kings and governors leading to an opportunity for testimony. Jesus told the disciples “not to prepare beforehand to defend” themselves since Jesus will give them the words and wisdom that cannot
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be resisted or refuted. Marturion is the Greek word for testimony, which is a derivative of Martus (witness). These two passages imply that it is the Holy Spirit that provides irresistible wisdom for the testimony. This wisdom is derived from the understanding that is provided by the Holy Spirit.

Tannehill contended that the Apostles understanding of Jesus messianic role is based not only on their witness of his death, resurrection and ascension, but an illumination on his fulfillment of the Hebrew Scriptures that came as a result of their minds being “opened by the risen Messiah,” which was not realized by the Judaic religious community since they were expecting the Messiah to assume an earthly not a heavenly throne based on their interpretation of Isaiah 9:6-7. It is because of the Holy Spirit inspired wisdom that was expounded by the “uneducated and untrained” apostles that the Sanhedrin stood “amazed, and began to recognize” the apostles “as having been with Jesus.”

Tannehill posited that the apostles’ ability to witness on behalf of Jesus was based on their boldness. Parrhesia, the Greek word for boldness, means unreservedness, fearless confidence, and assurance. “The Peter who speaks with boldness has been transformed from the Peter who wilted under pressure when accused of being one of Jesus’ companions.” Tannehill pointed out that it was “by means of Scripture” that the Apostle Peter “is able to interpret both the immediate event of Spirit-inspired speaking and the whole story of Jesus as part of God’s purpose, and he boldly proclaims Jesus as both Lord and Messiah.”

Obedience to both God’s Word as well as the Holy Spirit is a behavior that enables witness. After being arrested the second time, the Apostle Peter declared to the high priest and the Sanhedrin “We must obey God rather than men.” This was similar to what the Apostles Peter and John told the Sanhedrin after being warned not to speak or teach about Jesus, “Whether it is right in the sight of God to give heed to you rather than to God, you be the judge; for we cannot stop speaking about what we have seen and heard.” When human authorities, like the Sanhedrin, “demand something contrary to what God requires, allegiance to God must be maintained.” After recognizing that Jesus was the Messiah, the apostles had to choose to obey the living risen exalted Christ rather than men in order to fulfill Jesus’ command to “go into all the world and preach the gospel to all creation” and testify on Christ’s behalf. Just prior to his ascension, Jesus told the apostles that “you will receive power when the Holy Spirit has come upon you; and you shall be My witnesses both in Jerusalem, and in all Judea and Samaria, and even to the remotest part of the earth.”
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obeying the mandate to witness for Christ and to make disciples throughout all the world.”

Obedience is not a new concept within the Jewish culture, since it has historical precedent. It was highlighted in the Pentateuch’s description of “Noah’s greatest character traits” which were “quiet submission and obedience. He walked with God. . . He did all that God commanded of him.”

“In Judaism,” Abraham’s obedience leading to “the sacrifice of Isaac is the top symbol of faith. The rabbinc literature glorifies this story and emphasizes the exemplary act of Abraham.”

Although only implied in the pericope, courage is also an enabling behavior for those called to obey God. During his farewell discourse prior to his arrest and crucifixion, Jesus told his disciples that, “These things I have spoken to you, so that in Me you may have peace. In the world you have tribulation, but take courage; I have overcome the world.”

Tharseo, the Greek word for courage means “to be of good courage, be of good cheer;” while eirene, the Greek word peace, means “the tranquil state of a soul assured of its salvation through Christ, and so fearing nothing from God and content with its earthly lot.”

Nikao, the Greek word for overcome, means “victorious over all His foes.” Courage is based upon faith that Jesus is victorious (nikao) over the world and its prince that brings death.

Jesus exhortation is to be eirene (tranquil) and have tharseo (courage). This implies that for Christians, who have a new covenant relationship with God through Jesus, the source of courage is based on Christ’s peace that passes all understanding.

It is motivated by the faith that Jesus has conquered all to include death.

Based on faith in the risen Christ and peace from the Holy Spirit, Christians are empowered to have courage to be victorious by overcoming tribulations in the world. Hauerwas pointed out Thomas Aquinas believed that “Christians are required to patiently persevere in the face of persecution,” and that martyrdom is a display of ultimate courage. Because Peter and the apostles were filled with the Holy Spirit, they was able to boldly standup to the Sanhedrin in witness of Christ which nearly resulted in their martyrdom had it not been for the Pharisee Gamaliel’s intervention. Aquinas believed that martyrdom
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requires a man to cling onto his faith to be able to disregard the threat of death. Faith inspired courage enables one to willingly risk the securities of life.

The ideological texture analysis of this pericope suggests that martyrriological leadership is empowered by the infilling of the Holy Spirit. The analysis also suggests that the enabling behaviors for martyrriological leadership are wisdom and understanding, boldness, obedience, and faith and peace facilitated courage. These key enablers are enhanced in those who are “redeemed and indwelt by the Holy Spirit.” Because it is impossible to see within someone’s heart and always discern how to motivate someone, Holy Spirit inspired wisdom is critical in effectively testifying for Christ. This is why Jesus told believers to “not worry about how or what you are to speak in your defense, or what you are to say; for the Holy Spirit will teach you in that very hour what you ought to say.” To effectively transmit God’s good news to a lost world, it takes boldness and fearless confidence. In order to have the greatest impact in testifying for Christ, timing is important; since it is impossible to discern the appropriate time to witness, obedience to the Holy Spirit’s prompting is critical. Lastly, to overcome the fear of persecution and possible physical threats associated with speaking the truth, faith and peace enabled courage is required to obey the Holy Spirit.

IV. AUTHENTIC LEADERSHIP’S ROLE IN MARTYRIOLOGICAL LEADERSHIP

The popularity of the authentic leadership theory arose primarily in response to the corporate ethical debacles at the turn of the century. Avolio et al. point out that authentic leadership is not just a construct where the leader “knows who they are, what they believe and value,” but it is a process where the leaders transparently interact and influence followers through collaborative relationships based on their values and beliefs. Authentic leaders influence followers through personal transparent identification with them based on the leader’s authenticity and commitment to doing “what is right and fair.” They lead from the front by setting the example through their interpersonal relationships. Avolio, Luthan and Walumbwa describe authentic leaders as individuals who are optimistic and highly moral characters based on their moral character and commitment to doing what is right and fair.
on their deep awareness of how they think and behave. These leaders are not motivated by self-interest but by positive values and altruism. Since authentic leadership forms the basis for all other types of positive leadership models, pragmatically it should be able to be integrated with martyrriological leadership by Christian practitioners.

Martyriological leaders must be authentic or their credibility will be undermined resulting in the loss of influence required to effectively fulfill the martyrriological leadership characteristics two and three posited by Niewold: witness about Christ's personal influence on the leader's life thru conversion, and the applicability of the message of redemption and forgiveness. The Apostle Paul encouraged Titus to remind his congregation that it is good and profitable for believers to engage in good deeds.

The Apostle Peter's exhortation pointed to the importance of these good deeds since they provide a non-verbal message corroborating the gospel to unbelievers. In his first epistle, the Apostle Peter told believers to "keep your behavior excellent among the Gentiles" since they will glorify God at Christ's second coming because they observed your good deeds, even though they are currently slandering you for your beliefs as evildoers who have abandoned loyalty to the gods and the Hellenistic community. Allbee posited that in addition to demonstrating that he was the Christ, Jesus's signs and wonders served as a witnessing model for spreading the gospel by going about doing good which included miracles "to relieve suffering and oppression." As a result,

being a disciple also includes a commitment to obey Jesus' teachings and live out the loving ethic of the Kingdom of God as one learns from Christ and is transformed by the Holy Spirit (Gal 5:16) into his image (Rom 12:2). These two aspects of discipleship, Christian witness and Christian ethics, are integral and complimentary. Motivated by the ethic of Christian love for his neighbor, a disciple witnesses to and extends the kingdom of God while also living out and expressing its ethic. This ethic itself then serves as a further witness to God's kingdom by explicating its nature.

Living a Godly life displaying God's love that is different from the world distinguishes the believer, which will ultimately provide opportunities to witness. Consequently, the Apostle Paul exhorted believers that they no longer live as the Gentiles live in ignorance, sensuality, impurity and greed. He encouraged them to lay aside their old self, by renewing the spirit of their minds and putting on the new self, which is holy and righteous in the likeness of God, so that they do not grieve the Holy Spirit who empowers them to witness. To avoid grieving

---

190 Avolio and Gardner, "Authentic Leadership Development."
191 Niewold, "Beyond Servant Leadership."
192 Titus 3:8.
193 1 Peter 2:12.
196 Allbee, "Christ Witnessing to Culture," 23.
197 1 John 4:17-21.
198 Allbee, "Christ Witnessing to Culture."
the Holy Spirit the Christian leader must walk the Christian life based on biblical ethical principles outlined by the Apostle Paul in Ephesians 4:17-5:20.

Since martyriological leadership is dependent upon being empowered by the Holy Spirit, it is essential that the Christian leaders be both martyriological and authentic. Since the actions of authentic leaders “are based on their values and convictions,” they do not try to “please an audience, gain popularity or advance some personal or narrow political interest.” Consequently, “what they say is consistent with what they believe, and their actions are consistent with both their talk and their beliefs.” The difference between secular and Christian authentic leaders are their motivational beliefs. Secular authentic leaders are motivated by a positive altruistic philosophy, while authentic Christian leaders’ motivation comes from their true core character that has been transformed by the renewal of their spirit through the Word of God.

The Apostle James pointed out that one’s heart, true core character, serves as the source of ultimate motivation for one’s behavior and works. If it is based on bitter envy or self-seeking ambition, then it will ultimately result in temptation leading to sin and death. James maintains that bitter envy occurs when selfish ambition is unfilled. These two vices are the sources of poor (egoistically motivated) ethics that lead to personal and organizational destruction which grieves the Holy Spirit. For the Christian, one’s true core character has been transformed by the infilling of the Holy Spirit and the renewing of one’s mind through the Word of God.

The Apostle James in the thematic peak pericope of his epistle challenges leaders to show their genuine manner of life that emanates from their core character, through their habitual good works and by gently imparting skills and knowledge to their followers. He points out that they must impart this wisdom based on pure [faultless], peaceable, suitable and equitable, cooperative, forgiving, unwavering, genuine hearts (true core character) that bears the fruit of the Spirit which will result in fruitful just relationships and harmonious collaborative environments.

Niewold posited that “martyriological leadership is limited to those who stand on the boundaries of two worlds, often endangering their own lives or welfare in the process.” Similarly, Allbee (2005) maintained that “Christian disciples must continue to ‘remain in the world’ and continue to not be ‘of the world,’ . . . part of what it means to be a follower of Christ is to be in the world as he was in order to witness as he did.” However, unlike Niewold who contended that martyriological leadership is an “activity that is carried on by a special class of
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individuals that John calls ‘prophets.’” Allbee (2005) maintained that loving commitments to neighbors by Christian leaders, puts them “in a position to respond to inquiries about their loving practices with evangelistic intentions and have even more opportunity to witness by fervently reaching out and evangelizing.”

Although ecclesiastical leadership is important, Niewold overlooks the fact that most contemporary Christians have vocations that are outside the church. As a result, these Christians, who are leaders in the community and in non-ecclesiastically related enterprises, often have more opportunities to portray martyriological leadership than prophets. Christian leaders of secular organizations and enterprises have numerous opportunities to display God’s love and concern to their employees, peers, clients, and customers many of whom will never enter the doors of a church or evangelistic outreach. Allbee pointed out that such displays of love may include:

- Being an inexpensive Christian doctor in a world of rising health care costs,
- being satisfied with developing a Christian business where one can make a living profit rather than only opting for business investments that will maximize one’s profit, and
- being committed to providing full-time employment or more equitable wages for one’s employees.

Winston refers to this as **agapao** leadership. **Agapao**, the Greek word for love, means “a moral love, doing the right thing at the right time for the right reason” which has some similarities with authentic leadership that is committed to doing “what is right and fair.”

**Agapao** leaders deeply care about their employees. This includes not only care about the professional welfare of the employee through “individualized consideration,” but also includes care for the personal wellbeing of employees by ensuring they have such things as a “minimum living wage” or safe working conditions. Courageous Christian leaders must be committed to righteousness by refusing to compromise their biblically inspired ethical principles by standing up for what is right, to include witnessing for Christ, regardless of the potential cost to their careers or livelihood. This suggests that Christian leaders require the courage to be authentic martyriological leaders who lead by example through pure hearts regardless of the organizational context.
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V. DISCUSSION

The pericope in Acts 5:27-32 is initially focused on the Holy Spirit filled apostles refusal to obey a mistaken command, to not speak and teach about the resurrected Christ, from the Sadducee led first century Judaic religious leadership that was motivated to maintain their temporal honor and privileges within the Jewish society. Consequently, the Sadducees were trying to stop the spreading belief of Jesus as the Messiah. The pericope transitions to the Apostle Peter’s defense by providing a witness to the Christ, who though he was accursed by his murder when he was hung on a tree, was raised by God to a position of exaltation as Prince and Savior to grant Israel repentance and forgiveness of sins. In their testimony, the apostles accused the Sanhedrin of being ungrateful to Israel’s Patron and Jesus his Broker Son. Consequently, not only was the apostles’ disobedience, but their accusatory testimony such an insult to the Sanhedrin’s honor that they almost killed the apostles if Gamaliel had not intervened. An ideological texture analysis of the pericope and complementary passages within the Book of Acts suggests that martyrriological leadership, as depicted in figure 1, is empowered by the Holy Spirit to enable the leader to obey the Holy Spirit prodding to boldly and courageously testify about what the risen Savior has done and can do using the Holy Spirit inspired wisdom and guidance. Although the secular authentic leadership theory was developed in response to the major ethical debacles at the beginning of the 21st Century, the results of this analysis suggests that the integration of authentic leadership principles within martyrriological leadership is essential. Since martyrriological leadership is dependent upon being empowered by the Holy Spirit, living an authentic Christ centered life based on biblically oriented ethical principles is essential to avoid grieving the Holy Spirit resulting in the disempowerment of the martyrriological leader. The creditability and effectiveness in influencing others through one’s testimony requires authenticity since the leader’s behavior must be consistent with their speech. Living an authentic life, that emanates from one’s core character that has been transformed by the infilling of the Holy Spirit and the renewal of one’s mind through the Word of God, enables the leader to display God’s agapao love to peers, employees, clients and customers. This ultimately provides opportunities to witness (martus) about the gospel of repentance, forgiveness and salvation by non-ecclesiastical authentic martyrriological leaders to a contemporary world that typically shuns religious establishments.
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Figure 1. Martyriological leadership model

Limitations

Even though a socio-rhetorical criticism was conducted on this pericope, it did not include an inner texture or sacred texture analysis. Although the analysis suggests that there are four martyriological leadership enabling behaviors, this list may not be complete since only this pericope was analyzed. This analysis included only examination of the martyriological related literature associated with the pericope. Although this analysis suggests that authentic leadership principles should be incorporated into the martyriological leadership paradigm, more analysis is required on the interrelationships between the authentic leadership principals and martyriological enabling behaviors.

Conclusion

The socio-rhetorical analysis highlighted that the impact of the social and cultural context, cultural references and oral-scribal recontextualization was significant on this pericope. It provided an understanding of the extensive resistance that the apostles received from the first century Judaic religious establishment which almost led to their early martyrdom. The interpretive context of the pericope revealed the Holy Spirit’s empowerment role within martyriological leadership and the existence of four possible enabling leadership behaviors. The results of the analysis also suggest that authentic leadership principles should be integrated into the martyriological leadership paradigm.

Based on the limitations of this study, more work is required to validate these recommendations. Specifically, an exhaustive literature review is required as well as a socio-rhetorical analysis of all of the martyriological leadership related biblical passages to identify not only any additional enabling leadership behaviors but their possible interrelationships and interdependencies. Furthermore, a detailed comparative analysis is required on the complete list of enabling martyriological leader behaviors with the authentic leadership principles required to generate a more comprehensive martyriological leadership model. Lastly, this model will require empirical research with both ecclesiastical and non-ecclesiastical Christian leaders to
validate the model’s accuracy and its ability to be practically applied.