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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to contribute to the limited body of research on the interactions between Jesus and individuals. The research was based upon 26 encounters between Jesus and individuals that are recorded in the synoptic gospels. A model based upon the characteristics of a facilitative counselor presented by Rogers (1961) and Carkhuff, Truax and Berenson (1967, 1977) was constructed and the encounters between Jesus and individuals were viewed in relation to this model.

Results obtained indicated that the characteristics of a counselor found in the model were generally present in Jesus' relationships with individuals, and that Jesus displayed counseling characteristics that were not found in the model. The summary indicates that, of the characteristics in the model, empathy, respect, warmth, non-evaluation, acceptance, concreteness, genuineness, self-disclosure and confronting were found to be recognizable in a majority of the encounters and these appear to be basic to Jesus' relationships with individuals. The counseling characteristics unique to Jesus were his availability, the depth of compassion evidenced in his relationships, his willingness to risk and his acceptance
of the reality of the community.

It is the view of the author that further research into this portion of the life of Jesus will yield significant understanding about Jesus and his relationship with individuals. This information and understanding will be important to pastors as they develop their personal patterns of counseling as well as to theological colleges whose task it is to train pastors for the parish ministry.

As a result of the study the author is convinced that there can be a unique dimension to counseling as practiced by the Christian pastor.
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Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

Background

The author was ordained a minister of the United Church of Canada twenty-eight years ago and has spent the years since as a pastor in rural Saskatchewan. Training for ordination contained little in the area of pastoral psychology; what was received was related to premarital counseling and working with families facing grief experiences.

This training seemed adequate at the time; however, as the years passed, other types of counseling became more common. Personal crises, emotionally disturbed children and family breakup were some of the areas that demanded more attention and time. Since trying to meet this need with little training brought forth a vivid feeling of inadequacy in the author, further training in psychology and increased counseling skills were sought.

This increased training helped. More competence in the counseling field was evident; but now there came a growing feeling of role confusion. What was the dimension of this confusion and what was its meaning?

In a typical grief situation the role of the minister is well known and accepted by the family, the minister and
the community. The family knows the minister will come to their home; the community, sharing in the family's sorrow, expects the minister to be there, and the minister, easily adjusting the schedule for the day, makes time for the call. The minister goes with almost no tools—no sense of being able to solve the problem or take away the sorrow. Instead he goes with full knowledge of personal inadequacy in the situation. The minister enters the home in a very personal way, being with the grieving family. In many instances the minister has been personally wounded by the loss of the parishioner and grieves along with the family. Belief and hope that the family will move through this time of grief is based not upon the strength or skill of the minister but upon the grace of God, the gift of life itself and its renewing and healing power.

But counseling is seen in a different light. The role of the minister is not as well defined in the mind of the person seeking help, nor in the community nor in the minister. Appointments are made at the convenience of the minister's schedule, and take place in the office rather than the person's home. The community is kept apart from the counseling session, not able to share the hurt or support the person; indeed in many situations the community is perceived as a burden or a threat. The minister approaches the counseling session with skills and insight
which have been acquired and thus both the client and the minister expect some positive results. Even though there will be some involvement between the minister and the client, there will be some distance, some separateness, a feeling of space between the minister and the person seeking help.

Does further training, which increases the minister's adequacy as a counselor move the minister further from the people and so destroy something basic to the minister-parishioner relationship? Does the expectation of success, of production, foster a greater desire for skill and training, and so push the minister further along this path of separation between people and pastor?

Purpose

The intention in this study was to build a model combining the characteristics of the counselor which are set forth by Carkhuff and Rogers and then to look at the encounters between Jesus and individuals which are recorded in the synoptic gospels to attempt to identify three things: similarities between the characteristics of Jesus as he related to individuals and those in a Carkhuff-Rogers model; characteristics in the model that are not found in the encounters between Jesus and individuals; and finally, characteristics of Jesus' encounters which were unique with
Him, and not found in the Carkhuff-Rogers model. It was anticipated that these findings would form a rudimentary frame of a model which parish ministers might have in mind as they carry out their tasks within a congregation and community and as they fashion an approach to counseling that is both "of Christ" and psychologically sound.

The view of man held by Rogers is that man has power to grow if the life situation is positive and expectant for growth.

First, inherent in the individual are the capacity to understand the factors in his life that cause him unhappiness and pain and the capacity to recognize his self-structure in such a way as to overcome these factors. Second, the individual's inherent power will operate if a congruent therapist can establish with him or her a relationship involving a depth of warm acceptance and understanding (Carkhuff and Berenson, 1977, p. 60).

The view of man taken by Carkhuff is that the person grows with help and helps others to grow.

Helping is about human growth, personal responsibility, learning, and skills. All these things do make a difference to the helpee and to the helper; they make a difference to all people (Carkhuff and Berenson, 1977 p. 237).

Jesus' view of man may differ from these views in its understanding of man's spiritual nature; yet there seems to be a commonality in all three views at the point of a person's power to grow toward wholeness, even though there may be differences in what constitutes wholeness.
The author acknowledges that there are a variety of concepts of the person of Jesus. No attempt is made in this study to set forth the various concepts or to outline once concept as basic to this study. Rather, the author hopes that persons will come to this study with their individual understanding of Jesus and let the encounters, individually and together, speak to them within their personal understanding of, and faith in, Jesus.

Rationale for the Study

For the Christian community Jesus is the model for action. The parish minister struggles to see his ministry with others in the light of the ministry of Jesus. To enable this to be as valid and as helpful as possible, a fuller understanding of Jesus' relationship with individuals is needed.

The question faced in this study was whether the role of a parish minister includes being a counselor with similar training and approach to that of any other counselor or whether the minister has a calling to develop a counseling approach which takes into account the values that are "of Christ" and unique to the Christian's lifestyle and system of belief. It was not the intention in this study to answer this question totally but rather to search the Scriptural record of encounters between Jesus
and individuals for therapeutic insights that might form a basis for an answer to the above question.

Model

Rogers, in an address to the American Personnel and Guidance Association at St. Louis in 1958, (1961, pp. 39-57) sets forth the characteristics of a helping relationship. He asked the question, "What are the characteristics of those relationships which do help, which do facilitate growth?" He cited a study by Baldwin in which an "acceptant-democratic" parental attitude toward children seemed to be most growth facilitating. Children in such a family relationship showed accelerated intellectual development, more originality, more emotional security and control and less excitability than children from other types of homes (Rogers, 1961, pp. 41-42). In a study by Whitehorn and Betz, physicians working with schizophrenic patients were observed. It was found that the helpful physicians primarily made use of active personal participation, tended not to give advice and were more likely to develop a relationship of trust and confidence with the patients than were the less helpful physicians (Rogers, 1961, pp. 42-43). Rogers noted Heine's study with persons who had gone to a variety of therapists for psychotherapeutic help. The clients reported changes in themselves regardless of
the type of therapy received, but they further indicated that trust, being understood, the feeling of independence and the clarity with which the therapist openly stated feelings which they were trying to verbalize, were the factors they found most helpful (Rogers, 1961, p. 43).

Other studies which emphasized the importance of a growing mutual liking and respect between client and therapist and of warm acceptance of the client in the relationship were also cited. Rogers used these studies as a basis, added his own years of experience in working with people, and set forth ten characteristics of a helping relationship (Rogers, 1961, pp. 50-55).

Truax and Carkhuff (1967) state that "research seems consistently to find empathy, warmth, and genuineness characteristics of human encounters that change people for the better" (p. 141). They set forth characteristics in addition to the above:

The growing body of converging evidence has important implications for our own personal conduct in human encounters whether we are functioning as a therapist, an educator, a parent or, more generally, as a person.

To be facilitative toward another human being requires us to be deeply sensitive to the moment-to-moment "being" of the other person and to grasp both the meaning and significance and the content of his experiences and feelings. To do this, requires that we, at least to a certain high degree, accept and nonpossessively prize this other person. Moreover, neither of these two facilitative conditions can be constructively meaningful in a human encounter unless
it is "real". Unless the parent or teacher is genuine in relating to a child, his warmth, caring and understanding have no meaning, or may even have a potentially threatening meaning. To be understood deeply or to receive a communication in a "warm" voice can be deeply threatening if it comes from an unpredictable "phony" or a potential enemy.

These findings might mean that we should aim at being what we are in our human encounters—that we would openly be the feelings and attitudes that we are experiencing. Most basically, this might mean coming into a direct personal encounter with a child or a patient or a spouse—a meeting on a person-to-person basis, which is often too rare.

These findings might also mean that to be therapeutic we should aim toward communicating in personal encounters an outgoing, positive warmth, communicated in a total, rather than a conditional, manner.

These research findings might also mean that we would move toward becoming listeners as well as talkers; we might aim toward developing both an ability to perceive sensitively and accurately the feelings and experiences and their meanings to another person, and an ability to communicate a greater degree of this understanding in a language consistent with his language. (Truax and Carkhuff, 1967, pp. 142-143)

The findings of the research of Truax and Carkhuff have been summarized in the four facilitative characteristics of empathy, respect, concreteness and genuineness, and the four active-orientated characteristics of self-disclosure, confrontation, immediacy, and self-exploration.

A composite model using the four facilitative counseling characteristics, empathy, respect, genuineness, and concreteness, and the four action-orientated counseling characteristics, self-disclosure, confrontation, immediacy,
and self-exploration which have been set forth by Truax (1967), Carkhuff and Berenson (1977) has been presented as Figure I. To these have been added the ten characteristics of a counselor in a helping relationship presented by Carl Rogers - namely confirming others, non-evaluation, non-threatening behavior, warmth, non-judgmental behavior, acceptance, trustworthiness, transparency and separateness for the counselor and separateness for the client. The encounters of Jesus with individuals have been viewed in relation to the counseling characteristics of this model. A detailed presentation of each of the characteristics of a counselor as set forth in this model are found in Appendix A.

The helping model was seen to have three areas; the helper's acceptance of the client, the positive approach of the helper to the helping relationship, and the challenging of the client. Each counseling characteristic as set forth by Carkhuff, Truax and Berenson (1967, 1977) and by Rogers (1961) was assessed as to whether it was of the accepting, acting or challenging area of counseling.
Figure I

Model of a Helping Relationship
Data

The author sought to make no distinction between counseling encounters and other encounters, but rather attempted to look at the encounters between Jesus and individuals through the model of a helping relationship. The three synoptic gospels, Matthew, Mark and Luke were chosen because of their historical orientation as contrasted to the interpretive focus of the Gospel of John. The difficulty in distinguishing between narrative and didactic material in the encounters recorded in John's gospel prohibited the using of that material in this study. Passages chosen for study were those which record encounters of Jesus with individuals within the three gospels and which have sufficient data to enable a study of the encounters to take place. The criteria for selection of accounts for study were that each passage chosen must contain at least a three fold exchange of conversation between Jesus and the individual and/or a detailed description of the encounter. If the encounter was found in more than one gospel, each reference was studied separately, but the report was based on findings and insights from a composite of the separate gospel accounts.

The New Testament quotations in this study are from the translation, Good News for Modern Man.

The following passages met the above criteria and therefore, were chosen for study.
Jesus heals a leper: Matthew 8: 1-4 
Mark 1: 40-44 
Luke 5: 12-16

Jesus and Zacchaeus: Luke 19: 1-10

Jesus and Blind Bartimaeus: Mark 10: 46-52 
Luke 18: 35-43

Jesus and the man from the tomb: Mark 5: 1-21 
Luke 8: 26-39

Jesus and Simon: Luke 7: 36-50

Jesus and the woman who anointed him: Luke 7: 36-50

Jesus and Peter—the denial: Matthew 26: 31-35 
Mark 14: 27-31 
Luke 22: 31-34

Jesus and Judas—the betrayal: Matthew 26: 48-50 
Mark 14: 45-46 

Jesus and the rich young man: Matthew 19: 16-22 
Mark 10: 17-22 
Luke 18: 18-23

Jesus and the teacher of the law: Matthew 22: 34-40 
Mark 12: 28-34 

Jesus and the father of the epileptic boy: Matthew 17: 14-18 
Mark 9: 14-28 

Jesus and the Canaanite woman: Matthew 15: 21-28 
Mark 7: 24-30

Jesus and the woman who touched his cloak: Matthew 9: 20-22 
Mark 5: 25-34 
Luke 8: 43-48
Jesus and the Jewish official:
Matthew 9: 18-19, 23-26
Mark 5: 22-24, 35-43
Luke 8: 40-42, 49-56

Jesus and Peter at Caesarea Philippi:
Matthew 16: 13-20
Mark 8: 27-29
Luke 9: 18-20

Jesus and the mother of James and John:
Matthew 20: 20-21

Jesus and Martha:
Luke 10: 40-42

Jesus and the widow of Nain:
Luke 7: 11-15

Jesus and Simon's mother-in-law:
Mark 1: 30-31

Jesus and the criminal:
Luke 23: 40-43

Jesus and Peter—on forgiveness:
Matthew 18: 21-22

Jesus and the deaf and dumb man:
Mark 7: 32-35

Jesus and Pilate:
Matthew 27: 11-14
Mark 15: 1-5

Jesus and John the Baptist:
Matthew 3: 13-15

Jesus and a Roman Officer:
Matthew 8: 5-13

Jesus and the High Priest:
Matthew 26: 62-64
Mark 14: 60-62

A summary of the insights gleaned from this study of the encounters between Jesus and individuals has been made in light of the model of characteristics of the counselor. This summary formed the basis for the development of a Christian approval to helping relationships for the parish minister.
Method

Each encounter was examined using a worksheet (Appendix B) as a pattern. If there was evidence of a characteristic in the encounter a note was made and the evidence listed. Evaluation was made as to whether the evidence concerning the characteristic was significant, recognizable, absent or negative. The nature of the reporting of the encounters in the synoptic gospels would seem to provide inadequate data for analyzing the levels of responses, forcing the researcher to depend almost completely upon the actions of Jesus and the individual for information concerning the nature of those interactions. An example is the encounter between Jesus and the man from the tomb (Mark 5: 1-21, Luke 8: 26-39).

Limitations

It is accepted that in the study of encounters recorded for a variety of purposes, one is not able to know what truly "happened" between the participants (Oglesby, 1969, p. 11-12). In the records of the encounters between Jesus and individuals, there are neither verbatim records nor full and detailed accounts of the interactions. Thus one cannot work in this area of study without the realization that it is impossible to know what truly "happened" between Jesus and individuals.
The author sought to view each encounter of Jesus with an individual separately, observed if any pattern of characteristics emerged when the encounters were viewed in summary, and searched for insights and clues that added to one's understanding of Jesus.

Hypotheses

In this study the author's hypothesis was that Jesus incorporated into his relationship with individuals the characteristics of the areas of accepting, acting and challenging which form our model. It was expected that Jesus' characteristics would be found to be especially strong in the area of accepting. It was expected that there would be discovered some characteristics of Jesus' relationship with individuals that are unique and not found in our model. This uniqueness may lie in the depth of the interactions between Jesus and others, or it may spring from a dimension not in the model. It was expected that this study would show that Jesus incorporated these characteristics in himself so deeply and fully that we would find it difficult to compare them in the usual manner.

An example of this may be self-disclosure. We may not find Jesus using self-disclosure in individual encounters; yet when we look at the total ministry of Jesus we may see evidence of a high level of self-disclosure.
For example, in parables such as the prodigal son or the lost coin, in sharing with his followers the experience in the Garden of Gethsemane and in the Cross itself there was much self-disclosure.

A study was done on the initiative of the late Dr. Harold P. Frederickson, who suggested that new perspectives on the Gospel narratives might be gained by a closer reading of the Gospels. This study involved an examination of the self-disclosure in the Gospel narratives, specifically in the context of the experience in the Garden of Gethsemane and in the Cross itself.

The study focused on the role of self-disclosure in the Gospel narratives, particularly in the context of the experience in the Garden of Gethsemane and in the Cross itself. It aimed to explore how the self-disclosure in the parables of the prodigal son and the lost coin, as well as in the experience in the Garden of Gethsemane and in the Cross itself, contributed to the development of new perspectives on the Gospel narratives.
Chapter 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

In a survey of the literature related to this study the author found a lack of material. Much has been written about the nature of pastoral ministry and about Christian counseling but nothing was found to relate directly to a study of the encounters of Jesus with individuals as seen in relation to a model formed from the characteristics of a counselor presented by Rogers and Carkhuff.

A study was done on the indices of the issues of Pastoral Psychology for each of the years 1966 - 1970, coinciding in time with the early years of Carkhuff's and Truax's work. These indices included titles of articles, authors, books reviewed and contributions to the reader's forum. There was found no mention of the Bible, any of the synoptic gospels, nor the names of Carkhuff or Truax. There was reference to two articles by Carl Rogers, neither having to do with the characteristics of a counselor.

In the five years of publications studied there was found only one article that touched on gospel incidents as a basis for counseling insights or understandings. An article titled "Prognostic Signs for the Pastoral Counselor from the Life of Christ" (p. 13-20) written by Powell suggests
examples of character traits in persons Jesus tells about which serve as suggestive material in determining the prognosis of persons either in, or contemplating, pastoral counseling. Among those, he lists the ability of a person to reach out as seen in the woman who touched his garment (Matthew 9:2f), the capacity of the person for relationship as seen in the Roman official's concern for his servant (Matthew 8:5f), and the ability of a person to look at himself in an objective sense as seen in the prayer of the tax collector in the parable of the Pharisee and the publican, "God, be merciful to me a sinner" (Luke 18:13). "In these concepts of self, I believe we have the basic questions regarding the person's success or failure in the process of pastoral counseling" (Powell, 1966, p. 20). These three abilities of a counselee, to reach out, the capacity for relationship and the ability to look at himself in an objective sense, are positive signs that the counselee is orientated toward growth. This article was primarily concerned with the counselee while the present study sought to look at the nature of the encounter between Jesus and the individual.

The author did a survey of the books in the general area of pastoral counseling and pastoral psychology. In two books by Hiltner (1958, 1959) no mention is made of
encounters in the gospels as a resource for understanding the counseling relationship. In one chapter in *Pastoral Counseling* (Hiltner 1959) speaks of the use of Scripture verses and Biblical ideas in the counseling interview but does not touch on insights discovered within the encounters of Jesus with individuals.

Oates has four books in this area (1951, 1953, 1970, 1974). Reference is made to the qualities of the inherently helpful person set forth by Truax and Mitchell (1974, p. 94-95), but there is no relating Jesus' encounters with individuals to the mentioned qualities. Chapter titles in *The Bible in Pastoral Care* (1953) illustrates the approach used: The Symbolic use of the Bible; The Bible in Pastoral Care of Children; The Bible as an Interpreter's Guidebook; The Bible as a Book of Comfort; The Bible as an Aid to Prayer. The Bible is seen as basic to pastoral care but no attempt is made to use the encounters between Jesus and individuals as foundations for the understanding of the relationship between a minister and his people.

Wise has a chapter titled "Counseling and the Christian Faith" (1951, pp. 142-167). He emphasizes the religious dimensions in the pastor-parishoner relation even when the external symbols such as scripture reading and prayer are not present. Jesus' relation to people is
mentioned but no systematic study of encounters between Jesus and individuals is made.

The New Shape of Pastoral Theology, which is edited by Oglesby, contains essays in honor of Seward Hiltner and covers the general area of pastoral theology. In an essay by LeRoy Aden, titled "Rogerian Therapy and Optimal Pastoral Counseling" (Oglesby, 1969, p. 263-272) there is a helpful discussion of three of Roger's therapeutic ingredients, empathic understanding, unconditional positive regard and congruence. Aden sets forth the way these three tend to actualize increased awareness, unconditional acceptance and unconditional trust and how this approach can become a helpful medium through which the individual is empowered to experience and accept God's gift of unconditional forgiveness. Aden believes that if a person receives understanding, positive regard and congruence from others then it will be easier for him to be open to receive the gift of grace from God. Yet this author did not explore Jesus' encounters with individuals as illustrations of this aspect of counseling. In none of the other essays in Johnson's book is there any reference to a study of the encounters of Jesus with individuals.

Clinebell (1966) speaks of a number of the characteristics of a counselor which are part of the model within this study, but he makes no reference to the encounters
of Jesus with individuals as being illustrative of pastoral counseling understanding or skills.

In his book *Kerygma and Counseling* (1966) Oden explores an area which is parallel to this study. He states that "Our project focuses upon an exploration of the relation between a psychotherapy of human self-disclosure and a theology of God's self-disclosure" (Oden, 1966, p. 9). He narrows his field of study by paying particular attention to the theology of Karl Barth and the Psychotherapy of Carl Rogers; "There is a sense in which my whole effort is an attempt to show the hidden similarities, despite basic differences, between a Barthian theology of divine self-disclosure and a Rogerian therapy of human self-disclosure" (Oden, 1966, p. 10). He sees in God's self-disclosure of Himself in Christ a model in which therapeutic counseling can take place. "First we come to know the healing action of God in the Christ event; then, having learned the character of authentic healing, we may perceive psychotherapeutic healing as analogous to the healing action of God (Oden, 1966, p. 17). Oden moves from the divine revelations of God in Christ to the parallel human self-disclosure in the counseling session and although he does not focus upon the interpersonal encounters of Jesus with individuals, the fact that disclosing is seen as a God-act as well as a human act is significant to this study."
In commentaries on the synoptic gospels such as those used in this study (Barclay, 1960, Fenton, 1963, Caird, 1963, Nineham, 1963, Interpreter's Bible, 7, 8, 1951, 1953), there are many references to Jesus' relations with individuals. In Barclay's commentaries, these are often from a psychological perspective. In none of the commentaries used or reviewed in this study are the encounters of Jesus with individuals seen in relation to a model of counseling characteristics.

Although there is much written in the broad areas of Jesus' relations to individuals and the use of Christian principles in counseling, the author could find no literature relating directly to a study of the encounters of Jesus with individuals as seen in relation to a model of counseling characteristics. It was hoped that this study would stimulate further research in this area.
Chapter 3

ENCOUNTERS

In the study of the encounters each element of conversation and action was viewed as to its verbal and non-verbal messages. If a characteristic of the model was seen to be present in the encounter this was mentioned and illustrated from the text. Background information relevant to understanding detail of the encounter was given and elements of the relationship between Jesus and the individual evident in the encounters but not included in the model are listed. Each encounter was studied separately and a summary of the findings in each of the encounters was given.

With a Leper

The material about Jesus with a leper is found in Matthew 8: 1-4, Mark 1: 40-44, and Luke 5: 12-16.

Respect

Jesus showed respect for the leper as he broke through the barriers that separated the leper from his community. "Respect appears to shatter the isolation of the individual and to establish a basis for empathy" (Carkhuff and Berenson, 1977, p. 10). Jesus did not withdraw from the leper; rather he focused his attention upon him, listened
to his request and responded in both word and deed. The leper had doubts as to his own worth, wondering if Jesus would think it worthwhile to be bothered with him, "Sir, if you want to . . ." (Matthew 8: 2), but Jesus responded immediately to him.

Acceptance

Jesus' acceptance of the man enabled him to approach Jesus without fear or hesitation. This man endured "complete segregation" (Nineham, 1963, p. 85) and was forced to call "unclean, unclean" in order that no one need come closer than six feet. He had to live outside the city (Leviticus 13: 45), excluded from its social and religious life, as well as being completely unprotected and vulnerable to attack from enemies or bands of robbers. Here the leper felt so accepted that he "came to Jesus, knelt down and begged him for help" (Mark 1: 40).

The touch deeply symbolized his acceptance, breaking through the laws of uncleanness, and accepting the man as part of the community. The broken skin of many lepers would make them abhorant to the touch of most. In Jesus' day a leper was not only barred from the synagogue (Nineham, 1963, p. 86), but a generally accepted belief that illness was punishment for sin barred the man from feeling accepted by God. Because he felt separated from the community and God the touch of Jesus was a significant act of acceptance.
Non-Evaluation

Jesus accepted this man without evaluation or judgment as to his past or to the promise of his commitment in the future. A man carried heavy burdens in his daily life; Jesus had a gift to give and that gift was shared.

Genuineness and Self-Disclosure

All through this encounter there is one goal—the wholeness of the leper, physical, social and spiritual. "Sir, if you want to, you can make me clean." Jesus reached out and touched him. "I do want to," he answered, "Be clean!" (Matthew 8:2-3).

Mark's record of this encounter has Jesus expressing anger (Mark 1:41) at the forces of evil that so deformed, segregated and confined people; and with a "wave of emotion" (Nineham, 1963, p. 86) he sends the leper away to the ritual of cleansing in order that it would be known that he was ceremonially clean and so accepted again into the worship and social life of the community.

Jesus' words and actions are congruent; he responded to the man's urgency with his own immediate response, "go straight to the priest; ... offer the sacrifice ... to prove to everyone that you are now clean" (Matthew 8:4).

Beyond the Model

To touch a leper would have seemed at the time an
unthinkable action; even if it did not actually violate the law, it brought ceremonial defilement, quite apart from the loathsome appearance of leprosy. Montefiore writes:

Here we begin to catch a new note in the ministry of Jesus; his intense compassion for the outcast, the sufferer, who, by his sin, or by his suffering, which was too often regarded as the result of sin, had put himself outside respectable Jewish society, who found himself rejected and despised by man and believed himself despised and rejected by God. Here was a new and lofty note, a new and exquisite manifestation of the very pity and love the prophets had demanded (Nineham, 1963, pp. 87, 88).

With Zacchaeus

The material about Jesus with Zacchaeus is found in Luke 19: 1-10.

Empathy

Jesus was immediately sensitive to the position of Zacchaeus in the society. Zacchaeus' occupation separated him from the ordinary life of the community, "He belonged to a calling which automatically carried with it popular detestation and social ostracism" (Caird, 1963, p. 207). For a man of his position to climb a tree (Luke 19: 4) in order to see beyond the crowd indicates that he was earnest in his search for answers to some deep and personal questions. Jesus was empathetic toward Zacchaeus and responded to his longing by declaring to him and to the crowd "I must stay in your house today" (Luke 19: 5). The
physical closeness of Jesus spoke a non-verbal message of empathy: "I am with you."

Warmth

The warmth of Jesus toward Zacchaeus is indicated in the joyous welcome extended to Jesus by Zacchaeus, "Zacchaeus hurried down and welcomed him with great joy" (Luke 19: 6). For a man who had experienced so much hostility, this warmth would be startling as well as freeing.

Accepting and Non-evaluation

The acceptance of Zacchaeus by Jesus is non-judgmental and complete. He entered into Zacchaeus' house (Luke 19: 5) accepting him as a person, claiming a closeness that the law of hospitality declared (Hastings, 1909, p. 366). Even though Jesus knew the reputation of tax collectors, and that the crowd labeled Zacchaeus as a sinner (Luke 19: 7), Jesus accepted him, "I must stay at your house"(Luke 19: 5), and brought no measure of evaluation into the encounter.

This non-judging, non-labeling acceptance of Zacchaeus by Jesus gave him the freedom to step out of the role in which he was cast to self-explore as to what the future might be.

Confirming Others

Jesus confirmed Zacchaeus as worthy when he declared
"Salvation has come to this house today; this man also is a descendent of Abraham" (Luke 19:9). His neighbors may have acted as if he was not one of them, but Jesus' announcement of his inclusion, of his salvation, is an act of confirming.

**Permitting Separateness**

Zacchaeus felt accepted and confirmed as a person of worth and thus he was free to be himself. The "Listen, Sir!" (Luke 19:8) indicated that his desire to rectify any wrong that he had done and to contribute to the needs of the poor, was his own choice, not a result of pressure applied by Jesus over lunch; "I will give . . . and if I have cheated . . . I will pay" (Luke 19:8).

**Concreteness**

Jesus' response was concrete and left no room for ambiguity. "I must stay at your house today" (Luke 19:5). When Jesus proclaimed, "Salvation has come to this house today; this man also is a descendent of Abraham" (Luke 19:9) the crowd knew for sure that Jesus had accepted him as a "true son of Abraham and an heir to the promises of God" (Caird, 1963, p. 208).

**Self-Disclosure**

When Jesus looked at Zacchaeus in the tree, understanding his position in society and feeling the hostility
of the crowd toward Zacchaeus, he declared "Hurry down, Zacchaeus, for I must stay in your house today" (Luke 19: 5). In that declaration he disclosed to Zacchaeus and to the crowd that he did not accept the evaluation of society toward people; he cared for all people. This disclosure on a public thoroughfare, in the midst of a crowd was both verbal and non-verbal. At the end of the encounter he declared the purpose of his being: "The Son of Man came to seek and to save the lost" (Luke 19: 10). There is no doubt that Zacchaeus and the crowd knew Jesus to be one who cared for the people whom society had cast aside.

**Immediacy**

Jesus recognized in Zacchaeus a feeling that the moment was important for him, his attention was focused on that moment, and Jesus responded, "Hurry down . . . today." There is an excitement with the immediate, a challenge that is to be faced in the present moment.

**Beyond the Model**

Jesus entered into the ordinary life pattern of the people; he went to where they were, walked their roads, ate their food, shared their frustrations and expected nothing special, other than what they knew.

Jesus used Zacchaeus' life situation. His daily experiences, his place in the community and his home were
not stripped away in the encounter but became the arena in which a new life-style could be worked out.

Jesus self-disclosed to a level that is not recognized in our model. He made himself totally vulnerable to the whole of society when he broke all traditions that separated Zacchaeus from the community by receiving hospitality in his home. This was not a disclosure of an idea but of his total life.

When Jesus invited himself to Zacchaeus' house he put the initiative upon Zacchaeus, placing himself in the role of a guest and Zacchaeus in the role of a host. Zacchaeus had to respond either with hesitation, formality and embarrassment or with joy, thankfulness and a change of heart. This act of placing oneself in the other's debt is beyond the model.

In self-disclosing, Jesus took upon himself the hostility of the crowd which had been directed toward Zacchaeus. All the people who saw it started grumbling "... this man has gone as a guest to the home of a sinner" (Luke 19: 7), and, even though he does not justify that hostility, he accepts it. In taking this burden of hostility upon himself, Jesus freed Zaccaeus to proclaim a new life style with joy and courage.

With Blind Bartimaeus

The material about Jesus with Blind Bartimaeus is

Warmth

Bartimaeus must have felt the warmth of Jesus in this encounter; the evidence for this is the fact that his call got louder as Jesus came closer "Many ... told him to be quiet. But he shouted even more loudly" (Mark 10: 48) (Bruce, 1912, p. 603). We see other evidence in the request that Bartimaeus be called (Mark 10: 47), and in the running of the blind man, following his ear, to Jesus. There is no evidence of fear or hesitancy on the part of Bartimaeus indicating that he felt free to come closer.

Non-evaluation

There were no judgmental responses by Jesus to the man's request for sight. Bartimaeus made reference to his need for mercy (Mark 10: 47) but Jesus asked no question about his righteousness nor extracted any promises about his future.

Confirming Others

Bartimaeus was confirmed as a person as Jesus accepted him in the present and recognized his future potential. Jesus never asked about the man's past or how he had become blind, but simply: "What do you want me to do for you?" (Mark 10: 51), that is, do you want alms in order to continue
in the old pattern or do you want the gift of life? and with the request for sight the word was Go (Mark 10:52). Jesus had no indication what the man would use his new life for, but Jesus confirmed him with respect and trust by his word Go.

Permitting Separateness

Jesus permitted Bartimaeus to experience separateness. From the initial calling by Bartimaeus, a calling that would not be quieted, to the question by Jesus, "What do you want me to do for you?" (Mark 10:51), to the command Go (Mark 10:52), the initiative is left with Bartimaeus. There is no attempt to make Bartimaeus dependent.

Genuineness

Jesus turned from the crowd and his disciples to focus upon the quest of the man. "What do you want me to do for you?" (Mark 10:51) was an authentic question by Jesus, and that genuineness enabled the man to respond with just as clear and concise a response: "I want to see again" (Mark 10:51).

Confrontation

Jesus confronted the blind man with the need to be articulate in what he desired, "What do you want?" (Mark 10:51). The man's persistence in calling out was, to Jesus, an indication of his faith, but Jesus insisted on
bringing that faith to articulate expression; "... he will not bestow healing on a beggar who, in reality, was interested only in alms" (Caird, 1963, p. 207).

**Beyond the Model**

Jesus' sense of the unity of the person is beyond the model. The healing of blind eyes was related to faith in self and in God, and all of this was related to the lifestyle of the person in his daily existence. Jesus encountered the whole person.

**With a Man from the Tombs**

The material about Jesus with a man from the tombs is found in Mark 5: 1-21 and Luke 8: 26-39.

**Empathy**

The empathy of Jesus for the man is evident in his willingness to be with him, and the evidence continues as Jesus and the man, now calm and well, were together meeting the people who had gathered from the area (Mark 5: 15) and who had known the man when he was uncontrollable (Mark 5: 3).

**Respect**

Jesus asked for the man's name, implying a willingness to be involved with him as a person and a desire to facilitate the finding of an identity. Respect is also conveyed by Jesus as he found clothes, in all probability
from himself and the disciples, for this man who previously would not wear clothes (Luke 8: 27).

Non-evaluation

The calmness of this man witnessed to the non-judgmental relationship that existed between Jesus and himself. There is no evidence of Jesus evaluating the man's past or his present situation; the man thus was able to be peaceful, confirmed as a person with both present worth and future potential.

Confirming Others

The significant incident which indicates that this man was confirmed as a person is that Jesus went to where the man lived his life. We are given no reason why it was important for Jesus to go there; there were many other people and places, other than this gentile maniac who lived in the place of the dead (Interpreter's Bible, 1951, p. 712) who would gladly have welcomed Jesus. But he went to where the man was and risked being hurt by his uncontrollable behavior (Bruce, 1912, p. 371). In his going to him, Jesus confirmed him as a person even though he was possessed and even though society had no way to control him (Mark 5: 4).

The man was so confirmed by Jesus that he begged to go with him. Jesus' response to that request was to give the man responsibility, again confirming him as a person of
worth (Mark 5: 19).

**Confrontation**

Jesus did not permit the man to become dependent upon him; rather he confronted him with his own separateness and the necessity to work out his own pattern of life (Mark 5: 19-20). The culmination of this confirming and confronting of the man by Jesus is recorded at the end of the encounter, "So the man left and went all through the ten towns telling what Jesus had done for him, and all who heard it were filled with wonder" (Mark 5: 20).

**Beyond the Model**

The factor of physical risk accepted by Jesus in coming close to this man is not contained in the model, and yet the part it played was significant.

**With Simon the Pharisee**

The material about Jesus with Simon the Pharisee is found in Luke 7: 36-50.

**Respect and Accepting**

Jesus openly accepted Simon by receiving the invitation to dinner with graciousness. Even though Simon did not perform the usual acts of a host which consisted of the provision of a special garment for the guest, a kiss of welcome, the washing of feet, and the anointing of head
and feet with oil (Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, 2, 1962, p. 316), acts which symbolize the interdependence of life (Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, 2, 1962, p. 654), Jesus sat at his table, shared his food and accepted the closeness that hospitality implied. "In its simplest aspect, hospitality is the reception of the wayfarer as an honoured guest, providing shelter and food. When he has eaten of the host's bread, the two are at once bound as brothers for mutual help and protection" (Hastings, 1909, p. 366).

Confirming Others

Jesus confirmed Simon as a man who could grow and change. He saw potential in Simon, evidenced by his accepting the invitation to dinner, and by seeking to share a deep truth with him (Luke 7: 40). Simon's faith was narrowed to keeping the laws; obeying the law rather than love was the criterion of success (Hastings, 1909, p. 720). Jesus desired that Simon see the woman as a child of God worthy of love and being loved, and then as a sinner in need of forgiveness.

Concreteness

The responses of Jesus were concrete and specific. After the parable (Luke 7: 41-43) Jesus said to Simon, "Do you see this woman?" (Luke 7: 44), not letting him
become engaged in an abstract debate about the merits of love but focusing upon the woman who was in their midst. Jesus further listed the specific duties of a host, which Simon knew, and with the very explicitness of his words, forced attention upon the life-aspect of the situation.

**Confrontation**

When Simon showed his displeasure at Jesus being anointed by the woman (Luke 7:39), Jesus quietly led him into confrontation (Luke 7:44) and self exploration (Luke 7:44-46). Jesus confronted the reality of Simon's assessment of the woman (Bruce, 1912, p. 516) and challenged him to truly see her as a person (Luke 7:44). Jesus believed that Simon had capacity to change and grow.

**Self-Exploration**

Jesus' warm acceptance of Simon and of the woman was an invitation to Simon to self-explore, to explore why he omitted the acts of hospitality, the nature of his life as a child of God, the boundaries of his own love, and his eager willingness to judge others.

**Beyond the Model**

The encounter with Simon took place in the midst of others — people who came to listen to the dinner conversation (Caird, 1963, p. 114), as well as the other guests at the table (Luke 7:49), and Jesus, in accepting
this invitation, and in not reacting to the lack of social amenities, made himself vulnerable to misinterpretation and opposition.

With the Woman who Anointed Him

The material about Jesus and the woman who anointed him is found in Luke 7: 36-50.

Respect

The woman must have felt fully respected by Jesus to be able to give so much of herself and her substance without hesitation or lingering doubt. This respect by Jesus overcame the hostility and evil judgment that others had directed toward her (Luke 7: 39), enabling her to give freely and fully of herself.

Accepting

This woman must have felt unconditional acceptance by Jesus prior to this incident to feel freed to come to him while he was at the banquet. The acceptance of the woman by Jesus was complete in that she held nothing back, giving her tears, accepting the embarrassment of letting her hair down "forgetting that this was something a decent woman never did in public" (Caird, 1963, p. 114), using expensive ointment (Arndt, 1956, p. 220) to anoint his feet. Jesus accepted her gifts, her total self in contrast to so many who desired her body and rejected her person. The
woman was labeled as a sinner (Luke 7: 39) but Jesus removed the label, saying to the woman, "Your sins are forgiven" (Luke 7: 48).

Confirming Others

The non-verbal communication between Jesus and the woman before and during the banquet, climaxed in Jesus receiving in public the ministrations of an unacceptable person, spoke eloquently of the confirming of the woman by Jesus. Jesus not only accepted the tears, wiping, kissing and anointing of the woman but he also reinforced his confirmation of her by using her love as an illustration to Simon, and commending her acts as a direction toward forgiveness. The woman, being confirmed as a person, was enabled to accept forgiveness (Luke 7: 48). Thus the challenge to "go in peace" (Luke 7: 50) was not an empty nor a mocking word.

Concreteness

There is concreteness shown by Jesus in the direct way he responded to the woman; "Your sins are forgiven" (Luke 7: 48) and when others began to grumble he said to the woman "Your faith has saved you; go in peace" (Luke 7: 50).

Genuineness

In this encounter Jesus did not attempt to cover
over what was happening and there was no embarrassment in
the fact that the woman was at his feet, kissing them;
indeed, he accepted her act of devotion, not needing to
look around or stare at her (Luke 7: 44). What the woman
felt at the very beginning, which enabled her to approach
Jesus, his continual acceptance of her in the face of the
obvious judgmental and condescending attitude of Simon,
the warmth with which Jesus used the example of her love in
the lesson following the parable, and the gentle loving
words at the end of the encounter indicate that the one
message of acceptance of the woman was in every part of
the relationship. His attitude, word, and actions spoke
the same message and the woman received it without mis-
understanding.

Self-Disclosure

The very fact that Jesus was willing to permit the
woman to approach, touch and anoint him was a significant
act of self disclosure. Whether Simon was able to accept
the message or not, Jesus declared to him and to all
others present that his love and care extended to all,
that barriers of society must not break the bonds of love
between people.

Beyond the Model

Self disclosing that made him vulnerable to attack
from authorities and others is beyond the scope of the model. He made no attempt to explain the relationship with the woman. The people could think what they would, but he would not hide or keep any secrets.

Forgiveness in the depth that Jesus proclaimed it is beyond the model. The model provides freedom from guilt by a non-judgmental, accepting and confirming attitude being communicated to the client. Jesus' forgiveness is of a different dimension. It relates to the creation of the person and the worth of that person before God.

With Peter--Denial

The material about Jesus with Peter at the time of the denial is found in Matthew 26: 31-35, Mark 14: 27-31 and Luke 22: 31-34.

Accepting

Jesus' acceptance of Peter was complete and lasting; it held in the face of Peter's two-fold promise to be faithful (Matthew 26: 34). This acceptance by Jesus was maintained in spite of his own loneliness (Mark 14: 27). Jesus accepted Peter as he was and gave no hint of moving away or turning aside from him. Jesus did not mock him for his empty promises, nor was he cynical at his hasty promise to die. It was this acceptance of Peter by Jesus that enabled Peter to speak what was in his heart, even
though his courage did not match his words.

Concreteness and Confrontation

Jesus was concrete in this encounter; there was no ambiguity in his responses. Peter knew what Jesus said and reacted to that. Jesus gave exact specifications to make the statement more impressive (Bruce, 1912, p. 438); "Before the rooster crows two times tonight you will say three times that you do not know me" (Mark 14: 30). This explicitness prepared Peter, in some measure, for confrontation at the time of denial of his Lord. Jesus sensed in Peter the unreality of professed outward strength and hidden inner weakness and confronted him at that point.

Genuineness and Self-Disclosure

Jesus stated simply that Peter would deny him. It is not a judgmental statement (Bruce, 1912, p. 438) but a simple explanation of fact. Jesus saw Peter's potential for the future and did not cast him aside for his unfaithfulness; rather he stated his dependence upon Peter and need of him: "And when you turn back to me, you must strengthen your brothers" (Luke 22: 32). Jesus did not attempt to possess Peter but rather gave him freedom to return and a purpose for the future. Jesus disclosed his own loneliness; "You will say that you do not know me" (Mark 14: 30), to which Peter responded with the most
genuine response of which he was capable.

Beyond the Model

The factor here that is beyond the model is that the encounter is relating to life and death situations, for both of them, but especially for Jesus.

With Judas


Accepting

There was no drawing away from Judas, no raising of barriers, physical or psychological, and even though Judas felt that Jesus might react with force to prevent his arrest evidenced by Judas coming with a crowd (Luke 22: 47), there is evidence only of the acceptance of Judas by Jesus.

Permitting Separateness

Jesus permitted Judas to be who he was. No attempt was made to dominate, to judge or to evaluate Judas. Jesus did not draw on past association or relationship to remind Judas of the frame in which the betrayal was taking place. The use of Judas' name by Jesus and the gentleness of Jesus' reaction and response speak of Jesus permitting Judas to act as he would.
Concreteness

Jesus' response was concrete, specific and to the point; "Is it with a kiss, Judas, that you betray?" (Luke 22: 48) "Be quick about it friend" (Matthew 26: 50). Jesus displayed no pretense or mock surprise, just a recognition that betrayal was being signaled by a kiss. After the kiss, Jesus kept Judas to the point "Be quick about it, Friend" (Matthew 26: 50), not letting Judas raise false hopes by delaying or making it more difficult by continuing conversation. There is a definite possibility that the word used in Matthew 26: 49 kissed him is different than used in verse 48, and means kissed him repeatedly (Fenton, 1963, p. 425).

Confrontation

The kiss that signaled the betrayal became also the symbol of the confrontation of Judas. This gesture "was common between rabbis and their disciples" (Nineham, 1963, p. 395). As Judas used the kiss as a sign for Jesus' arrest, Jesus used the kiss to initiate confrontation "Is it with a kiss, Judas . . ." (Luke 22: 48)? It is as if Jesus was saying, Do what you must do, Judas, but a symbol of affection continues to challenge longer than the act itself. Thus the previous associations, the arrangements by Judas, the tenderness and caring for each other are all focused in the kiss, and the confrontation
of Judas is here as well; "Is it with a kiss, Judas . . .?" (Luke 22: 48).

Beyond the Model

The personal association existed between Jesus and Judas, an association that had elements of friendship, teacher-disciple relationship, and some measure of believer and focus of belief, is beyond the model.

With the Rich Young Man

The material about Jesus with the rich young man is found in Matthew 19: 16-22, Mark 10: 17-22 and Luke 18: 18-23.

Respect

The respect which Jesus showed toward the rich young man was indicated in the fact that even though the encounter began with an empty compliment which Jesus did not accept but turned it into reality testing with his counter question (Mark 10: 17-18), Jesus accepted the man's question with seriousness. Jesus engaged in the encounter at the point where the young man stood, "What good things must I do to receive eternal life?" to which Jesus replied "Keep the commandments" (Matthew 19: 16-17). The man saw religion as doing; Jesus' respect for him was such that he was willing to stay in his area of understanding as long as was needed. Jesus continued to move with the young
man as far as he would go and did not disengage till he would go no further. There is no mark of evaluation or judgment in this encounter, simply a shared sadness (Bruce, 1912, p. 250), in the young man because he was not able to do the one thing needed (Mark 10: 21), and in Jesus because the other had such diligence in faith (Mark 10: 20, 21).

**Warmth**

Warmth was expressed by Jesus. In Mark's account (10: 21) it is said that Jesus looked at him with love. Nineham (1963, p. 274-275) indicates the word "love" carries with it a gesture to emphasize closeness, a caring such as putting your arm around the other.

**Concreteness**

Jesus was explicit in the whole encounter. He answered the questions the young man asked and did not reply in generalities but focused his whole attention on the man. "It is subjective counsel and relative to the individual" (Bruce, 1912, p. 250). Jesus spoke a word that needed to be said if the young man was going to reach the goal indicated in his question; "What else do I need to do?" Jesus said to him, "If you want to be perfect go and sell, ... give ... and come and follow me" (Matthew 19: 20-21).

The action implied in the use of the word "love"
(Mark 10: 21) (Nineham, 1963, p. 274-5), putting your arm around the other, is a concrete action.

Confronting

The young man was led in this encounter to the area of challenge, confrontation and self-exploration. He was respected, supported, confirmed as a person, and thus freed to explore himself, to abandon roles and to change. The young man got the message, for he went away sorrowing (Mark 10: 22) not angry nor contemptuous nor afraid, but sorrowing in that he was unable to meet the challenge.

Beyond the Model

Jesus and the young man believed that eternal life was a valid dimension of life--to seek it is a life giving quest and to loose it is to die in the deepest sense. The challenge was to live in the reality of a culture which makes little of wealth and power and much of love and compassion.

With the Teacher of the Law


Respect

Even though he knew that the question was part of a
trap (Matthew 22: 34), respect was shown by Jesus for he took the teacher and his question seriously. Jesus could have encountered the man at the point of the trap, arguing its merits or the reason for it being set or he could have walked away, refusing to be caught, waiting until the young man returned with a more honest approach. But Jesus allowed himself to answer the trap question, becoming vulnerable and unprotected by his forthright answers, and in doing so went beyond the trap to encounter the teacher at the point of his seeking.

Warmth

Evidence of Jesus' warmth toward the man is seen in the final word of the encounter: "You are not far from the Kingdom of God" (Mark 12: 34). Warmth was responded to by the Teacher as he spoke words of closeness, "Well done Teacher! It is true as you say" (Mark 12: 32).

Non-evaluation

In spite of the attempt to trap Jesus, we see no indication of Jesus judging or evaluating the Teacher even though the teacher evaluated him (Mark 12: 32). It may have been this factor that enabled the teacher to move beyond the initial purpose of the encounter and experience it as a genuine search for truth and understanding.
Concreteness and Self-Disclosure

Jesus was concrete in his statements of the law. Everyone knew the law; what they wanted was to hear Jesus declare his priorities. He was explicit at this point: "This is the most important one. The second most important commandment is this." "There is no other commandment more important than these two" (Mark 12: 29-32).

This act of self-disclosure was performed openly in the presence of the Pharisees and, in Mark's account (12: 32-33), it enabled the questioner to declare his own statement of faith concerning the centrality of the law.

To see this concreteness in its full light one must compare Jesus' statements with the endless discussions that took place in his day about the law or with some of the speeches of some politicians of our own day.

Confrontation

The confrontation in the encounter was the answer to the questions. Jesus knew that if a question is asked, the answer must be considered and he let the answers do the confronting.

Beyond the Model

Beyond the model there is acceptance here of reality, and the reality is in the realm of God-man and man-man relationships. There is the assumption that man must live
with that reality.

With a Boy's Father

The material about Jesus and a boy's father is found in Matthew 17: 14-18, Mark 9: 14-27 and Luke 9: 37-43.

Empathy

The father was struggling with his fear because of his son's illness and because he believed that his own faith would prove to be inadequate. Jesus listened and did not withdraw as the father told of his plight and felt with the father that "A whole world of disbelief stands in the way of the boy's restoration" (Interpreter's Bible, 1951, 7, p. 781). Jesus expressed his empathy in the lament: "How unbelieving you people are! How long must I stay with you? How long do I have to put up with you?" (Mark 9: 19) (Nineham, 1963, p. 243). Here Jesus, like the man, was disappointed that the disciples were not able to heal the child.

Warmth and Acceptance

The warmth and acceptance of Jesus was expressed in the words "Bring the boy to me" "How long has he been like this?" and "Jesus took the boy by the hand and helped him rise" (Mark 9: 19, 21, 27). Evidence of the father's feeling of acceptance and warmth is noted in that he twice told the story of his son's illness (Mark 9: 17-18, 22) with
increasing intensity and he felt free to express his fear that his own faith would not be sufficient for his earnest request (Mark 9: 24).

Non-evaluation

Jesus accepted the man without judgment or question; "Bring the boy to me" (Mark 9: 19). The statements "Yes ... if you can! Everything is possible for the person who has faith" (Mark 9: 23) is not a statement of judgment but rather an acceptance of what faith he had and an invitation to more.

Genuineness

The genuineness of Jesus' concern for the father and his son was evident. There was no double message, no ambiguity, no changing the subject. Jesus' concern for the boy, cutting through the disbelief of the community (Mark 9: 19), the struggle for faith by the father (Mark 9: 24), the curiosity of the crowd (Mark 9: 24), and the power of the evil spirit (Mark 9: 26), reached out to touch the boy and help him up.

Self-Disclosure

In this continuous concern for father and son, Jesus self-disclosed the depth of his own caring for the bound and hurt. There was no mistaking that Jesus was one who cared.
Confrontation and Self-Exploration

The depth of Jesus' concern for the boy enabled the father both to accept the confrontation by Jesus, "Everything is possible for the person who has faith" (Mark 9: 23), and to recognize his own lack of faith, "I do have faith, but not enough. Help me" (Matthew 9: 24). The father sensed in Jesus one who challenged him to grow in faith and who could facilitate growth.

With the Canaanite Woman

The material about Jesus with the Canaanite woman is found in Matthew 15: 21-28 and Mark 7: 24-30.

Non-threatening

The woman showed no fear of Jesus. Jesus had gone into a house, indicating that he wanted to be alone. She came into the house and made a request for help, but it was passed over. She came closer and made her request a second time, but again it was rebuffed. Then once again she requested healing for her daughter. She sensed, whether from previous encounters or from this one that she need not be afraid; with Jesus she could be fully herself.

Warmth

The gospel record seems to indicate a double message given by Jesus, a message of the priority of his ministry
to the Jews (Matthew 15: 24-26), and a message of concern and approachableness. The first message seems emphasized in the record, but the second message is the one the woman reads. The disciples wanted Jesus to send her away (Matthew 15: 22), perhaps wanting Jesus to do what she asked and get rid of her (Fenton, 1963, p. 255). Jesus did not do this but rather answered the disciples that his ministry was to the "lost sheep of the house of Israel" (Matthew 15: 24). Even in this word she sensed concern and warmth for she came closer (Matthew 15: 25) and made her request a second time.

**Concreteness**

Jesus was explicit and specific as he spoke about the priorities of his ministry (Mark 7: 27). The woman understood and showed no surprise but continued to set forth her own concern in very concrete responses.

**Confrontation**

The Jew-Gentile division was a barrier between the woman and Jesus. She came as if that barrier were nothing between them, but Jesus did not heal her daughter till she had expressed her faith in such a way that the barrier was truly bridged. In this confrontation Jesus used the insult of the day, calling Gentiles dogs (Matthew 15: 26). Her response was to focus on his gift and her concern.
She would not let anything deter her from her mission, and even though she was confronted by the depth and immensity of the barrier she responded to Jesus with warmth and at least a touch of humor.

This encounter took place in a house (Mark 7: 24); thus the reference to "dogs" and "children" came out of a home situation. Animals were allowed in homes as a regular practise (Heaton, 1956, p. 71), and yet it was not the usual practice to have dogs in the house but only puppies as play things for the children (Bouquet, 1953, p. 143). If the actual scene in that house suggested this interplay, then the response of the woman in not taking the insulting word dogs to heart, and her courage in responding with faith can be understood. When Jesus saw that her faith in him was so great that it bridged the confining Gentile-Jew division, he exploded with joy (Interpreter's Bible, 1951, 2, p. 441) and declared: "You are a woman of great faith" (Matthew 15: 28).

Beyond the Model

The Jew-Gentile division placed great burden on this encounter, holding Jesus and the woman apart till faith and concern became so strong as to overcome all division.

With the Woman who Touched Him

The material about Jesus with the woman who touched

**Confirming Others**

Jesus confirmed the woman in that he would not disengage the encounter until she had experienced full healing and peace. The woman suffered from "severe bleeding for twelve years" (Matthew 9:20) and this made her permanently unclean (Caird, 1963, p. 124), and incapable of becoming pregnant. A woman's ordinary menstruation resulted in a temporary state of uncleanness, but a continuous flow, menorrhagia (Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, 11, 1962, p. 499), resulted in the woman being continually classified as unclean and unfit for human contact. "A woman's menstrual flow . . . was a potent source of uncleanness. It produced an impurity of seven days duration in the woman . . . more serious than menstrual impurity was a persistent discharge of blood from a woman" (Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, 1, 1962, p. 644).

A woman's role in society was secured through her family and especially as a mother of children. "Barrenness was believed to be a curse from God" (Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, 1, 1962, p. 359). "No attempt can be made to investigate the problems of the associated barrenness before the abnormal uterine bleeding has been
relieved" (Israel, 1967, p. 474). This woman, having a hemorrhage for 12 years and without hope of having children, was desperate. She tried many cures, and having heard of Jesus came behind him through the crowd and touched his garment. Jesus sensed the nature of her isolation, the emptiness of her hope, the desperation in her act, and he responded with gifts greater than she ever imagined.

Jesus confirmed her and recognized her potential as a woman and as a mother and freed her from the burden of her physical situation. After the woman had been healed, Jesus asked, "Who touched my clothes?" (Mark 5: 30) and kept looking to see who it was (Mark 5: 32). The woman "came trembling with fear and fell at his feet" (Mark 5: 33), and "told him why she had touched him and how she had been healed at once" (Luke 8: 47). Jesus knew a woman had touched him (Bruce, 1912, p. 375) and that she was healed; yet he singled her out and focused the attention of all upon her. Her hesitation in confessing what had happened was not fear of Jesus but fear of losing her healing; "she knew what had happened to her, and thought what a dreadful thing it would be to have the surreptitiously obtained benefit recalled by an offended benefactor" (Bruce, 1912, pp. 375-376). Jesus had the same concern; if she was allowed to slip away she might have lost the healing through a sense of guilt from disobeying the law of
cleanness, or if she remained physically cured she would have missed the rich blessing of a life within God's grace (Caird, 1963, p. 124). She needed the blessing of Jesus on this cure which she gained by stealth, and his assurance that she owed her new health not to a magical power but to her own faith in the saving activity of God (Caird, 1963, p. 124). Receiving the total gift from Jesus confirmed her as a person in every part of her life.

Non-evaluation

We have in this encounter no measure of evaluation or judgment of the woman. She approached Jesus through the crowd from the back, not in fear of him but because of her uncleanness, hoping to be healed and to slip away unnoticed. Jesus did not mention the law which she broke with her touching. This non-evaluative, non-threatening relationship permitted the woman to be free to change, to abandon roles and to explore herself.

Self-Disclosure

In this encounter Jesus self-disclosed the depth of his compassion. There is no indication that this woman was known by Jesus or any of the disciples, and there is no indication that she held any position of importance in society. Yet "from the moment Jesus was face to face with the woman, there seems to be nobody there but she and He.
It happened in the midst of the crowd; but the crowd was forgotten and Jesus spoke to that woman and treated her as if she was the only person in the world" (Barclay, 1960, p. 114).

**Confronting**

Jesus confronted this woman not at the point of her desire for healing but at the point of her willingness to settle for so little. She had thought to win healing from Jesus by belief in his powers: "If I touch just his clothes she said to herself, I shall get well" (Mark 5: 28), but Jesus confronted her with the fact that healing resulted from faith in the saving power of God, "My daughter, your faith has made you well" (Mark 5: 34).

**With the Jewish Official**


**Empathy**

Jesus showed empathy for the man in that, when the man expressed his concern, Jesus responded to it immediately, and began the journey to the man's home. On the way a messenger came with the word that the child was dead. Jesus sensed the official's fear and said to him: "Don't be afraid, only believe" (Mark 5: 36).
Respect

The Jewish official no doubt found it difficult to come to Jesus, but he was enabled to approach without fear, fall at Jesus' feet and speak his message of concern for his daughter. The man's initial feeling of being respected was confirmed as Jesus began to accompany this man home, and Jesus' concern for him and his daughter continued in spite of three interruptions, by the woman with the issue of blood, by the messengers and the mourners; "a multitude of people seen making a confused din, in which sounds of weeping and howling without restraint are distinguishable" (Bruce, 1912, p. 376).

Warmth and Acceptance

Jesus accepted this official as readily and as completely as he accepted the tax collector and the outcasts. Questions about the past or the faith of the father were not present. No evaluative or judgmental statements were spoken. Jesus sent the mourners away, took the mother and father with him into the room, and, taking the child by the hand, said, "Little girl! Get up" (Mark 5:41). The warmth and care of Jesus extended to the nourishment of the child as he instructed them to give her something to eat (Mark 5:43).
Self-Disclosure

Jesus interrupted his time with the crowd, left the majority of the disciples behind (Mark 5: 37), walked directly into the house and the room where the girl was, raised her up with his hand, and gave her back to her parents. This non-verbal, active response disclosed without doubt that Jesus cared deeply and that he would go to any length to express his caring. When Jesus spoke of loving one another, the people knew what that meant.

Beyond the Model

The physical involvement of Jesus with the man and his family, and the entering into the man's home was a factor not found in our model.

With Peter--Caesarea Philippi


Warmth

Jesus expressed warmth toward Peter by calling him by his full name, "Simon, son of John" (Matthew 16: 17) and declaring that his happiness was assured (Matthew 16: 17). A moment later Jesus gave him a personal name, used for the first time, a nickname "Rock" (Fenton, 1963, p. 268) that spoke of closeness and warmth between them.
Confirming Others

After Peter had freely expressed his faith concerning Jesus (Matthew 16:16), Jesus gave him responsibilities. There was no hesitation by Jesus at this point but rather an acceptance of Peter's statement, a recognition of his potential, and a sharing of responsibility.

Genuineness

Jesus asked a question to which he truly desired an answer. He was as open and as pointed in his questions as possible; "Tell me" and "What about you?" (Mark 8:27, 29) are words that speak of his earnestness and his need to know. This genuineness took away all hesitancy from Peter and elicited from him a self-disclosing response. Peter, freed from any threat of evaluation or judgment, was enabled to reply with a statement describing his very personal understanding of Jesus (Matthew 16:16).

Immediacy

Jesus asked the disciples who they believed he was (Matthew 16:15), and when Peter responded (Matthew 16:16) Jesus sensed the moment was charged with commitment, learning and growth and immediately responded, disclosing his messiahship and moving on to the discussion of the meaning of that disclosure for the future.
Beyond the Model

Faith was elicited in many who experienced personal contact with Jesus. An example is this encounter between Jesus and Peter. The close association that had developed into friendship and worship between Jesus and Peter is an element beyond our model.

With the Mother of James and John

The material about Jesus with the mother of James and John is found in Matthew 20: 20-21.

Accepting

In this encounter Jesus listened intently to the Mother of James and John and, in spite of the fact that she had misinterpreted the nature of the kingdom—"You do not know what you are asking for" (Matthew 20: 22)—Jesus did not condemn or ignore her. She felt accepted as a person, for she was enabled to approach Jesus without hesitation, to ask for special considerations, a request recognized as being not quite proper. Note her formal approach: "She . . . came to Jesus with her two sons, bowed before him and asked him for a favor" (Matthew 20: 20), and then said "Promise" (Matthew 20: 21). She was enabled to state clearly her motherly concern. We do not know the tone of Jesus' response, but there is no reaction in the woman nor any indication in the conversation with
the two sons that would imply sharpness or disgust in Jesus' attitude.

Confronting

The challenge to the mother was in two areas, her possessiveness of James and John--"these two sons of mine" (Matthew 20: 21)--and her concept of the kingdom. Jesus turned from the mother to the sons when he answered her question, and he tested the two men on their understanding of the kingdom, helping them to see that its focus is not structure but suffering (Interpreter's Bible, 2, 1951, p. 495).

With Martha

The material about Jesus with Martha is found in Luke 10: 40-42.

Accepting

In an encounter where Jesus is issued a command, "Tell her to come and help me" (Luke 10: 40), and where his caring was questioned, "Lord don't you care?" (Luke 10: 40), Jesus' sensitivity toward, and acceptance of, Martha were still very evident. He did not ignore her feelings but rather, in responding to her, accepted them. He did not condemn her for her works nor create distance or barriers between himself and Martha; indeed he responded to her with gentleness, acceptance and warmth,
"Martha, Martha" (Luke 10:41). He accepted her hospitality throughout the encounter, an indication of his respect for, and acceptance of, her.

Non-evaluation

Jesus brought evaluation to bear upon Martha's troubled spirit, "you are worried and troubled over so many things" (Luke 10:41). "She earns reproof from Jesus because she had not yet learned that unselfishness, service and even sacrifice can be spoiled by self-concern and self-pity, that good works which are not self-forgetful can become a misery to the doer and a tyranny to others" (Caird, 1963, p. 150). But Jesus did not leave it there. His full acceptance of her, his acceptance and need of her hospitality, his closeness which was evident in the fact that he could be explicit, freed Martha to consider self-exploration.

Concreteness

Jesus used concreteness and explicitness to maintain the focus of the encounter upon Martha's troubled spirit. He did not allow it to shift to Martha's belief that Mary lacked a sense of duty. "You are worried and troubled ... just one thing is needed" (Luke 10:41-42). He would not permit Martha's self-righteous attitude to destroy Mary's relationship; "Mary has chosen the right thing, and it
will not be taken away from her" (Luke 10: 42).

**Confrontation**

Jesus confronted Martha at the point of her priorities "You are worried and troubled over so many things, but just one thing is needed" (Luke 10: 41-42).

**Self-Exploration**

Jesus' answer, "Martha, Martha!" to her demand that he tell Mary to help around the house, came as an invitation to Martha to look at herself and consider the one thing needed. Jesus, in extending this invitation, professed faith in Martha's ability to discover and incorporated this one thing.

**With the Widow of Nain**

The material about Jesus with the widow of Nain is found in Luke 7: 11-15.

**Empathy**

Even though this was a chance meeting between Jesus and the funeral procession, the expression of empathy toward the woman was immediate and deep, "When the Lord saw her his heart was filled with pity for her" (Luke 7: 13).

The role of the widow was neither secure nor pleasant in biblical society. "Many references to the widow
indicate that hers was an unfortunate state and that she was frequently subjected to harsh treatment” (Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, 4, 1962, p. 842), and a woman who had lost her only son (Luke 7: 12) would have been particularly vulnerable and fearful. Jesus sensed this and immediately responded.

Warmth

The warmth of Jesus toward the woman is evident in Jesus' responses, "Don't cry" (Luke 7: 13) and "... Jesus gave him back to his mother" (Luke 7: 15). The emphasis is upon the mother rather than the raising of the son.

Accepting

Jesus accepted the woman as a person of worth. He willingly interrupted and delayed his journey, listened to someone speak of her personal loss and private situation, and broke the laws of uncleanness to touch the coffin which would be without a lid (Bruce, 1912, p. 512). This last incident was no superficial act, "Among the Jews a corpse was regarded as exceptionally defiling ... He who touched a corpse was unclean for seven days" (Hasting, 1909, p. 146). The woman could not have but felt accepted by Jesus as a person of worth, even though she was going through the early stages of grief (Bouquet,
Non-Evaluation

There was no judgment or evaluation of the widow by Jesus in relation to her faith or her life and no delay in the healing until questions could be asked and answers given. Jesus responded to her sorrowing in word and action, even though, to our knowledge, he did not know her name.

Genuineness

The genuineness of Jesus in this encounter was evidenced in that he did not play to the crowd, his followers nor the people in the funeral procession. He defied the law of uncleanness, and his genuineness was recognized by the young men who were carrying the coffin, for they stopped and set the coffin down (Luke 7:14). Jesus was artificial neither in his compassion nor in his power. "The dead man sat up and began to talk, and Jesus gave him back to his mother" (Luke 7:15).

Beyond the Model

A compassion that would not let Jesus tolerate barriers which held people in bondage takes us beyond our model, as does the confrontation of death itself.
With Simon's Mother-in-Law

The material about Jesus with Simon's mother-in-law is found in Mark 1: 30-31 and Luke 4: 38-39.

Acceptance

The action of Jesus that is seen in the contrast between the immobility of the woman—who was "Sick in bed" (Mark 1: 30)—and the purposeful, healing movements of Jesus—he "went, took, and helped" (Mark 1: 30-31)—symbolizes the acceptance of the woman by Jesus. He did not hesitate to go to her, left no distance between them, nor was there aloofness after. Jesus accepted her, her hospitality and the bond of fellowship which the sharing of food symbolized (Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, 2, 1962, p. 306).

Non-Evaluation

In this encounter there is no indication of evaluation or judgment of the woman by Jesus. He accepted her as she was, freeing her to be herself, in her home and in relation to others; "she began to wait on them" (Mark 1: 31).

Self-Disclosure

There is some indication that Jesus perceived the illness of the woman to be a result of the power of evil (Mark 1: 34). If this was the situation, then the act of healing, the touch, the lifting up, was an act of self-
disclosure by Jesus, declaring himself as one with power to overcome evil. The genuineness of Jesus' responses and the singleness of his compassion were preludes to this act of self-disclosure.

Touching was a common act associated with healings in the days of Jesus (Nineham, 1963, p. 80). Here it is done with acceptance, gentleness and warmth; he "... took her by the hand and helped her up" (Mark 1: 31).

Beyond the Model

The emphasis here upon the completeness of the cure is beyond the model. "The fever left her and she began to wait on them" are statements to emphasize the total nature of the healing (Interpreter's Bible, 8, 1953, p. 98).

With the Criminal

The material about Jesus with the criminal is found in Luke 23: 40-43.

Respect

The criminal shared the longing of his own heart: "Remember me, Jesus, when you come as King!" (Luke 23: 42). Jesus did not respond with false hope or pious phrases nor did he pay unnecessary attention to death; rather he showed deep respect for the criminal by moving beyond the present reality to answer the longing of his spirit "Today you will be in Paradise with me" (Luke 23: 43).
Warmth

The criminal felt close to Jesus, in that he was able to use Jesus' name in his request. He did not use it in a formal way but as a friend "Remember me, Jesus" and Jesus spoke warmly to him "I tell you this: today you will be ... with me" (Luke 23: 42, 43).

Accepting

Jesus accepted him as he was and did not seek any information on which to make judgment about his faith or his righteousness. The man recognized his own shortcomings (Luke 23: 41) but his acceptance by Jesus freed him from his past. Even though he was bound to a cross he was freed to look at life in a new way.

Genuineness

This encounter must be seen against the background of its time and place. Here men found themselves facing the fact of their personal death; no more illusions, no more wondering why, no longer trying to assess blame. The physical hurt of the cross makes personal the dread of death, and it is against this pounding destruction of life that the genuineness and gentleness of this encounter must be seen. Jesus listened intently to his request, and responded to him at the point of his asking, and with equal intensity.
The genuineness of Jesus' response to the criminal lead to self-disclosure. Jesus disclosed that the here and now was not the only place and time, what they were experiencing was not the only experience, and what was yet to come would also be able to be shared.

Immediacy

Jesus recognized the urgency in the criminal's request, "Remember me" (Luke 23: 42) and he responded immediately. "Today you will be in Paradise with me" (Luke 23: 43).

Beyond the Model

In this encounter Jesus accepts death not as the final word of man's existence but as within God's creation. The criminal's imminent death and his own were seen not only as the result of man's action but within God's plan. The fact of death, of Jesus' own death, is beyond the model.

With Peter—Forgiveness

The material about Jesus with Peter on forgiveness is found in Matthew, 18: 21-22.

Accepting

Jesus accepted Peter as one who was able to receive a new concept of forgiveness; he accepted Peter's assessment,
noting that he went beyond the common standard of practice of these times (Bruce, 1912, p. 241) but, not allowing him to rest on his generous statement of seven times (Matthew 18: 21), challenged him to consider unlimited forgiveness (Fenton, 1963, p. 299). There was in this a significant acceptance of Peter by Jesus.

Genuineness

The genuineness of Jesus' answer was evident in the fact that nothing was held back; there was no attempt to be ambiguous or philosophical, or to compromise the answer by applying it only in certain situations. Jesus spoke an emphatic No (Matthew 18: 22) (Bruce, 1912, p. 241), an indication that the movement was forward and that the break with the past was complete.

Jesus self-disclosed his own understanding about forgiveness; a forgiveness not limited by law, not just the opposite of vengeance but a new understanding altogether.

Confronting

The confronting of Peter was at the point of Jesus' self-disclosure about forgiveness, "No! not seven times ... but seventy times seven" (Matthew 18: 22). Jesus in his genuineness, freed Peter from all limiting ideas about forgiveness and challenged him to move toward the concept that scores are no longer kept.
With a Deaf and Dumb Man

The material about Jesus with a deaf and dumb man is found in Mark 7: 32-35.

Empathy

Jesus had empathy with the man, for he sensed his boundness and seemed to strain under the man's restrictions. "Jesus looked up at heaven, gave a deep groan and cried open up!" (Mark 7: 34). This deaf and dumb man could hardly speak (Mark 7: 32) and if he had experienced embarrassment because of this impediment, it may have been the reason why Jesus took him off alone, in case his first attempt at speaking would be garbled and cause him more embarrassment.

Warmth

In the closeness of Jesus and the man warmth is present. Jesus took the man off alone; perhaps, as Bruce suggests (1912), he did not want to be drawn into a healing ministry on a large scale; or, as Nineham suggests (1963), he desired to keep his messianic calling a secret. But, in any case, the seclusion accentuated the closeness of the man with Jesus. It is true, as Nineham states that

the order and character of the gestures vary slightly in different MSS, and versions; in any case all of them are known to have formed part of the healing technique of contemporary wonder-workers. Touching and manipulation of
the affected organ are too obvious to need comment; the use of saliva is widely attested, as are the look toward heaven, which sought and obtained power, and the sigh or groan which were recommended in several magical texts as a potent action (1963, pp. 203-204).

Yet this act by Jesus is truly a symbol of closeness and warmth. Jesus took his head between his hands, placed fingers in each of his ears, licked his thumb and touched the man's tongue. The warmth of this closeness is very evident.

Non-Evaluation

There is in this encounter no evaluation or judgment by Jesus. The account suggests that Jesus had never met the man before: "Some people brought him a man" (Mark 7:32). Yet he asked no questions, nor sought any information upon which to make judgments. Jesus simply responded to the requests and freed the man from his boundness.

Concreteness

There was no ambiguity or double messages in this encounter. Jesus' acts and words were concrete and easily understood and related to the one purpose of healing the man.

Beyond the Model

The concreteness of the acts of Jesus goes beyond the
model, as does the belief held by Jesus, the deaf and
dumb man and his friends that Jesus had power to heal.

With Pilate

The material about Jesus with Pilate is found in

Acceptance

There was confirming and acceptance of Pilate by
Jesus in this encounter. When Pilate questioned Jesus,
Jesus answered (Matthew 27: 11). He showed no anger or
hostility toward Pilate, brought no evaluation or judgment
to bear on this relationship, and in the encounter gave no
indication of disrespect toward Pilate (Bruce, 1912).

Genuineness and Self-Disclosure

Jesus responded to this encounter with genuineness
and self-disclosure. The deep meaning of Jesus' positive
answer (Bruce, 1912) may have been missed by Pilate
(Matthew 27: 11), for it was a claim of his messiahship,
the fulfilment of that hope which the Jewish nation had
held for centuries. Jesus knew that his answer and its
meaning would not be missed by Jewish authorities and, in
the face of this, he self-disclosed.
Confrontation

The disclosure of Jesus and the silence became the frame for the confrontation of Pilate (Mark 15: 5). Jesus let the wondering of Pilate bear fruit; Pilate now was forced to define his belief as a man, a governor and as a leader of people.

Beyond the Model

The use of silence by Jesus in this encounter became a positive technique. It held the focus of the encounter upon the main issue, "Who is this man, Jesus?", forced those present to make some decision about that issue, and prevented side issues from clouding the situation.

With John the Baptist

The material about Jesus with John the Baptist is found in Matthew 3: 13-15.

Respect

It was no chance meeting of Jesus and John, "Jesus went from Galilee to the Jordan, and came to John to be baptized by him" (Matthew 3: 13). Jesus' respect for John and his ministry was in this significant action.

Accepting

This coming of Jesus to be baptized by John was an
indication of the acceptance of John and his ministry. The acceptance was without judgment or pressure being placed on John to change or conform. The warmth in the acceptance of John came from Jesus' recognition of their similar ministry; "We shall do all that God requires" (Matthew 3:15). They were together in their obedience to God and in their hope for man.

Permitting Separateness

Jesus permitted John to be himself and fulfill his own ministry. The very act of receiving baptism symbolizes the separateness of the ministry of John.

Genuineness and Self-Disclosure

Jesus recognized the differences in their ministeries. He made no attempt to cover these differences. Yet he would not permit the differences to destroy the relationship between them: "Let it be this way for now ... we shall do all that God requires" (Matthew 3:15).

The genuineness of Jesus is seen in his act of self-disclosure, being baptized by John. Jesus sought baptism so that all might know of his identity with the common people, identity with others seeking baptism, or as Bruce (1912) declares "a brother of the sinful" (p. 86).

Confrontation

There is no formal confrontation of John in this
encounter; but Jesus' full and complete acceptance of John's ministry opened the way for John to consider and explore. John, accepted but not forced to conform, received as a partner but not evaluated, was free to explore his ministry, his role, his person. He was neither threatened nor ignored by Jesus.

Immediacy

There is a recognition by Jesus of the importance of the moment. Jesus would not dwell in the past, did not talk about their training or experiences, nor would he consider the future and the coming fulfilment of their ministries. He accepted John's ministry at the moment and sought the act of baptism (Matthew 3: 15).

Beyond the Model

The reality of Jesus' call and the identification of Jesus through that call with the worshipping religious community is a factor beyond our model.

With the Roman Officer

The material about Jesus with the Roman officer is found in Matthew 8: 5-13.

Respect

Jesus' quick response to the man's urgent plea for help spoke of the respect of Jesus for him: "I will
go and make him well" (Matthew 8:7). This response was so accepting that the man seemed to be caught off balance, but it enabled him to speak of his faith and how he thought the healing could take place. Jesus was surprised (Matthew 8:10) but he changed his plans and accepted the suggestions of the officer.

The officer spoke of his own unworthiness: "I do not deserve to have you come into my house" (Matthew 8:8), perhaps an echo of the Jew-Gentile division of that day. But Jesus did not accept his unworthiness: "I tell you, I have never seen such faith as this in anyone in Israel" (Matthew 8:10).

**Non-Evaluation and Acceptance**

Jesus did not bring to this encounter any judgment of the man. He did not accept the judgment of society that Jews and Gentiles should have no dealings. Jesus accepted the man, "I will go" (Matthew 8:7), and his faith. Indeed he made use of it as a teaching illustration for the people who were following him. "I tell you, I have never seen such faith as this in anyone in Israel. Remember this!" (Matthew 8:10-11).

**Concreteness**

Jesus' two words to the officer are explicit and left no room for misunderstanding; "I will go and make
him well," "Go home, and what you believe will be done for you" (Matthew 8: 7, 13). The man responded to the concreteness exhibited by Jesus by plainly setting forth his belief (Matthew 8: 8, 9).

Confrontation
The very presence of Jesus and his actions were confronting to the officer. "Oh no, sir," (Matthew 8: 8) was his response to Jesus' announcement that he would go to the officer's home.

Immediacy
The challenge to the officer came at the point of the immediate response of Jesus to his request for help: "I will go" (Matthew 8: 7). The officer was forced at that point to consider his response and act quickly. There was no going back or time for reconsideration after the request had been made.

With the High Priest
The material about Jesus with the High Priest is found in Matthew 26: 62-64 and Mark 14: 60-62.

Respect
Even though Jesus had remained silent in the face of accusations, when the high priest questioned him he took the question seriously and answered it. The high priest
was the proper person to ask the question (Bruce, 1912) and Jesus respected him because of his office.

**Genuineness and Self-Disclosure**

The genuineness of Jesus was deeply evident in this encounter. There was no artificiality in either action or words. He tried neither to answer in a way that would cloud the issue nor did he remain silent so the issue could not be resolved.

There were, in Jesus' day, many interpretations of the role and nature of the messiah; (Hastings, 1909) and because of this Jesus did not publicly announce his messiahship. But when confronted by the high priest's question, "Are you the Messiah, the Son of the Blessed God?" (Mark 14: 61) he answered, "I am" (Mark 14: 61). This self-disclosure in the presence of the religious authorities cleared away much speculation and wondering and permitted attention to be focused on the central issue.

**Confrontation**

By his silence to their questioning, he forced the questioners to hear their own words. And when he self-disclosed to them that he was the messiah, they were confronted with that and had to decide what their action would be.
The above twenty-six encounters from the synoptic gospels are those upon which this study has been based.
Chapter 4

SUMMARY

In this chapter, the findings of the study of the encounters between Jesus and individuals which are recorded in the synoptic gospels are given. Each encounter was analyzed to determine whether or not each characteristic of a helping relationship which is part of the model used in this study was seen in specific words or behaviors to be present, could be inferred from the encounter, was absent or was present but in a negative sense. When a characteristic could be recognized in the recorded verbal exchange and/or was evidenced in the actions of Jesus or the individual then it was assessed as observable in the encounter. When the characteristic was inferred to be present but not evidenced in a verbal exchange or specific action it was assessed to be inferable. A summary of the findings is given in Table I.
### Table I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Immediate</th>
<th>Continuous</th>
<th>Challenging</th>
<th>Transparency</th>
<th>Self-Disclosure</th>
<th>Permissiveness</th>
<th>Acceptance</th>
<th>Non-Judgmental</th>
<th>Non-Attachment</th>
<th>Accepting</th>
<th>Warmth</th>
<th>Respect</th>
<th>Empathy</th>
<th>Accepting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reflective</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observant</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accepting</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observant</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflective</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observant</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accepting</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observant</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accepting</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observant</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accepting</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observant</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accepting</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observant</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accepting</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observant</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accepting</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Helping Characteristics in Jesus' Encounters
Empathy

In this study empathy was found to be observable in six, inferable in 12 and absent in eight of the encounters.

Three individuals, Zacchaeus, the widow of Nain and the man who lived in the tombs experienced ostracism. Jesus expressed empathy by closeness with the man from the tombs, by words with Zacchaeus and by action in stopping the funeral procession and raising the son of the widow. In the other three observably empathic encounters each individual carried a burden of concern. The father of the epileptic and the Jewish official were concerned about their children and the deaf and dumb man carried the burden of deafness and difficulty in communicating.

In almost one-half of the encounters studied, empathy could be inferred as a characteristic of Jesus' relationship but it was not as clear as in the above incidents. It is often in conjunction with warmth and confirming others.

In the remaining eight encounters empathy seems to be absent. Four of these are from the passion narrative, Peter's denial, Judas' betrayal, Pilate and the High Priest. In these encounters in which emotional context is high, empathy does not seem to be a part. It would seem that in encounters that contain direct confrontation, empathy is not a factor. In two of the remaining four encounters the
individuals are seeking special things, the rich young man wanted the key to eternal life and the mother of James and John wanted special places for her sons. In Simon's mother-in-law and Peter on forgiveness no response as to shared feelings is recorded.

In 18 of the 26 encounters Jesus is shown as empathic. He gave his full attention to the other. There is nothing casual or mechanical about his relationship with others; this being recognized as the basis for empathy (Truax & Carkhuff, 1967, p. 46). Empathy was more likely to be present when the individual carried a heavy burden of care in daily life, and absent when the individual was seeking to fulfill his own desires. It is indicated from this and the summary on respect that respect can be shown in encounters when empathy is not evident, but that respect is needed if empathy is to be shown.

Respect

In this study respect was found to be observable in 11 and inferable in 15 of the encounters. Jesus showed high regard for all of the people in the encounters. He was respectful to those who opposed him, the High Priest and Simon the Pharisee; to the outcast, the leper and the woman who anointed him. He respected the
questioner even though the questions asked were selfish, as in the encounter with the mother of James and John, or even if the question was used as a trap as in the encounter with the teacher of the law.

Respect has within it the concept of worth. Jesus accepted the worthiness of each individual. We have no evidence of Jesus cutting others down or responding to them with anything less than respect. Indeed respect is so much a part of each encounter that it is impossible to discover a pattern of use.

Warmth

In this study warmth was found to be observable in 11, inferable in 10 and absent in five of the encounters. There seems to be no pattern in the group of situations in which Jesus showed warmth, for there are parents concerned for their children, people cut off from society and others engaged in theological discussions.

In five of the encounters warmth is absent. Three of these are related to the passion experience, Peter's denial, Pilate, and the High Priest, an indication that the nature of the encounter may make warmth inappropriate. In the remaining two encounters where warmth is absent, the mother of James and John and Peter on forgiveness, the narrowness
of the encounter seems simply to exclude it.

In 21 of the 26 encounters we find warmth being easily communicated by Jesus in a variety of situations and relationships. In no encounter did Jesus deny warmth. It seems to be a natural expression of his humanness and liking of people.

Non-Evaluation and Non-Judgment

In this study non-evaluation and non-judgment were found to be observable in 11, inferable in 13 and negatively shown in two of the encounters. These two categories will be viewed as one, for the author has not been able to keep them separate within this study.

In two of the encounters Jesus made evaluative statements; he asked Simon the Pharisee "Do you see this woman?" (Luke 7: 44) and to Martha he responds "Martha! Martha! You are worried and troubled over so many things" (Luke 10: 41). In each of these cases the responses are gentle and spoken in the context of significant acceptance of the person. It can also be noted that confrontation is significantly evident in both of the above encounters, an indication that the evaluative statements were related to therapeutic concerns. In all the rest of the encounters a non-evaluative and non-judgmental attitude is observable or inferable.
Jesus healed, accepted, responded with no reference to the person's past, and did not attempt to decide whether others were worthy to receive healing or not. For him the worth of the person was related to God's gift in creation, not to what the person had accomplished or done up to that point in time.

Jesus gave opportunity for a new life style to be chosen by the individual after the encounter was over: "Your faith has made you well." The choice was a valid choice and was not limited by any pre-conditions set by Jesus. The opportunity came as a result of being warmly accepted and confirmed as a person of worth.

Jesus made no judgments in regard to faith. For him faith seemed to be regarded as journey with direction, rather than a destination to be achieved. He challenged the superstitions of the woman who came to Jesus believing that if she could touch his garment she would be healed, but he accepted her faith, however small: "Your faith has made you well" (Mark 5:34).

It did not seem necessary for Jesus to seek information upon which to make judgments nor necessary to make judgments based upon information which he did possess. This must be seen in relation to the fact that Jesus did make evaluative statements to the disciples (Luke 6:20), the crowd (Mark
and religious authorities (Luke 11: 42) in other aspects of his ministry. Jesus was willing to set individuals free to be truly themselves, and he would not restrict that freedom by evaluating their past or judging their present. Perhaps our eagerness to evaluate others is based upon our need to judge rather than upon the fact that judgments are required to preserve the sanctity of the kingdom or the purity of the church.

Acceptance

In this study acceptance was observable in 17 and inferable in nine of the encounters. Jesus accepted the criminal in the last moments of his earthly life, Peter and Judas even though their actions were matters of life and death, the leper and Zacchaeus even though society had rejected them. The strength of his accepting others was illustrated by the way he broke the laws of uncleanness to touch or be touched as with the leper, the widow of Nain, the woman with the issue of blood, and the woman who washed his feet.

The acceptance of others by Jesus was evidenced in many ways, by touching as noted above, by listening as to the father of the epileptic, by acting as with Zacchaeus, by permitting the others to be separate as with John the
Baptist, by believing that they could entertain new ideas as with Peter on the issue of forgiveness, and by giving them his blessing as to the woman who anointed him. No other characteristic in our model is so much in evidence in the encounters studied as is the characteristic of acceptance.

Non-Threatening

In this study a non-threatening attitude was observable in one and inferable in the remaining 25 encounters.

In the encounter with the Canaanite woman, the non-threatening characteristic is very evident. In all of the remaining encounters this characteristic is recognizable. The Canaanite woman was concerned for her daughter and even though the disciples of Jesus tried to dissuade her from the pursuit of her goal, she would not be dissuaded. She showed no sign of fear. She did not interpret any of Jesus' words or actions as threatening.

In all of the other encounters the non-threatening attitude is recognizable. People approached him easily and without hesitation, calling loudly, abruptly breaking into Jesus' schedule, falling at his feet, begging him or touching his clothes. In none of these encounters is there any evidence of the people being afraid of Jesus, or of being reluctant to approach him.
Jesus brought no attitude of threat to these encounters. In the incident where the Jewish official experienced despair, the messenger coming to tell him that his daughter had already died, Jesus responded: "Do not be afraid" (Luke 8: 50).

The use of threats had no place in the relationships of Jesus to others in these encounters.

Confirming Others

In this study confirming others was observable in seven, inferable in 17 and absent in two of the encounters. The confirming of others is a significant factor in seven of the encounters studied. He confirmed Zacchaeus as having a place in society, Simon as having ability to grow and change, the man from the tombs as having ability to take responsibility, the woman who anointed him as being able to begin a new life, Peter as being able to understand deep truths and blind Bartimaeus and the woman with the issue of blood as people with potential.

Jesus also confirmed others as he sought to make sure that healings were complete. He did not allow the woman with the issue of blood to slip away until her healing was confirmed; and he sat with the man from the tombs while the citizens came from the town in order that the people might know that the man was no longer uncontrollable but confirmed as a member of society. It is only in the two encounters with Pilate and with the High Priest that the
attitude of confirming others appears to be absent.

Jesus confirmed others as they were, and as to their potential. He never withheld or used confirming others as a reward or punishment. He accepted others as part of God's creation and he attempted to confirm others in that relationship.

Permitting Separateness

In this study permitting separateness was observable in four and inferable in 22 of the encounters.

The factor of permitting separateness was very evident in four encounters and recognizable in the remainder. Zacchaeus decided what he would do in response to being accepted by Jesus. Judas was encouraged to do what he had chosen: "Be quick about it, friend" (Matthew 26: 50). Blind Bartimaeus was given a choice and John the Baptist was encouraged to continue in his own ministry.

We have no indication of Jesus seeking to control or limit the independence of others; indeed he sought always to encourage and permit separateness. Permitting separateness is part of the area of accepting and comes as a part of seeing others as worthy and unique.

Concreteness

In this study concreteness was observable in 11 and inferable in 15 of the encounters.
Jesus exhibited specificness and explicitness in all of the relationships within our study. The number of words used by Jesus was minimal. Those he chose to use did not confuse but clarified, confirmed others and encouraged growth. He asked Simon, "Do you see this woman?" (Luke 7: 44); he said to Zacchaeus, "Hurry down." (Luke 19: 5), and to the rich young man he instructed: "Go and sell all that you have" (Mark 10: 21).

The actions of Jesus were concrete as well. He took the deaf man's head in his hands, placing his fingers in his ears. He quickly started to the home of the Roman official where his servant lay ill. He received the kiss from Judas.

In some instances a simple statement by Jesus related to more than one area of response. Jesus' word to Zacchaeus, referred to above, related empathy, acceptance, concreteness, confrontation and immediacy. A statement such as this one to Zacchaeus was very specific. One concludes that Jesus sought continually to be concrete in his relation to other people.

Genuineness

In this study genuineness was observable in 13 and inferable in 13 of the encounters.

In this area the author has included the characteristics of trustworthiness and transparency with that of genuineness.
Here is included the genuineness of the helper, his realness and congruency and the revealing of this characteristic to others. It includes the characteristic of being open, of having nothing hidden or covered and of not playing roles.

Evidence within this study shows Jesus as being genuine in relation to others. When Jesus was angry against the forces of evil that bound the leper, he showed it (Mark 1: 40-44); he simply stated as a fact that Peter would deny him (Matthew 26: 31-35); in the encounter with the widow of Nain he was concerned with the possibility that she not be left destitute (Luke 7: 11-15). Approaching the end of his life, in encounters with the High Priest, Pilate and the criminal on the cross his genuineness was still evident.

Jesus did not bring anything false into the encounters, nor did he leave unsaid that which needed to be spoken. He asked blind Bartimaeus: "What do you want me to do for you?" (Mark 10: 51) not wanting to heal a man if all he wanted was alms.

Being Separate

Being separate was inferable in all of the encounters studied. The separateness of Jesus seems to be taken for granted. Jesus did not depend upon others. He heard the
discussion of the criminals on the crosses and their recognition of his righteousness, but Jesus did not depend on their recognition of his righteousness for his self image; indeed he heard the longing of the man who said, "Remember me," and Jesus responded to his longing (Luke 23: 40-43). Jesus is not dependent on others for his own being, and even though he sought closeness he remained separate.

Self-Disclosure

In this study self-disclosure was observable in 12, inferable in 10 and absent in four of the encounters. Self-disclosing by Jesus involved the disclosing of his ministry, his work and his whole being. By associating with the woman who anointed him and with Zacchaeus he disclosed his non-judgmental acceptance of those whom society had labeled as sinners. In healing the blind, raising the dead, freeing those bound by demons and opening the ears of the deaf he disclosed his Messiahship (Matthew 11: 4-5, Luke 4: 18-19). When Jesus chose to answer specific questions that were asked of him by the teacher of the law, by Pilate and the High Priest he disclosed his own belief and understanding of his purpose.

Self-disclosure often was made as a result of Jesus' compassion. It was so in the encounter with the father of
the epileptic boy and with the woman who had the issue of blood.

Self-disclosing by Jesus was not done in hiding or in seclusion, but in the open, in the midst of crowds, in the presence of those who were antagonistic to him. These disclosures were not acts separate unto themselves, but grew out of the relationship between Jesus and others.

In the four encounters where Jesus did not self-disclose, it was not that he chose to hide himself, but self-disclosure seemed not to be a part of the encounter because of its nature. These encounters with Judas, the Canaanite woman, the mother of James and John and the rich young man focus upon the other person and their act or request rather than being an opportunity for self-disclosure by Jesus.

Self-disclosure is part of the very being of Jesus. He does not use it as a technique to facilitate some mood or win some measure of success. His self-disclosure is an outgrowth of his genuineness.

Confrontation

In this study confrontation was observable in 17, inferable in four and absent in five of the encounters.

Confronting by Jesus grew out of the necessity for each person to face truth, and did not take the form of
words or arguments. The woman with the issue of blood was confronted with new life because she was freed from the restrictions of past illness. Judas was confronted to assess his action by the very fact that Jesus received his kiss. Simon was confronted by Jesus accepting the acts of love of a woman whom Simon considered a sinner and by drawing Simon's attention to the fact that she was present: "Do you see this woman?" (Luke 7: 44).

In the six incidents where confrontation is seen as absent, the encounters focus upon the lifting of a burden from a person. Confrontation may have occurred after these incidents but no record of it is within the encounters.

Jesus does not seem to imply that once a person is healed, the task is to confront him; rather he seeks to give the full gift of life, and if, in that act of receiving from Jesus, the person senses his own weaknesses, inadequacy or sinfulness then that is between himself and God.

Jesus accepted life as continually confronting people with decisions and choices. When a person faces a basic issue of life such as truth, death, birth, health or freedom, he is challenged to look to himself and ask the questions that related to who he is and how he views his life. Jesus saw confrontation as the experience of all.
Immediacy

In this study immediacy was observable in five, inferable in nine and absent in 12 of the encounters.

In all of the encounters, events seem to happen quickly; but in four of them, Zacchaeus, the criminal, John the Baptist and the Roman official, Jesus seemed to sense a focusing of time upon that moment and responded to that focusing. Opportune moments are precious; Jesus made use of them. He called to Zacchaeus, responded to the criminal, identified with John the Baptist and, as soon as he heard of the plight of the Roman official, he started on the journey to where the servant was sick. If a person was open to receive the gift, then action was taken.

In none of the 12 encounters where immediacy is absent, do we sense Jesus using delaying tactics or hesitating in his responses to others. Jesus was sensitive to the moment of urgency in the lives of others and acted in order that such moments not be lost.

Self-Exploration

In this study self-exploration was observable in three, inferable in four and absent in 19 of the encounters.

Self-exploration came as an invitation to see oneself in a new light; looking at oneself from a new direction. In the three encounters where Jesus invited self-exploration there was no hint of an ultimatum. As fully accepted as
persons of worth, they were confronted with the belief that they had the capacity to grow and change. Jesus used Simon's neglect to fulfill the acts of a host, the question of faith by the father of the epileptic boy and Martha's insistance on duty as incidents to invite self exploration.

In 19 of the encounters self-exploration is seen as being absent, but in none of the encounters do we find Jesus inhibiting self-exploration. In the majority of encounters we do not have records of the nature of the challenge given by Jesus, but we can conclude that Jesus did invite people to self-explore and did confirm and accept others, thus freeing them to self-explore if they so chose.
Beyond the Model

In this study there are a number of characteristics of Jesus in his relation to individuals that are not found in the model. If a person seeks to fashion a personal counseling model including modern therapeutic findings as well as being "of Christ," these following characteristics should be taken into consideration.

The Availability of Jesus

The availability of Jesus is evidenced in almost every encounter. Whether he was approached by a person on their own behalf as with the leper, or on behalf of a friend as in the case of the deaf and dumb man, whether he met people by chance as with the widow of Nain or by arrangement as with Simon's mother-in-law, he was totally available to that person. Crowds, disciples or antagonists were for that moment set aside as his whole attention was focused on the one person. At the moment of his betrayal by Judas, Jesus was totally available to him. Even when the crowd was a threat, as in the encounter with Zacchaeus, Jesus was available without hesitation.

His availability is also evidenced in the fact that others saw him as approachable. There was no evidence
that people hesitated to come to him, or that they saw him as being too busy. The Canaanite woman entered the house where he was; others came and touched him, while others fell at his feet to ask a favour.

Jesus made his time available to others. He went to the home of the Jewish official, into the bedroom of Simon's mother-in-law, to the place by the lake where the demon-possessed man stayed. He took time to talk with the father of the epileptic boy and gave the criminal of his last few minutes of life.

Jesus was available to the special unforeseen needs of others. On the way to the home of the Jewish official, messengers came saying that the child had died. Jesus sensed the despair in the father's heart and immediately said "Don't be afraid," and continued on with the journey.

Jesus made himself available to receive the love of the woman who anointed him. He accepted her love at the time and in the mode she chose to express it. It could not have been a more inopportune time for Jesus to receive this expression of love, but he was available at the moment of her need to share.

**Taking Risks**

Jesus operated in the open, making himself vulnerable to attack and to being misunderstood. There was no attempt to hide or cover his action. He healed those who came to
him; ate with tax collectors, was anointed by a harlot, touched the unclean, associated with gentiles, doing it all in the open, making no attempt to hide or to explain. When witnesses were needed at his trial they were easily found.

There were many interpretations of the Messiah in Jesus' day. And though it was easy to raise the expectations of the Messiah's coming in the mind of the people it was impossible to fulfil all of the interpretations connected with that expectation. He knew that these rising expectations might force him to proclaim his own messiahship before he had adequately prepared his disciples and followers; yet he took that risk. He healed the sick, gave sight to the blind, cleansed the lepers, raised the dead, freed those bound by demons, all signs of the Messiah's coming, while at the same time he attempted to prepare his followers for the concept of a suffering Messiah. Jesus risked his whole ministry as he responded to the needs and requests of those he met day by day.

He did not attempt to protect himself, nor to cover or explain any of his actions. He did not take time to explain the meaning of having his feet anointed. Others could interpret it as they would. He answered a trap question, being more intent on what it meant to the
questioner than where it would lead him. He did not, for his sake, move an encounter to a more secluded place or to an area where he would be in control.

Jesus accepted the physical risk of going to the spot where the man from the tomb lived. He risked being injured by the man's uncontrollable behavior. He touched the leper, accepting the risk of disease and social stigma. Jesus calmly met Judas taking the risk of betrayal and arrest and the end of his ministry and life. Jesus publicly declared that he was going to Zacchaeus' house and thereby took upon himself the hostility of the crowd.

Jesus placed himself in the debt of others, accepting the vulnerability of that type of situation. He invited himself to Zacchaeus' house where he was the guest and Zacchaeus the host. And even though the host had responsibilities to the guest, Jesus made himself vulnerable to Simon by accepting his invitation to dinner.

We do not know the full meaning of Jesus' risk-taking or of his making himself vulnerable to his enemies, or why he made himself open to misunderstandings or the butt of coarse jokes, but it is obvious that we cannot truly understand Jesus without taking this aspect of his ministry into consideration.

Compassion

There is caring in the model in the characteristics
of warmth, empathy, and acceptance. But beyond the model is the compassion of Jesus. His compassion for the leper was shown in his anger against the whole force of evil which bound that man. Evil was focused in the disease, in the religion, in the law, in the society which alienated him from God, his community and his future.

The compassion of Jesus was most evidenced in relation to those who were bound, confined, restricted. The man from the tombs was restricted by his illness, the widow of Nain was bound by the conventions of society, the woman who anointed Jesus was bound by the self-righteous judgments of those in authority, the Canaanite woman was restricted by the fact that she was a Gentile and the woman with the issue of blood by the fact that she had been labeled unclean. Jesus was conscious of the personal tragedy involved and sought to alleviate the tragedy. Jesus' compassion seemed to have had the highest of priority as he encountered individuals in their personal life situation. He seemed to be particularly sensitive to the forces which removed freedom of choice from people.

Concept of Reality

The reality within the model is the reality of the moment. The reality in which Jesus worked is not only that of the moment but included the reality of what was to come; the becoming element. This concept is based on
a belief in God as Creator. Jesus saw beyond the present reality to the purpose and meaning of life as God created it. The woman who anointed Jesus' feet was invited to accept the reality of her own sin and the image and response it initiated among self-righteous people; but she was also invited to accept herself as a woman capable of giving and receiving love, capable of growth and challenge in the direction of fulfilment and joy of life.

The division between Jew and Gentile was sharp, harsh and bitter in Jesus' day. This division was reinforced by jokes, insults, and slurs. The reality of this division had to be accepted but there was also the reality that the division was not the last word, that separations can be bridged and attitudes changed.

Jesus accepted the reality of the worth of the person in the eyes of God and would not let that reality escape either from the person or from himself. When Judas came to betray Jesus with a kiss, Jesus accepted him as free to make his own decisions and worthy of that freedom.

The Community

Jesus recognized the community in the life of the individual. When the leper was healed Jesus told him to complete the ritual of ceremonial cleansing, for that was the form of cleansing the community could accept and thus he would be accepted as a member of the community.
During the passion Jesus had remained silent in the face of questions and accusations. When the High Priest asked him whether he was the Messiah he answered him. In the community in which he lived the High Priest was the one who had the authority to ask that question. In Jesus' day a woman was assured of a place in society as a mother of children. If a woman was barren her position was tenuous at best and often very difficult and insecure. Jesus sensed how important it was for the woman with the issue of blood to be healed so that she might occupy her rightful place in society as a mother of children.

After the man from the tombs had been healed, Jesus supplied him with clothes and sat beside him as the people of the village came to see what had happened. By his association with the man Jesus indicated to the community that the man, now calm and controlled, was able to accept his rightful place in the community. Jesus' announcement that Zacchaeus was now a Son of Abraham was a declaration that there was no valid reason for Zacchaeus to be ostracized and that he had every right to an accepted place in the community. Each person lives in relation to community and that relationship must be recognized, accepted and understood.

**Wholeness**

Positions of the model used in this study, specifically
in the area of accepting, relate to more than the immediate moment, as for example the characteristics of acceptance, of permitting separateness, of respect. In his relation to individuals, Jesus recognized this factor for he related to the whole person, not just to one position or experience.

He healed Simon's mother-in-law, restoring her to her place as a hostess in her own home, and then he accepted her hospitality, a sign that she was fully restored to her former place. Jesus asked blind Bartimaeus what he wanted; for Jesus would not give him his sight if all he wanted was a few pennies for daily existence. The unity of Bartimaeus was important; Jesus would not impose a gift on him if it was not wanted.

The woman with the issue of blood was in danger of losing the healing if she went home believing that she had received it by cunning, superstition and by breaking a law of society. Jesus singled her out in order that she would know of her acceptance as a person, and that her healing was a result of her faith in the saving activity of God, and in order that she might know that she was free of her trouble not only for the moment but also for the future.

Jesus went beyond the model in the depth and strength of his relationship with individuals. Here is the complete
giving of himself for the fullness of the other person. Barriers and hindrances of any kind that inhibited the process of life-growth were to be ignored, set aside, defeated, or overcome. Jesus did not come down heavily upon the other person but he took seriously the concept of salvation in its broadest interpretation and was not easily detracted from that goal.

A Personal Comment

In this study, Jesus is shown to have ultimate ability in establishing helping relationship. The deep level of accepting by Jesus is seen in the way he shared the wholeness of their life; he experienced their sorrows, rested in their homes, accepted invitations to dine, touched their bodies and received their gifts. He accepted, without hesitation, the other person, bringing no evaluative or judge mental criteria to the encounter. In many and various ways he eliminated physical, spiritual and societal barriers that had put distance between persons and God, community and family. His acceptance led to confirming of the other as a person of worth thus enabling growth to take place.

Jesus was truly present in each encounter in a positive way. He did not deceive but clarified the issues being faced; spoke words that needed to be said, acted in decisive ways
when action was called for. His acts were in the open for all to see. His genuineness in the helping relationship permitted the other person to face the reality of the situation and to live in that reality. Jesus by his active presence in the encounters moved people toward the reality of God, of community, of life itself. The acting of Jesus in these encounters included his whole being, his body, his words, his movements, his intuition, his prayers, his logic, his touch, his seeing, his hearing. Jesus was fully present in each encounter.

Jesus challenged those whom he met; challenged them at the point of life as they chose to live it; he opened up new areas of understanding which to the present moment they had not faced. Jesus would not let those whom he encountered, hide behind religious traditions, standards of society, personal fears or a sense of unworthiness. He confronted them with the magnificance of the gift of life and challenged them to live it.

When Jesus moved beyond the model of a helping relationship, he not only pushed beyond the common held concepts of acceptance, was more truly present in each situation than had yet been experienced, and by his presence challenged others to think about life in ways they had never attempted before; but in addition he brought to each relationship a totality that
included the reality of the present world and the reality of the spiritual dimension of life. He brought to bear upon each relationship the purpose and plan of God for that person, enabling the person to see himself not at the mercy of forces and powers which he neither understood nor controlled, but as a child of God within God's care and kingdom.

This study supports the author's view of God as a God who seeks relationship with his creation, and who sent His Son in order that that relationship might be established. To see Jesus as skilled in developing helping relationships is in keeping with this view. It is the author's belief that the validity of this research does not depend upon any specific theological position; others may bring their own personal construct of faith and find in this study insight and implications applicable and helpful to their personal faith position.
Chapter 5

IMPLICATIONS

There are a number of implications in this study for the pastoral counselor. One of the most significant is the almost complete absence of an evaluative or judgmental stance in Jesus' relations with individuals. The images of the church, the pastor, and Christianity being primarily judgmental is certainly challenged, and the whole issue of religion as a vehicle of judgment of individuals must be questioned. When a pastor finds himself in a judging relationship with an individual or when he seeks to use the church as a symbol of authority in the judgment of others, he must assess carefully the nature of his position, its purpose and consequences.

The church has continually struggled with the concept of being "Born Again" and what it means to the individual. This study finds Jesus releasing individuals from the burdens and roles of the past, letting them be totally free to choose their life style. Jesus gives new opportunity for life as if the person had been recreated. He placed no restriction or limitation upon people healed or helped. For the pastor this unconditional factor in the relation of Jesus to individuals is a factor which must be recognized. Need and the courage to approach Jesus seems to be the
only requirements for securing the gift of renewal of life. There was a spontaneity in Jesus' relationship with individuals that holds much meaning for the pastor as he ministers to his people. Jesus was not only available but he was willing to let things happen where and when they would. He extended almost no control over the physical arrangements of the encounters, and seemed more than willing to engage the individual with his whole self. This study indicates that for the pastor there are countless opportunities to encounter individuals in the varied activities of day by day living and he can be truly open and alive to these opportunities. Jesus was not willing to accept the barriers and evils of the society of his day; yet he recognized the reality of the community and he accepted the fact that persons had to live in community. The pastor can present the nature of the kingdom that Jesus promises and can make it as real and winsome as is possible, but the realities of the present existence, the nature of the present community and the demands of the present society cannot be passed over. The pastor has an ever present responsibility to strengthen the believer for the task of living in the world.

The element of risk accepted by Jesus in his encounters with individuals must be recognized. Concepts upon which
society builds its structures acquire great importance and to threaten or challenge these concepts creates risk. Not only did Jesus refuse to draw back from the risk inherent in involvement but also he made no attempt to minimize the risk. Pastors must recognize the nature of the risk that is present in their ministry and not yield to the temptation to use their office or their calling to insulate themselves from the risks of pastoral counseling.

Self-disclosure of his person and work was a significant factor in Jesus' relation with individuals. The pastor must assess his own relationship with his people, especially the concept of distances and aloofness that often are a traditional part of his role. There is indication in this study that the self-disclosing of the pastor in the realm of faith and Christian lifestyle could serve as bridges and signs, giving courage to others on their journey of faith.

In the construction of a model for the Christian counselor modern psychological insight must be taken into consideration. But in addition, factors such as the availability of the pastor to his people, the pastor's willingness to take risks within the counseling relationship, and the pastor's ability to see the other person as a child of God, must be incorporated into the model and used as factors in its development.
Areas of Further Study

The researcher believes that studies similar to the one undertaken, but with a deeper level of biblical research are needed in order to establish the validity of the present findings. The authenticity of the Biblical record of the encounters, the meaning of the words as Jesus used them, and the nature of the believing community are some of the factors that need to be studied.

Further research is needed in the area of pastoral counseling to discover which characteristics of counseling have added meaning when counseling is within the Christian context. Is acceptance more meaningful when it is an expected response of the pastor? Does the accepted role of the pastor affect the characteristics of the counselor in an unique or specific way? This area needs further study and research.
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Appendix A

MODEL DEFINITIONS

Accepting
Acting
Challenging

The accepting area includes all those characteristics of a counselor by which the counselor learns to enable the client to be truly and deeply accepted and understood. Here is included the characteristics of empathy and respect from the Carlshuff model, and, from the findings of Rogers, the characteristic of empathy, acceptance, confirming of others, non-evaluation, non-judgment, non-blame and being separate and permitting separateness.

Accepting in this model includes the willingness to be with the other and to share the model one takes, but with no desire to take over the other's responsibility for decisions. Here is the desire to respect "on the other person's deeper feelings as well as his apparent feelings" (Carlshuff and Berkenson, 1977).
This composite model of the characteristics of a counselor is constructed from a composite of the four facilitative characteristics and four action-orientated characteristics that Carkhuff presents (Carkhuff and Berenson, 1977) along with the ten characteristics of a helping relationship which Rogers has abstracted from the research (Rogers, 1961, pp. 34-57).

The model which the author has developed is composed of three areas which are identified as accepting, acting and challenging.

Accepting

The accepting area includes all those characteristics of a counselor by which the counselor seeks to enable the client to be truly and deeply accepted and understood. Here is included the characteristics of empathy and respect from the Carkhuff scale, and, from the findings of Rogers, the characteristics of warmth, acceptance, confirming of others, non-evaluation, non-threat, non-judgment and being separate and permitting separateness.

Accepting in this model includes the willingness to be with the other and to share the burden and tears, but with no desire to take over the other's responsibility for decisions. Here is the desire to respond "to the other person's deeper feelings as well as his superficial feelings" (Carkhuff and Berenson, 1977, p. 8) and yet
permitting the separateness of the person to be fully experienced.

It is with human warmth and respect that the worth of the other is recognized. This recognition of worth is not only in relation to the future potential of the other but in relation to the present reality as well. The other is accepted unconditionally, thus being enabled to grow and change with the support and freedom needed.

Acceptance permits no pressure of any kind to be used in imposing values, ideas, or positions on the other. The counselor is non-threatening, non-judgmental and non-evaluative toward the client. Here the goal is to eliminate the barriers that put distance between the counselor and client and yet, in the striving for closeness, there is freedom and support for the other to be separate and unique as a person.

**Empathy**

To show empathy is to respond with full awareness to the client's feelings; it is being tuned into the other's internal reactions and somehow communicating the message 'I am with you'. The counselor's ability to communicate at high levels of empathetic understanding "allows himself to experience or merge with the experience of the helpee, reflect upon this experience while suspending his own judgments, tolerating his own anxieties..."
and communicating this understanding to the helpee" (Carkhuff and Berenson, 1977, p. 9).

Respect

Respect can be communicated in a variety of ways, by silently being with the client who is going through a time of deep aloneness, by being willing to accept the client's choice not to share an experience, or by sharing deeply with the client the humor of a situation which the client has recounted. Respect is caring for the other as a separate person with a non-possessive caring. "The communication of respect appears to shatter the isolation of the individual" (Carkhuff and Berenson, 1977, p. 10).

Warmth

Warmth is the experiencing of positive attitudes toward others—attitudes of caring, liking, interest, respect. It is not being afraid to come close to another and refusing to build barriers that serve as excuses to keep distances between ourself and others. "It is a real achievement when we can learn that it is safe to care, that it is safe to relate to the other as a person for whom we have positive feelings" (Rogers, 1961, p. 52).

Non-Evaluation

Non-evaluating is entering fully into the world of the other's feelings and meaning, seeing them as the
person sees them and not bringing to bear any standard of evaluation. Can I "... step into his private world so completely that I lose all desire to evaluate" (Rogers, 1961, p. 53)?

Acceptance

Acceptance is receiving the other as he is, unconditionally, and being able to communicate that attitude of acceptance to the other. It is not only accepting the other as a whole person but "each facet of this other person which he presents" (Rogers, 1961, p. 54).

Non-threaten

To be non-threatening in a counseling relationship is to act with sufficient sensitivity so that behavior is not perceived as a threat by the client.

If a client can be "free from external threat" then the client "can begin to experience and deal with the internal feelings and conflicts which he finds threatening within himself" (Rogers, 1961, p. 54).

Non-judgment

Even though judgments are part of many of the aspects of our lives, one of the hopes within the therapeutic relationship is to free the client from threats of external judgment, whether the judgment be positive or negative. The counselor seeks for the fully accepting relationship
so that he has no desire to judge. This kind of a relationship, free of judgment will "permit the other person to reach the point where he recognizes that the center of responsibility lies within himself" (Rogers, 1961, p. 55).

Confirming of Others

To confirm others is to see them in the process of becoming—not limited by their or the counselor's past. If others are already labeled—poor student, neurotic person, then limits are already present and the relationship does not confirm the person. If we can confirm "him as a living person, capable of creative inner development" (Rogers, 1961, p. 56) then he is freed to live to the height of his potentialities.

Permitting Separateness

If within the counseling relationship, the counselor is able to permit the other to be, able to give the other freedom, and not feel that advice should be followed or life style altered to fit the values of the counselor, then this freedom enables the client to move toward independence and separateness. "Can I permit him to be what he is,—honest or deceitful, infantile or adult, despairing or over-confident?" (Rogers, 1961, p. 53).
Acting

This area sets forth the counselor as acting, not only in response to the client, but with initiative and involvement of his own person. Here are included three characteristics of Carkhuff's list; concreteness, genuine-ness and self-disclosure, and three characteristics of Roger's work, transparency, trustworthiness, and being separate. The acting is toward clarification, the elimination of misunderstanding, the banishing of fears and the bringing of light to illuminate the wholeness of the person and the relation between the counselor and client. The characteristics of this area do not permit the construction of illusions nor yielding to the temptation to live in them; rather the client is nudged, guided, stimulated, accompanied and winsomely called toward that reality which exists within the client as well as in the total situation. These acting characteristics must be operative in every counseling situation at all times. Being genuine in some areas of the counseling relationship while covering and deceptive in others, or being concrete in some responses, while evasive and confusing in others are not seen as helpful or as a valid part of the acting area of the model.

Transparency contributes to the unambiguosness of the relationship for the transparent counselor communicates
what he feels at the moment. The client who is unconditionally accepted as a person of worth will be facilitated in living apart from the control or shadow of others without dependency upon others or things. That freedom increases the possibility that the client may respond to the uniqueness and potential within.

**Concreteness**

Concreteness is the counselor's skill in facilitating increased explicitness and specificity about the problem facing the client. It can be helpful in clarifying plans: "When will you start?" in seeking accuracy; "What specifically is your fear?" in focusing on problem areas; "What part seems to be most threatening to you?" It seeks to remove ambiguity. Concreteness involves "the fluent, direct and complete expression of specific feelings and experiences, regardless of their emotional context" (Carkhuff and Berenson, 1977, p. 13).

**Trustworthiness**

Trustworthiness is to be dependable, consistent not only in the outward form of the relationship, but real and congruent within so that "whatever feeling or attitude I am experiencing would be matched by my awareness of that attitude" (Rogers, 1961, p. 51). The counselor recognizes that, if there are feelings of annoyance or hurt within,
and if an attempt is made to cover or pass over these, the result is perceived by the other as being untrustworthy.

**Genuineness**

Genuineness is the counselor's ability to be open, spontaneous and congruent, sharing true feelings and reactions, using them constructively in the counseling relationship. To be genuine is not to play the therapeutic role, not to be fake or artificial, not simply to be 'doing a job'. Without genuineness a trusting relationship can hardly exist. "The counselor must be a real person in the encounter, presenting himself without defensive phoniness, without hiding behind the facade of the professional role" (Truax and Carkhuff, 1967, p. 329).

**Being Separate**

A helpful counselor is one who respects his own feelings, understands and accepts his own needs and who discovers the joy of being a separate person even though feeling close and accepted by others. "Am I strong enough in my own separateness that I will not be down-cast by his depression, frightened by his fear, nor engulfed by his dependency? Is my inner self hardy enough to realize that I am not destroyed by his anger, taken over by his need for dependence, nor enslaved by his love, but that I exist separate from him with feelings and rights of my
Self-Disclosure

The counselor shares opinions, values, experiences, etc., that are appropriate and helpful to the counseling relationship believing that this will enable the communication to move to new depths of sharing. This is close to high levels of genuineness. "Self disclosure is the helper's ability to reveal his opinion or personal life in a way that is either relevant to the helpee's concerns or to the development of trust and equality in their relationship" (Symor, 1976, Ch. 5).

Transparency

Here the counselor seeks to communicate self unambiguously; that messages given to the other, verbally or non-verbally are not contradictory, that feelings which are relevant to the relationship are not hidden.

When words of the counselor give one message but the client picks up feelings of other messages, the transparency has been lost. "The most basic learning for anyone who hopes to establish any kind of helping relationship is that it is safe to be transparently real" (Rogers, 1961, p. 51).
Challenging

This area contains within it three action-orientated characteristics of Carkhuff; confrontation, immediacy and self-exploration. Here in this area of challenge we see an emphasis on the concept of commitment—commitment to the challenge of life, to the understanding of self, to the full use of the present moment, and to the discovery of one's glory in creation. The challenge here is that given by life itself: Who will we be? What will we do with our life? Where is the center of our strength? What are the values upon which we chose to live or die?

Confronting

The counselor confronts the client when he senses contradictions in what the client is saying, or differences between what he says and how he acts. In a situation where the client has nothing good to say about his family, only expressing disgust for them but yet continues to live at home, the counselor may confront the client with the discrepancy between words and actions, using the confrontation to move beyond the present counseling position. "Confrontation is the helper's ability to communicate his experiences of discrepancies in the other's aspirations, behavior, feelings, perceptions, or statements, in such a way as to constructively further the helpee's self-understanding" (Symor, 1976, Ch. 6).
Immediacy

Immediacy is the active use of the present moment in the counseling relationship, the counselor making use of insights that he has gleaned from the situation to further and deepen the client's understanding of self and of personal situations. "The helper acts on what he sees going on between himself and the helpee" (Carkhuff, 1969, 1, p. 192).

Self-Exploration

The counselor seeks to assist the client to explore his own feelings and experiences in relation to the problem area. It is a sincere attempt to help the client to know the reasons for actions and the basis for beliefs. The form can be either a continuous exploration or a spontaneous probing for the sake of understanding the self. "In successful psychotherapy, both individual and group, the patient spends much of his time in self exploration--attempting to understand and define his own beliefs, values, motives, and actions--while the therapist, by reason of his training and knowledge, is attempting to facilitate this process" (Truax and Carkhuff, 1967, p. 189).
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