



CHRISTIAN FAITH PERSPECTIVES IN  
LEADERSHIP AND BUSINESS

# Biblical Organizational Leadership

*Principles from the Life of Jesus  
in the Gospel of John*

*Edited by*

JOSHUA D. HENSON



palgrave  
macmillan

# Christian Faith Perspectives in Leadership and Business

## Series Editors

Doris Gomez, Regent University, Virginia Beach, VA, USA

Kathleen Patterson, School of Global Leadership and  
Entrepreneurship, Regent University  
Virginia Beach, VA, USA

Bruce E. Winston, Regent University, Virginia Beach, VA,  
USA

Gary Oster, Regent University, Virginia Beach, VA, USA

This book series is designed to integrate Christian faith-based perspectives into the field of leadership and business, widening its influence by taking a deeper look at its foundational roots. It is led by a team of experts from Regent University, recognized by the Coalition of Christian Colleges and Universities as the leader in servant leadership research and the first Christian University to integrate innovation, design thinking, and entrepreneurship courses in its Masters and Doctoral programs. Stemming from Regent's hallmark values of innovation and Christian faith-based perspectives, the series aims to put forth top-notch scholarship from current faculty, students, and alumni of Regent's School of Business & Leadership, allowing for both scholarly and practical aspects to be addressed while providing robust content and relevant material to readers. Each volume in the series will contribute to filling the void of a scholarly Christian-faith perspective on key aspects of organizational leadership and business such as Business and Innovation, Biblical Perspectives in Business and Leadership, and Servant Leadership. The series takes a unique approach to such broad-based and well-trodden disciplines as leadership, business, innovation, and entrepreneurship, positioning itself as a much-needed resource for students, academics, and leaders rooted in Christian-faith traditions.

More information about this series at  
<http://www.palgrave.com/gp/series/15425>

Joshua D. Henson  
Editor

# Biblical Organizational Leadership

Principles from the Life of Jesus in the Gospel of  
John

palgrave  
macmillan

*Editor*

Joshua D. Henson  
Regent University  
Ocala, FL, USA

Christian Faith Perspectives in Leadership and Business

ISBN 978-3-030-69928-4 ISBN 978-3-030-69929-1 (eBook)

<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-69929-1>

© The Editor(s) (if applicable) and The Author(s), under exclusive licence to Springer Nature Switzerland AG, part of Springer Nature 2021

Scripture quotations marked (ESV) are from The ESV® Bible (The Holy Bible, English Standard Version®), copyright © 2001 by Crossway, a publishing ministry of Good News Publishers. Used by permission. All rights reserved.

Scripture quotations marked (NIV) are taken from the Holy Bible, New International Version®, NIV®. Copyright © 1973, 1978, 1984, 2011 by Biblica, Inc.™ Used by permission of Zondervan. All rights reserved worldwide. [www.zondervan.com](http://www.zondervan.com). The “NIV” and “New International Version” are trademarks registered in the United States Patent and Trademark Office by Biblica, Inc.™

Scripture quotations marked (NASB®) are taken from the New American Standard Bible®, Copyright © 1960, 1971, 1977, 1995, 2020 by The Lockman Foundation. Used by permission. All rights reserved. [www.lockman.org](http://www.lockman.org).

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are solely and exclusively licensed by the Publisher, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other physical way, and transmission or information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed.

The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use.

The publisher, the authors and the editors are safe to assume that the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication. Neither the publisher nor the authors or the editors give a warranty, expressed or implied, with respect to the material contained herein or for any errors or omissions that may have been made. The publisher remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

This Palgrave Macmillan imprint is published by the registered company Springer Nature Switzerland AG

The registered company address is: Gewerbestrasse 11, 6330 Cham, Switzerland

*This book is dedicated to our colleague, friend, and fellow author*

*Kamerin Lauren, Ph.D.  
March 01, 1979 -  
September 27, 2020*

*Dr. Lauren had a heart to rediscover biblical restorative justice and servant leadership. She wrote in her dissertation: “The law according to God, as revealed through Jesus is merciful, it is ethical, and it considers all people. Justice is not intended solely for the ruling class, but rather in place to protect those without power.”*

*In Chapter Six, she wrote: “The currency of Heaven is service and servanthood is pleasing to God. Jesus humbled Himself to the point of death to set an example.”*

*Dr. Kamerin Lauren, following in the footsteps of Jesus, set an example for all to follow: one of passion, courage, service, dedication, love, and faith.  
Rest in God’s presence dear friend.*

## INTRODUCTION

Both sacred and secular theories of leadership have long considered Jesus as an exemplar of effective leadership. Yet, there is no consensus on Jesus' leadership style. Some pose that Jesus was a servant leader: pointing to Greenleaf's (1977/2002) and Wilkes' (1998) exploration of the life and leadership of Jesus. Others point to the spiritual and ethical aspects of Jesus' leadership (Bass, 2008), while some researchers and authors have attempted a more holistic perspective of Jesus' leadership.

Since the early 2000's, Kousez and Posner have published a series of books related to their seminal work *The Leadership Challenge* published in 1987. In 2004, they published *Christian Reflections of the Leadership Challenge*. In this book, they partnered with Christian leaders to explore leadership from a Christian perspective. In their introduction, the authors spoke directly to the problem: "Jesus has been called the greatest leaders of all time, but his leadership strategy—if you could even call it that—turned conventional wisdom on its ear" (Kouzes & Posner, 2006, p. ix). While Kousez and Posner also leaned toward the conceptualization of Jesus as a servant leader, they recognized the difficulty of defining His leadership.

In this book, we argue that the Divine nature of the incarnate Jesus lived-out among humanity makes it virtually impossible to fully grasp the depth of Jesus' leadership and message to the world. The Apostle Paul wrote of this limitation: "For now we see in a mirror dimly, but then face to face. Now I know in part; then I shall know fully, even as I have been

fully known” (*English Standard Version*, 2001/2016; 1 Cor. 13:12). On this side of eternity, we will always be limited by human understanding. To borrow from a familiar metaphor, the person and work of Jesus Christ is like a masterful painting: there is depth, texture, color, and perspective. With a small change of light or shift in one’s viewing angle, the masterpiece yields new awareness.

Likewise, the examination of the leadership of Jesus provides new depth and fresh insight with every study, narrative, and methodology. While the leadership of Jesus has long been a focus of leadership researchers, there is always a need for fresh perspectives. The majority of the work on the leadership of Jesus is generally divided into two camps: biblical studies and leadership studies. Those from the biblical studies field heavily engage the life and ministry of Jesus while failing to consider the contemporary applications provided by the social sciences. On the other hand, those from the social scientific perspective focus on contemporary application without delving deeply into the hermeneutical and theological foundations that yield rich data from the life of Jesus.

More recently, there has been a considerable push toward a thorough exploration of biblical principles of organizational leadership. From scholarly articles and dissertations to academic books, more and more is being written on biblical leadership. Since 2018, the *Christian Faith Perspectives in Leadership and Business* has published works on topics such as servant leadership, ethical leadership, leadership development, followership, crisis leadership, and employee development and evaluation from a biblical perspective. Many of these books to some degree engaged the life and leadership of Jesus; however, Jesus was not the exclusive focus of any of them.

In 2020, the editor and contributing author of *Modern Metaphors of Christian Leadership*, Dr. Joshua Henson, wrote a concluding chapter that explored 16 modern metaphors of Christian leadership within the context of the Gospel of John. From that chapter a question was born: What could we learn about the leadership of Jesus by exclusively exploring the narratives and discourses of the Gospel of John? Thus, the vision for this book was birthed.



## THE SCOPE

Once more returning to the painting metaphor, we argue that viewing the leadership of Jesus in a fresh light may offer new perspective and insight. *Biblical Organizational Leadership* offers a unique contribution to both the fields of biblical studies and organizational leadership by engaging in in-depth exegesis with the purpose of applying the extrapolated principles to the contemporary organizational context. The Gospel of John was chosen as the data source for this book for the following reasons. First, the Gospel of John is unique to the Gospels in that it is not part of the Synoptic Gospels. Second, it was written toward the end of the first-century being authored by the last living Apostle of Jesus Christ, John. Third, the narratives and discourses contained in the Gospel offer overt and intentional data related to the identity of Jesus Christ and His behavior as the leader of the Kingdom of God.

There are, however, limitations with the scope of this book. Namely, not every passage in the Gospel of John was examined. Further, there are multiple chapters that explore large portions of the same passages. Last, there is the potential for other interpretations of the exegetical data we provide, and the data may offer insights to other leadership theories not explored herein. We recognize that this book cannot adequately portray the totality of the leadership of Jesus Christ. Given this, we seek to build upon the work of Christian scholarship and provide a fresh perspective on biblical organizational leadership in the contemporary context.

## THE METHODOLOGY

Our research began by asking: What could we learn about the leadership of Jesus by exclusively exploring the narratives and discourses of the Gospel of John? After a designated period of reflective thought and research, the contributing authors presented a proposal that provided potential passages to be studied, related theoretical constructs, and potential themes or principles that may arise from the study. We recognize that this book provides a limited sampling of possible theories and passages from the Gospel of John; however, these chapters serve as a balanced sampling of both common and unique theoretical and practical perspectives of leadership.

The contributing authors employed grammatical-historical criticism, socio-rhetorical analysis, and narrative analysis methodologies as outlined

by Henson et al. (2020). As an additional layer of exegetical research, many of the authors engaged in Greek word studies as well as research into the social and cultural practices of first-century Judaism. Lastly, the authors applied contemporary organizational leadership literature to the themes and data extracted from their perspective passages and developed principles for biblical organizational leadership.

## THE CONTENT

Each chapter contains the following: (a) an introduction of the theoretical lens to which the exegesis will be applied, (b) an overview and background of the passage(s) as necessary, (c) themes extracted from the passage(s), (d) an integration of themes from the passage(s) and organizational leadership theory, (e) principles derived from each theme, and (f) discussion questions that provide opportunities for reflection on key themes from each chapter.

Chapter 1 explores Jesus as a dynamic force and communicator using the metaphor of the Word, or *logos*, in John 1. Chapter 2 considers Jesus as servant and disruptor investigating the actions of Jesus in cleansing the Temple in John 2. Chapter 3 examines Jesus' emotional awareness in His conversation with the Samaritan woman in John 4. Chapter 4 explores Jesus as mentor in the feeding of the five thousand in John 6. Chapter 5 researches Jesus as overcomer in the narrative of the resurrection of Lazarus in John 11. Chapter 6 reviews the act of Jesus' washing the disciples' feet in John 13 in consideration of Jesus as humble servant. Chapter 7 examines John 13 within the framework of Kouzes and Posner's (2012) model of exemplary leadership. Chapter 8 analyzes Jesus as authentic leader in the narrative of John 14. Chapter 9 researches succession planning through the lens of Jesus' high priestly prayer in John 17. Chapter 10 reviews the restorative nature of Jesus' leadership in John 21. Chapter 11 explores Jesus' loving leadership and follower empowerment through the lens of John 21. Chapter 12 explores the role of solitude and introspection in Jesus' leadership through an analysis of multiple passages in John. Chapter 13 researches Jesus as a transformational leader through narratives of three strategic passages in John 3, 7, and 19.

While not a complete analysis of all passages contained in the Gospel of John, this book provides an extensive exploration of key narratives and discourses in the Gospel. Further, the book not only explores popular

leadership theories such as servant, transformational, and authentic leadership but also discusses corollary characteristics of effective leadership such as emotional awareness, humility, empowerment, communication, and introspection. Each chapter provides practical principles for contemporary organizational leaders while offering reflective discussion questions to provoke further conversation.

Joshua D. Henson

## REFERENCES

- Bass, B. M. (2008). *The Bass handbook of leadership: Theory, research, and managerial applications* (4th ed.). New York, NY: The Free Press.
- Greenleaf, R. K. (with Covey, S. R., & Senge, P. M.). (2002). In L. Spears (Ed.), *Servant leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power & greatness* (50th anniversary ed). Paulist Press. (Original work published 1977).
- Henson, J. D., Crowther, S. S., & Huizinga, R. L. (2020). *Exegetical analysis: A practical guide for applying biblical research to the social sciences*. Kendall Hunt Publishing Company.
- Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (Eds.). (2006). *Christian reflections on the leadership challenge*. Wiley.
- Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2012). *The leadership challenge: How to make extraordinary things happen in organizations* (5th ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Wilkes, C. G. (1998). *Jesus on leadership*. Tyndale House Publishers.

# CONTENTS

<b>1</b>	<b>Jesus as Dynamic Force and Communicator</b>	<b>1</b>
	James A. (Andy) Wood Jr.	
<b>2</b>	<b>Jesus as Servant and Disruptor</b>	<b>31</b>
	Debra J. Dean	
<b>3</b>	<b>Jesus and Emotional Awareness</b>	<b>51</b>
	Carlo A. Serrano	
<b>4</b>	<b>Jesus as Mentor</b>	<b>71</b>
	Sam Dobrotka	
<b>5</b>	<b>Jesus as Overcomer</b>	<b>89</b>
	Alex G. Wright	
<b>6</b>	<b>Jesus as Humble Servant</b>	<b>105</b>
	Kamerin S. Lauren and Joshua D. Henson	
<b>7</b>	<b>Jesus as an Exemplary Leader</b>	<b>121</b>
	Craig A. Bell	
<b>8</b>	<b>Jesus as an Authentic Leader</b>	<b>141</b>
	Stuart W. Boyer	
<b>9</b>	<b>Jesus and Succession Planning</b>	<b>159</b>
	Suzana Dobric Veiss and Elizabeth K. Hunt	
<b>10</b>	<b>Jesus as a Restoring Leader</b>	<b>175</b>
	W. David Winner	

<b>11</b>	<b>Jesus as a Loving Leader</b>	<b>187</b>
	Christa M. Bonnet	
<b>12</b>	<b>Jesus as an Introspective Leader</b>	<b>207</b>
	Chad M. Minor	
<b>13</b>	<b>Jesus as a Transformational Leader</b>	<b>227</b>
	Kenneth S. Dixon	
	<b>Index</b>	<b>247</b>

## NOTES ON CONTRIBUTORS

**Craig A. Bell** is a Managing Partner of Bell, Griffin & Associates, a premier, full-service consulting practice to faith-based, governmental, and nonprofit organizations. He is a highly sought after thought leader, strategist, change agent, and motivational speaker on international, national, regional, and local levels. He has over 30 years of project and logistics management experience as a corporate Project/Change Manager for Fortune 500 companies. Additionally, he has over 25 years of executive leadership experience in Ecclesial service. Mr. Bell has an earned Doctor of Strategic Leadership degree in Ecclesial Leadership from Regent University.

**Christa M. Bonnet** is the Founder of *The Difference Makers Africa* NPO with a focus on the empowerment of female entrepreneurs. She fulfills a variety of roles including that of mother, social entrepreneur, business owner, and consultant. She is an emerging author, a qualified Master NLP Coach and Practitioner, and Master SQ & Quantum Leadership Trainer. She is also a specialist in Enterprise and Supplier Development in South Africa. Her research interests include Christian leadership, spiritual formation, spiritual intelligence (SQ), and transformation. Christa graduated in 2020 at Regent University (Virginia Beach) with a Ph.D. in Organizational Leadership.

**Stuart W. Boyer** serves as the Chief Academic Officer of Pacific Bible College and interim dean of enrollment services. He previously served as

professor of Biblical Studies and Practical Theology at Horizon University USA; also serving at Yellowstone Christian College and Calvary Chapel Bible College. He holds a Ph.D. in Organizational Leadership from Regent University USA. He is the author of *Biblical Leadership Development*. His career spans industries as a pastor-leader, mentor, initiator, and facilitator with an amiable personality. He has been involved in the organization, scheduling, planning, and implementation of evangelical ministries around the world.

**W. David Winner** currently teaches and is the coordinator of the Human Resource Development concentration in the Organizational Leadership Ph.D. program in the School of Business at Regent University. He also served 20 years in churches working with teenagers and young adults. Dave has a B.A. in Youth Ministry from Eastern University, a MDIV from Palmer Theological Seminary, and my Ph.D. in Organizational Leadership with a major in Human Resource Development from Regent University.

**Debra J. Dean** is an Adjunct Professor at Regent University. She has 25+ years of experience in corporate with responsibilities including, but not limited to, business transformation and operations excellence. She is a published researcher with work related to faith at work, followership, organizational metaphors, respectful pluralism, and social responsibility. She is a sought-after speaker on topics of faith at work and diversity & inclusion. She holds a Ph.D. from Regent University. Dean holds many titles including the 2020 Woman of Influence, Most Influential Business Consultancy CEO, Operational Excellence Leader of the Year, and Top Female Leader of the Year.

**Kenneth S. Dixon** is retired from the US Army after serving over 20 years of service. He is the Founder and Owner of K. Dixon's Leadership Consulting & Facilitation. Kenneth has a Bachelor of Science and a Master of Science degrees, both of which he attained from Southern Nazarene University in Bethany, Oklahoma. Kenneth also has a doctorate in Strategic Leadership from Regent University in Virginia Beach, Virginia. Kenneth enjoys exercising, reading, and writing. Kenneth lives in Arlington, Texas, just outside of Dallas with his wife, Sharion, of 17 years, and his 14-year-old son, Kenneth Jr., AKA, K.J.

**Sam Dobrotka** serves as campus pastor at Grace Covenant Statesville (NC). In addition to his role as pastor, he also teaches as an Adjunct

Professor at Southeastern University, SUM Bible College & Theological Seminary, and Development Associates International. Dr. Dobrotka earned his Ph.D. in Organizational Leadership from Regent University and holds M.A. degrees (Theology and Cross-Cultural Studies) from Fuller Theological Seminary. His research interests lie in the areas of clergy effectiveness, strategic planning, organizational change, team building, and conflict management.

**Joshua D. Henson** is the Founder of Rediscover Oikos, LL.C., a Christian leadership coaching and church consulting company. He is also an Adjunct Professor of Organizational Leadership at Regent University and Southeastern University. He serves as the Editor of the *Journal of Biblical Perspectives in Leadership*. He has published multiple articles and books including: *Exegetical Analysis: A Practical Guide for Applying Biblical Research in the Social Sciences*. He also serves as the Lead Pastor of Crossroads Church in Ocala, FL.

**Elizabeth K. Hunt** is an Associate Professor and Chair of the Department of Communication and Director of Character in Leadership at the University of Jamestown in Jamestown, ND. Hunt is also a principal partner at Lili, LL.C., providing services in the areas of organizational leadership, higher education, and curriculum development. Hunt holds a Ph.D. in Organizational Leadership from Regent University. Her research interests include sensemaking, leadership communication, organizational culture and climate, servant leadership, and values and character education.

**Kamerin S. Lauren** passed away after a long, courageous battle with cancer on September 27, 2020, just prior to the publishing of this book. She taught and served as a Professor in the Graduate & Professional Studies program at Oklahoma Wesleyan University. Lauren was also an IT Project Manager providing services in the areas of organizational leadership and project management for the Department of Defense (DoD) Office of the Inspector General (DoD OIG). Lauren held a Ph.D. in Organizational Leadership program from Regent University focusing on Ecclesial Leadership. In addition, Dr. Lauren held an M.A. in Government, focusing on Middle East Politics and Counterterrorism as well as an M.B.A.

**Chad M. Minor** lives with his wife Jamie and two boys William and Jackson in Canton, Ohio. Chad was selected as the 2019 Graduate School



Alumnus of the Year at Malone University and was recognized in 2018 as a City of Canton Difference Maker by The Canton Repository. He serves on the Board of Directors at Urban Ark Canton. He is part of The One Center for Leadership which strives to multiply kingdom leaders through catalytic conferences, collaborative workspaces, and customized coaching. He is currently studying for a Ph.D. in Organizational Leadership at Regent University in Virginia Beach, Virginia.

**Carlo A. Serrano** is a Professor and the Director of the Master of Arts in Christian Leadership program at Grace College of Divinity, USA. He also serves as an Adjunct Professor at Regent University, USA. He has over 15 years of combined experience in executive leadership as a pastor, nonprofit board member, and organizational consultant. Serrano is a published researcher with work related to resilience, leadership emergence, ethical leadership, and servant leadership. He holds a Ph.D. from Regent University. In 2019, Serrano was selected “Faculty of the Year” for Grace College of Divinity. He also serves as the teaching pastor for oneChurch.tv in Clarksville, TN.

**Suzana Dobric Veiss** teaches and serves as a program director in the School of Business at Fresno Pacific University, California. Veiss is also a principal partner at Lili, LL.C., providing services in the areas of organizational leadership, higher education, and curriculum development. Veiss holds Ph.D. in Organizational Leadership program from Regent University. She has served on the board of trustees’ executive leadership of the university and of numerous nonprofit organizations.

**James A. (Andy) Wood, Jr.** is the managing partner of the LifeVesting Group in Mobile, AL, providing executive leadership coaching, consulting, counseling, and communication services to clients worldwide. He is an Adjunct Professor in the School of Business and Leadership at Regent University and the Alabama School of the Arts at the University of Mobile. As a university professor, he has taught nearly 500 sections at every level in various institutions. He also has 32 years of church ministry experience as a senior pastor, church planter, men’s pastor, worship leader, and youth pastor in Texas, Alabama, Mississippi, and Manitoba.

**Alex G. Wright** is a Teacher, Preacher, Theologian, and the founding Senior Pastor of Beacon Christian Church in Lexington, KY. He holds a Master of Divinity from Asbury Theological Seminary and a Ph.D. in Organizational Leadership from Regent University. His research interests include justice, trust, and empowerment. Alex enjoys reading and sports. He lives in rural Kentucky with his wife Rachel and their three children.

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.1	The dynamic actions and communication of the Logos	8
Table 1.2	The relationship between the identity and actions of the Logos, modern leadership research, and the actions of a Logos-inspired leader	17
Table 4.1	Mentoring principles of Jesus observed in John 6:1–13	83



## Jesus as Dynamic Force and Communicator

*James A. (Andy) Wood Jr.*

Any understanding of the leadership of Jesus as presented in John's gospel should begin where John does—in the beginning. In contrast to the synoptic gospels which begin with the genealogy of Jesus' earthly family (Matthew), the birth of John the Baptist and Jesus (Luke), or the ministry of the Baptizer in the desert (Mark), John begins his narrative in eternity past. Echoing the creation theme in Genesis, he declares, "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God" (John 1:1). His gospel is founded on the premise that the life, lordship, and leadership of Jesus Christ can only be understood in its eternal context. The Fourth Gospel describes the arrival and influence of One who first spoke the universe into existence, then as Word-made-flesh arrived on the scene as a dynamic force and communicator. Simply put, he was a leader.

The purpose of this chapter is to explore the leadership of Jesus in light of the Prologue to John's Gospel (John 1:1–18). Central to our understanding of that is the word John first uses to describe who Jesus

---

J. A. (Andy) Wood Jr. (✉)  
LifeVesting Group, Mobile, AL, USA  
e-mail: [andy@lifevesting.com](mailto:andy@lifevesting.com)

© The Author(s), under exclusive license to Springer Nature  
Switzerland AG 2021

J. D. Henson (ed.), *Biblical Organizational Leadership*,  
Christian Faith Perspectives in Leadership and Business,  
[https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-69929-1\\_1](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-69929-1_1)

was and what he did—*logos*. While the English translation (“word”) falls flatly to a Western mindset, the concept has deep-rooted meaning in both Hebrew theology and Greek thought. Those traditions converge in the arrival of Jesus, the Word made flesh. To the Jew he embodied the Old Testament “Word of the Lord”—a dynamic force, powerful in his self-expression (Carson, 1991), to create, reveal, or order reality (Borchert, 1996). To the Gentile Jesus is the embodiment of the rational power of speech and thought and the means of persuasion and direction (Schrenk et al., 1964)—hence the manifestation of the power to communicate.

## A PERSPECTIVE ON THIS STUDY

In light of the redemptive purposes of the coming of Jesus, examining him as a leader, particularly based on the Prologue to John, may appear extraneous at best and offensively trivial at worst. Nothing could be further from the truth. This study will show that Jesus was the perfect embodiment of a proper understanding of leadership. As I will show in more detail later, John defines the coming of Jesus as a change agent who creates (v. 3), gives life (vv. 4, 11–12), enlightens (vv. 4, 9), and overcomes resistance (v. 5). Jesus communicated as a reflection of His incarnation (v. 14): He identified with, associated with, and revealed God’s glory, grace, and truth to the world (v. 9). John the Baptist referred to Jesus as having a higher rank (v. 15), and even the word for “declared” in v. 18 has as its root meaning “to lead out” (Bloomfield, 1840). All this and more is the stuff of leadership.

Another objection has to do with whether this can be any more than a futile academic exercise. As this argument goes, no one has the capacity to follow Jesus’ example as a leader; he is literally a world apart. Yet Jesus himself offered an explicit example to be intentionally followed when he washed the disciples’ feet (John 13:12–15). Moreover, his promises of the coming Holy Spirit and the resultant power make it clear that holding Christ up as an example of leadership is anything but futile (John 14:12). The leadership qualities Jesus demonstrated are not limited to being *inspirational*—through the power of the Holy Spirit they are also *imitable*, *impactful*, and *imperative*. He invites all who follow him to imitate his example, even though we may fall short of perfectly duplicating his effort. *Logos*-inspired leadership, rightly understood, carries great impact in any relational or organizational context. More than a good idea, for Christians in any context, it calls for nothing short of obedience.

## HOW THIS CHAPTER IS ORGANIZED

Before delving into an exegesis of the Prologue, I will first briefly review the two tributary roots of the *Logos* concept—the Old Testament understanding of the “Word of the Lord” and the Greek personification and deification of the *Logos*—a rational, invisible force that communicates. These converge to present an Ultimate Leader who is the *Logos* personified—a dynamic force and a communicator. The exegesis will be organized accordingly. I will show that as a dynamic force, Jesus created all things (v. 2), gives life (vv. 4, 11–12), gives light to every person (vv. 4, 9), and overcomes resistance (v. 5). As communicator, Jesus identified with our human state (v. 14), associated with us freely, despite our unworthiness (v. 14), revealed God’s glory, full of grace and truth (v. 14), and declared to the world what God was like (v. 18). Following the exegesis, I discuss a model of *Logos*-inspired leadership that reflects the eight leadership activities that Jesus demonstrated and trends in contemporary leadership research. The *Logos*-inspired leader follows the example of Jesus by innovating, enlivening, enlightening, competing, understanding, engaging, modeling, and sense-giving. The chapter concludes with a call for leaders to follow the example of the *Logos* made flesh.

## DEVELOPMENT OF THE *LOGOS* CONCEPT

It is beyond the scope of this chapter to explore every theory in detail related to why John referred to Christ with a popular philosophical and theological term elsewhere not found in the gospels. The word itself is used in three ways in the New Testament: (a) the standard meaning designating a word, speech, or act of speaking, (b) the special revelation of God to people, and (c) the revelation of God as Jesus the Messiah (Estes, 2016). According to Schrenk et al. (1964), *logos* has the original sense of “counting,” “reckoning,” or “explaining.” Thus, it came to mean “counting up” or “recounting,” an “account” that includes the sum of individual words to form a comprehensive construct “speech,” “language,” “sentence,” or “saying” (pp. 77–78). As usage continued to develop, the idea of accounting was extended to include a principle or law that can be calculated or discovered in calculation. This led to a reference to man’s ability to think or argue rationally. In the widest and most varied sense, *logos* is used for “what is spoken”—hence, “word”—“rationally established and constructed speech” (Schrenk et al., p. 74).

Vincent (1887) states that *logos* is a collection of both things in the mind and the words by which they are expressed. “As *logos* has the double meaning of *thought* and *speech*, so Christ is related to God as the word to the idea, the word being not merely a *name* for the idea, but the idea itself expressed” (p. 32). Newman and Nida (1993) add that this is more than a lexical or grammatical unit used to build sentences. *Logos* “is more accurately understood as an expression with meaning; that is, it is ‘a message,’ ‘a communication’... a type of ‘revelation’” (p. 7). *Logos* is the means by which one makes his thought, feeling, and desires known. It carries the imprint of the character, intelligence, and purpose of the one who utters it (Dods, 1903).

### EXPLANATIONS FOR THE USE OF *LOGOS*

Christianity was cradled in Judaism, but it was destined for the world (Barclay, 1979). John’s gospel seems intent on communicating to that world in all its diversity. Many theories have emerged over the years to account for John’s choice to use the term. Miller (1993) reviews nine of the most prominent ones:

1. The Old Testament *dabar*, which often represents the word of God as eternal, creative, sustaining, healing, redemptive, and prophetic.
2. The late Jewish *sophia*, “wisdom,” which in the wisdom literature is personified and represented as the first of God’s creations and the means through which God created all else.
3. Greek philosophy, particularly the *Logos* doctrines of Heraclitus, Epicharmus, and the Stoics.
4. Philo Judaeus who, in his synthesis of Hebrew theology and Greek philosophy, employed *logos* over 1200 times to designate the mind of God, the creative instrument of God, the bond and preserver of all existing things, the mediator between the creator and creature.
5. The Aramaic *memra*, translated “word,” which, some have alleged, occurs in the targums of the OT as a divine hypostasis.
6. Rabbinic speculation on the Torah in which the Law is portrayed as interchangeable with “the word of the Lord.”
7. Gnostic sources, in which the Word functions as an intermediary between the material and spiritual realms.

8. The Hellenistic-Gnostic redeemer myth, the Johannine Logos having been mediated through the tradition reflected in the Mandaeans and the *Odes of Solomon*.
9. The view that the Johannine Logos represents the breaking of the divine silence.

Miller argues against all these, asserting that the meaning of John's use of *Logos* originates in his use of the terms *logos* and *rhema* throughout the Fourth Gospel itself. Bryant and Krause (1998) agree, asserting that the term emerged from Jesus' own preaching and ministering. The most common explanation, albeit without consensus, is that John's use of *logos* reflects the Hebrew emphasis as word-in-action *and* the Greek idea of logical, ordered communication reflecting the thought and the being of the communicator (Beasley-Murray, 1999). Below is a deeper exploration of these two streams of understanding.

### THE OLD TESTAMENT "WORD OF THE LORD"

John begins with language reflective of the creation of the world through the word of God in Genesis. Kim (2009) argues that John's prologue, as is the entire gospel, is immersed in Old Testament theology. Allen (1996) adds that John deliberately builds on Hebrew words and phrases because of the clear link of Jesus Christ to revelations of Yahweh in the Hebrew Bible. Gaston (2014) argues that the Fourth Gospel is inherently Semitic in character. This points to the Hebrew word *dabar*, typically translated "word" as is *logos*. Schrenk et al. (1964) trace two main elements to *dabar*—the dianoetic and the dynamic. From the dianoetic perspective, *dabar* always represents a thought and belongs to the field of knowledge. To grasp the *dabar* of a thing is to grasp the thing itself. The dynamic element is reflected in the power of a word. "Every *dabar* is filled with power which can be manifested in the most diverse energies. This power is felt by the one who receives the word and takes it to himself" (p. 92). That dynamic energy applies to any word, most of all to the word of God. Deeply rooted in Hebrew thought, the conception of any word is an effective and creative power (Barclay, 1979). Paterson (1954) describes the Hebrew spoken word as "fearfully alive. It was not simply a vocable or sound dropped heedlessly from unthinking lips. It was a unit of energy charged with power" (pp. 2–3).



The “word of the Lord” is the means by which God makes himself known, declares his will, and brings about his purposes (Youngblood et al., 1995). It is a means of divine revelation (Maruya, 1981) and demonstrated in creation (Barclay, 1979). The universe came into being because God spoke; his word effects its purpose and accomplishes his will (Isaiah 55:10–11). “God simply speaks, and his powerful word creates” (Carson, 1991, p. 115). Contrary to Western thought, the word is more than just an expression of thought—it was action. And God’s word, specifically, is God in action (Beasley-Murray, 1999), the primary means by which He is present and at work in the world (Youngblood et al.). “The Word of God is God’s power, intelligence, and will in expression; not dormant and potential only, but in active exercise... with creative energy, and communicating life from God, the Source of life and being” (Dods, 1903, p. 120).

## DEVELOPMENT OF *LOGOS* IN GREEK THOUGHT

While John’s gospel was clearly influenced by Old Testament teaching, it was probably written from Ephesus to reach a Greek audience. Barclay (1979) maintains that John used *logos* specifically with the Greeks in mind, and that it was steeped in Greek thought (cf. Beasley-Murray, 1999; Senior, 2008; Kim, 2009; Green et al., 1992). *Logos* has already been described as a term for speech, utterance, and revelation in the sense of “something displayed, clarified, recognized, and understood” (Schrenk et al., 1964, p. 80). But the Greeks used the term in philosophy and theology to describe a metaphysical reality.

It is presupposed as self-evident by the Greek that there is in things, in the world and its course, a primary λόγος, an intelligible and recognizable law, which then makes possible knowledge and understanding in the human λόγος. But this λόγος is not taken to be something which is merely grasped theoretically. It claims a man. It determines his true life and conduct. (Schrenk et al., p. 81)

Heraclitus first introduced the *Logos* in the sixth century B. C. as the force that keeps the world in an orderly state in the midst of flux and chaos (Barclay, 1979). The *Logos* gives shape, form, or life—the eternal principle of order—to the material universe (Green et al., 1992; Barclay). To Heraclitus the *Logos* binds the individual to the whole and forms a

bridge of understanding between man and the world, between men in their political order, between man and God, and between this world and the world above (Schrenk et al., 1964).

The Stoics carried the idea further with the understanding that *logos* is the rational principle by which everything exists. It is the essence of the rational human soul (Carson, 1991). This grew out of the Stoics' fascination with the order of the universe. The *Logos* to the Stoic was the mind of God, creating and sustaining the universe (Barclay, 1979). It is the power which extends throughout matter and works imminently in all things, thus equated with the concept of God and the basis of unity of this world (Schrenk et al., 1964).

Philo, an Alexandrian Jew who lived at generally the same time as Christ, was the first to converge Greek thought about the *Logos* to the Old Testament teaching on the Word of the Lord. With more than 1200 references to the *Logos*, Philo taught that the *Logos* was created, but was incorruptible and eternal. God is the Father of the *Logos* and Wisdom its mother (Barclay, 1979). Philo distinguished between the ideal world, which he called the *Logos* of God, and the real or phenomenal world. *Logos* is the ideal man, the primal man, from which all material beings derive (Carson, 1991). Philo's *Logos* "is the image of God, the second God, between the begotten and the unbegotten. The *Logos* is the instrument of God in creation; the thought of God stamped upon the universe" (Barclay, 1979, p. 31).

The metaphysical reality so evident to Hellenistic thought, combined with the use of *logos* as speech, became the basis by which John begins to describe the life of Christ to a Greek-speaking world. The *Logos* is a form of God's self-communication (Senior, 2008), by which he breaks his silence and comes with words of grace and truth (MacLeod, 2014). God's communication in the Prologue first takes on the form of his word to human beings, who ultimately reject him. Rather than retreating, God communicates even more clearly with a new work, the incarnation of Christ (v. 14).

### CONVERGENCE: THE *LOGOS* AS DYNAMIC FORCE AND COMMUNICATOR

It would be an unnecessary false dichotomy to insist that John's use of *logos* is either Jewish or Greek; as Senior (2008) points out, the term bridges the Semitic and Greek cultures.

As is often noted, “word” in Hebrew (*dabar*) has a dynamic force, implying not only communication but also action or creation. Through the force of “word,” reality itself is created and shaped. In Greek thought, *logos* or “word” often connotes intelligibility or rationality and order, as in the derivative term “logic.” Thus using the metaphor of *logos* enables John not only to speak of God’s creative activity in the world but also to convey the power of communication and coherence that gives ultimate meaning to the world. (Senior, 2008, p. 307)

This convergence of the *Logos* concept as a dynamic force and a communicator is expanded in John’s summary of the work and message of Christ, by which he describes the changes brought about by the *Logos* and the means by which he communicated. This provides the foundation for a model of *Logos*-inspired leadership. Table 1.1 provides a summary of John’s description of the *Logos* and the typology of his work and message.

In order to make the model as clear as possible while staying true to the message of the text, the exegesis that follows will be arranged by category and typology.

**Table 1.1** The dynamic actions and communication of the Logos

<i>Verse</i>	<i>Category</i>	<i>Typology</i>
All things were made through him, and without him was not any thing made that was made (v. 3)	Dynamic force	Creates
In him was life (v. 4a)	Dynamic force	Gives life
the life was the light of men (v. 4b)	Dynamic force	Enlightens
The light shines in the darkness, and the darkness has not overcome it (v. 5)	Dynamic force	Overcomes resistance
The true light, which gives light to everyone, was coming into the world (v. 9)	Dynamic force	Enlightens
And the Word became flesh (v. 14a)	Communicator	Identifies
and dwelt among us (v. 14b)	Communicator	Associates
and we have seen his glory, glory as of the only Son from the Father, full of grace and truth (v. 14c)	Communicator	Reveals
No one has ever seen God; the only God, who is at the Father’s side, he has made him known (v. 18)	Communicator	Declares

## EXEGESIS OF JOHN 1: 1–18

It should be noted from that outset that the summary of qualities assigned to Jesus by John in the Prologue is further described in detail throughout the gospel in general (Carson, 1991) and reflected in the signs Jesus performed (Kim, 2009). All that Jesus did, He did as the Word-made-flesh. This is easily seen throughout the gospel through his signs, his encounters with seekers such as Nicodemus and the Samaritan Woman, and his confrontations with hostile Jews and Romans. This is noteworthy as well in the terms John used in the Prologue to describe responses to the *Logos*. More than simply hearing what the Son of God declared, we beheld (v.14) and either received or rejected him (vv. 11–12, 16). This was a dynamic force and communicator who would not be ignored.

### *The Logos: A Dynamic Force that Creates*

Not only did the world become a harmonic whole through the *Logos*, it was also created through his intervention, thus expressing his creative energy (Cansi, 2015). John states in v. 3 that every single thing that now exists traces its existence back to a *Logos*-driven beginning. “All things” reflects “every single thing,” not “everything all at once” (Reynolds, 1909). The aorist *egeneto* (“came into being”) indicates progress or a process of a creative order from nothing to something that could have taken place at any time (Lenski, 1961)—what Vincent (1887) refers to as “the unfolding of a divine order” (p. 36). The second part of the verse contains the Greek emphatic phrase *oude hen* (“nothing”), which would best be rendered, “not one single thing” (Borchert, 1996). Everything from subatomic particles to galaxies find their source in him (Gangel, 2000). Whatever one’s view of the timing involved in creation, the *Logos* is the instrument through which God manifests his creative power. As a model of leadership, this reflects the leader’s unique role to innovate, either through evolution or revolution, to achieve an envisioned outcome.

*Principle One: The biblical leader is a dynamic force that innovates in order to achieve a desired outcome.*

### THE LOGOS: A DYNAMIC FORCE THAT GIVES LIFE

“In him was life,” John writes (v. 4), a term (*zoe*) he uses 36 times. While it can refer to life in any dimension, in this context it most likely refers

to “eternal life” (Newman & Nida, 1993). To state that “in him was life” is to affirm his life-giving, life-sustaining character (Kling, 2013), the physical, moral, and eternal fountain of life—its principle and source (Vincent, 1887). Says Gangel (2000), “Jesus Christ the Creator provides physical life; Jesus Christ the Redeemer provides spiritual life, and Jesus Christ the Savior provides eternal life” (p. 10).

Eternal life means more than just a never-ending existence, however. “For John *life* (‘eternal life’) describes a quality of existence, that is the kind of life that man has when God rules in his life” (Newman & Nida, 1993, p. 11). In the *Logos*—and only in the *Logos*—was “life in the fullest, highest sense, the eternal, blessed life of God” (Lenski, 1961, p. 38).

It may fitly be said that Jesus came to change existence into life.... Jesus came to lift men out of a weary, drooping, defeated existence into a full, virile, victorious life... In Jesus Christ the mere task of living becomes the real glory of life. (Barclay, 1979, p. 43)

To change and to lift is to *lead*. As leader, the Word-made-flesh comes to do more than simply inspire or enlighten, though that has its place. As Borchert (1996) states, “*Behind light stands a ‘life’ reality...* The Johanne message may suggest that we ought to look for ultimate meaning not merely in our systems or in enlightenment but in the ultimate source of the universe—the Life-giver” (p. 109).

*Principle Two: The biblical leader is a dynamic force that gives quality of life.*

### *The Logos: A Dynamic Force that Enlightens*

Inseparable from the previous phrase, the life that characterized the *Logos* was the “light of men” (v. 4). The concept of light evolved from something desirable and pleasant in the Old Testament to the NT concept of being equated with the power of good, engaged in a struggle with darkness and evil (Newman & Nida, 1993). The definite article suggests that Jesus is not just light in a figurative way—he is the true light (Conzelmann, 1964). The genitive construction (“light of men”) means “light *for* men” (Newman & Nida, 1993, p. 11). Lenski (1961) adds that “light” equals truth, the reality of God’s will, purpose and plans. The *Logos* reveals the life that is inherent in God and can be shared with humanity,

despite the prevalence of death and darkness in the world (Bryant & Krause, 1998).

Lenski (1961) notes that to “give light” (v. 9) is to bestow knowledge of the truth. This knowledge is never merely intellectual but affects one’s entire being—a form of spiritual enlightenment. The emphasis in v. 9 is on the fact that Jesus is the *true* light—that which is real or genuine, as contrasted to that which does not exist or is an imitation (Newman & Nida, 1993). The focus of the word is on completeness and authenticity, steadfastness and faithfulness (Borchert, 1996). “Jesus, then, is the genuine light, the real light. Other lights may flash and fade, other lights may mislead and misdirect. He is the true light” (Barclay, 1979, p. 43).

No limitation or restriction is provided in the language of the text to the impact of the light Jesus gives; the enlightenment of the *Logos* is for every man. This speaks to an important leadership principle, that neither Jesus nor his follower-leaders are limited in their potential influence merely to the Gospel-receptive. *Logos*-inspired leadership brings understanding, truth, and clarity to any and all who are willing to receive it.

*Principle Three: The biblical leader is a dynamic force that brings understanding, truth, and clarity to all who are willing to receive it.*

### *The Logos: A Dynamic Force that Overcomes Resistance*

John describes the light in v. 5 as actively shining in the darkness. As metaphors for moral conditions, darkness and light expose “a terrible antagonism, a fearful negative, a veritable opposition to the light, a blinding of the eye of the soul to the clearest beam of heavenly wisdom, righteousness, and truth” (Reynolds, 1909, p. 10). John hints that the coming of the Messiah would be met with intense opposition—something he enlarges on in vv. 10–11. The world did not recognize him, and his own people rejected him, because they are characterized by darkness (Kim, 2009). “Darkness in the thought of John is not merely lack of knowledge or illumination, it is a symbol of rebellion, conflict, and hostility. It signals an existence both external and internal that opposes God” (Brown, 1965). The present tense “shines” reflects the continuous action of the light, embracing both history and John’s present time, having “gone forth continuously and without interruption from the beginning until now, and is still shining” (Vincent, 1887, p. 40). This reflects an ongoing conflict, though one the outcome of which has

already been decided. John is, after all, writing from a post-Resurrection perspective.

The word describing the response of the darkness to the light (*kate-laben*) could be translated in several different ways, including “comprehend,” “overtake,” “seize,” or “attain.” Vincent (1887) notes that it is used in the sense of “laying hold of so as to make one’s own,” hence, “to take possession of” (p. 41) or “to lay hold of with evil intent” (Reynolds, 1909, p. 10). Delling (1964) adds that the word could be used in the negative sense “to overpower.” The darkness inherent in being separated from God “has not been able to vanquish the power of His light. By the very existence of this light the whole sphere of night is overcome and deprived of its power” (p. 10).

*Principle Four: The biblical leader is a dynamic force that overcomes resistance.*

### *The Logos: A Communicator Who Identifies*

In describing the incarnation in v. 14, Vincent (1887) explains that the phrase “became flesh” means more than assuming a human body, but rather human nature in its entirety. Jesus identified himself with all that is human—body, soul, and spirit. That includes the region of sensibility and visibility (Spence-Jones, 1909), man’s creaturely weakness (Beasley-Murray, 1999), the transitoriness and mortality of human life (MacLeod, 2014), and “the frailty, limitations, and temporality of humans” (Waetjen, 2001). This suggests that both flesh and spirit are dear to God, and God did not hesitate to enter into that life (Barclay, 1979). This was a revolutionary idea to the Greek world—a world that approached their gods as apathetic and detached. John “pointed at Jesus Christ and said: ‘Here is the mind of God; here is the expression of the thought of God...’” (Barclay, 1979, p. 34). Also, beyond the classic Hebrew conception of God as “other than,” the *Logos*, God’s very self-expression, clothed himself in our humanity and chose to make himself known in a real, historical man (Carson, 1991). The leadership implications of this are profound:

Look steadily at the Incarnation, at the love which made Christ take our place and identify Himself with us; consider the new breath of life that this one act has breathed into human life, ennobling the world and showing us

how deep and lovely are the possibilities that lie in human nature; and new thoughts of your own conduct will lay hold of your mind. (Dods, 1903)

*Principle Five: The biblical leader communicates by identifying with the humanity of those he or she leads.*

### *The Logos: A Communicator Who Associates*

John describes the *Logos* as one who, in identifying with us, communicated by dwelling among us. The verb means “pitched his tent,” and evokes images of the Tabernacle, Israel’s Exodus, and Christ fulfilling the hope of a second Exodus (Beasley-Murray, 1999). John thus implies that God has chosen to dwell among his people in an even more personal way—as the Word-made-flesh (Carson, 1991). The phrase suggests several themes that were reflected in the life and leadership of Jesus. First, similar to the OT tent of meeting, Jesus moved with his disciples as a Paraclete or Counselor—a manifestation of the reality of divine presence (Borchert, 1996). This was important enough to Jesus that upon announcing that he would be leaving them, he reassured them that he would send another Counselor or Comforter who would continue what he had begun (ch. 14–16).

The use of the term also suggests mobility. “Like the tabernacle of the Exodus it can move from place to place and coincidentally sanctify time and space. As a result, the boundary lines between the sacred and the profane are dissolved” (Waetjen, 2001). The *Logos*, in effect, moved where we moved, participated in our history, dined at our tables, and manifested his love in “all the routine and incident of a human life” (Dods, p. 122).

A third dimension of the phrase reminds us that the tenting of the *Logos* was in the context of community. The tabernacle reference is a reminder of the ancient Old Testament dwelling around which Israel as a nation clustered their tents (Dods, 1903). John makes it clear that he is one of many eyewitnesses; the story of Jesus is *our* story, not just his (Waetjen, 2001). Moreover, “us” is a reference to all of us, regardless of social status, race, or gender. Jesus lived among the lowest class of population, living as they lived. He “had no money to give, no knowledge of science to impart; He lived a sympathetic and godly life, regardless of Himself” (Dods, 1903, p. 122).



*Principle Six: The biblical leader communicates by associating with constituents, regardless of status, ethnicity, or gender.*

### *The Logos: A Communicator Who Reveals*

John presents Jesus as the definitive revelation of God's nature and identity for us (Senior, 2008). The *Logos*, says Lenski (1961), is the final and ultimate revelation of God, embodied in Jesus Christ. "In him all the purposes, plans, and promises of God are brought to a final focus and an absolute realization" (p. 30).

Three specific terms characterize the revelation work of the *Logos*. The first, "glory," refers to the Hebrew description of the visible manifestation of God's self-disclosure (Carson, 1991). Bryant and Krause (1998) suggest that the word *doxa* could refer to (a) the sum of all God's attributes, (b) from Hellenistic Greek opinion or honor; (c) power or might; (d) a translation of the Hebrew *kavod*, which came to be associated with "lights;" or (e) an *epiphany* or *manifestation of the Godhead*. It doubtless points to Jesus' greatness, manifested not just in his miracles and teaching, but also in his humiliating death and resurrection. John repeats the word "glory" as if to say "glory indeed" (Lenski, 1961), and describes it as the kind a father grants to his one and only, best-loved Son (Carson, 1991).

The other two terms appear together on two occasions (vv. 14, 18). The *Logos* revealed the character of a God who was full of grace and truth (v. 14). Each comes with the article ("the grace" and "the truth"), and each supplements the other (Robertson, 1933). One of the great themes of the New Testament, though not thoroughly in John, grace (*charis*) fundamentally means "that which delights or causes joy" or "making glad with gifts" (MacLeod, 2014). Theologically, it is undeserved favor, the expression of God's pardon, justification, and adoption to childhood of those whose sin and guilt alienate them from God's love (Lenski). Truth is a much larger theme for John. *Aletheia* literally means "that which is not hidden," or "what has been made manifest." As such this applies to anything uncovered, whether by science or by divine revelation (Bryant & Krause, 1998). With John, the *Logos* reveals God as he really is, and became on earth what he was before his Incarnation—the light of men (v. 4) (MacLeod).

*Principle Seven: The biblical leader reveals God's character through his or her lifestyle.*

### *The Logos: A Communicator Who Declares*

John's prologue ends with the aorist description of the *Logos* as a proclaimer and expositor. "No one has ever seen God; the only God, who is at the Father's side, he has made him known" (v. 18). With the emphatic use of the pronoun, John declares that the only son of God himself (and only he) has declared him. The term *exegesato* is the source of our English word "exegesis." It is an old verb meaning to lead out, to draw out in a narrative, or to recount (Robertson, 1933)—suggesting that the Word-made-flesh is the ultimate narrator of God's story (Carson, 1991). But this is no mere sermon or parable—*Jesus made known the nature and character of God as an act of leadership*. He leads through expounding (Lenski, 1961), interpreting or translating (Vincent, 1887), making known or explaining divine secrets (Bryant & Krause, 1998), "drawing forth from the depths of God all that is possible that we shall see, know, or realize" (Reynolds, 1909). The historical aorist middle use of the term sums the work of Jesus in its entirety. That includes his words and deeds to be sure, but also his very coming and presence. "The Logos is the supreme exegete, the absolute interpreter of God" (Lenski, p. 101).

*Principle Eight: The biblical leader communicates by making sense of God's story, grace, and truth.*

## A MODEL OF LOGOS LEADERSHIP

Thus far I have established that the nature and activity of Jesus the *Logos*-made-flesh reflect specific acts of love and leadership. Moreover, the acts described in the Prologue to John's gospel serve as a model for leaders in any situation, but particularly for those who by faith and commitment identify as followers of Christ. This model adds to our understanding of leading by identifying first and foremost as a follower. As Paul exhorted the Corinthians to "imitate me as I imitate Christ" (1 Corinthians 11:1), *Logos*-inspired leadership personalizes the leadership role as follower first, then servant, then as an agent of transformation and influence. As Jesus himself embraced his identity as dynamic force (John 14:30) and communicator (John 12:49) in the language of a follower of his Father, those who follow his example will do the same.

The specific action points of the *Logos* Leadership model reflect many current trends in leadership research. In fact, multiple books and bodies of research exist for each of the eight facets of the model, and the sheer

size of that is beyond the scope of this chapter. This model welcomes the discoveries, theories and concepts provided in the literature, but looks beyond that to the unique contribution of John's description of what Christ the *Logos* did as a dynamic force and communicator (and example to his followers). The model seeks to provide an answer to the question, How can leaders flesh out the incarnational leadership example of Jesus?

Table 1.2 shows the progression of thought and research leading to the actions of a *Logos*-inspired leader. Following our understanding of John's language, it begins with a sense of identity—that a “Word” leader is a dynamic force and a communicator. As reflected in the exegesis, the eight *Logos* acts of leadership are reflected in the second column. This is followed by a summary of the rich collection of theory and research relevant to that specific action. The fourth column then summarizes the eight actions of a *Logos*-inspired leader. The sections that follow explain this more specifically by showing how those actions reflect the Word-made-flesh and how they intersect with contemporary research.

### *A Logos-Inspired Leader Innovates*

Burns and Stalker (1961) first called significant attention to the relationship between leadership and innovation. Since then a significant number of studies have explored the relationship more deeply (e.g., Karakas, 2007; Garcia-Morales et al., 2012). As Denti and Hemlin (2012) note in their review of the research, a leader performs two essential tasks in this regard: to facilitate innovation by supporting individuals and teams as they turn their creative efforts into innovations, and to manage the organization's goals and activities aimed at innovation. They conclude that (a) the strongest relationship between leadership and innovation takes place in organizations with a supportive culture for innovation and where organizational structures are de-formalized and de-centralized, and (b) when leaders influence creative self-efficacy they help stimulate innovation on the individual level.

*Logos*-inspired leadership looks to the creative power that was demonstrated before the world began. As the *Logos* was the means through which the world was made, and as humans were created in his image, those who follow Christ have the capacity to be a creative force in their own right. That usually begins with some sort of idea or vision of a desired outcome, combined with the creative energy to initiate, organize, and execute that vision to completion. Leaders who have the resources of an

**Table 1.2** The relationship between the identity and actions of the Logos, modern leadership research, and the actions of a Logos-inspired leader

<i>Logos identity</i>	<i>Logos action</i>	<i>Research reflection</i>	<i>What a Logos-inspired leader does</i>
Dynamic force	Creates	Innovation and leadership	Innovates—Provides creative energy, order, and execution to the fulfillment of a vision
Dynamic force	Gives life	Servant leadership	Enlivens—improves the quality of life for those he/she leads
Dynamic force	Enlightens	Enlightened leadership	Enlightens—acts as a force for good to bring truth, goodness, and beauty to the world, beyond self-interest or organizational success
Dynamic force	Overcomes Resistance	Competitive leadership	Competes—outsmarts, outpaces, and overpowers competitive or hostile forces from without
Communicator	Identifies	Empathetic leadership	Understands—listens and communicates with constituents from a perspective of awareness of what makes them human—their ideas, feelings, desires, and frailties
Communicator	Associates	Relational leadership	Engages—freely and authentically associates, collaborates, and socializes with constituents
Communicator	Reveals	Authentic leadership	Models—embodies the values, mission, and desired behavior of the organization (leads by example)

(continued)

**Table 1.2** (continued)

Logos <i>identity</i>	Logos <i>action</i>	<i>Research reflection</i>	<i>What a Logos-inspired leader does</i>
Communicator	Declares	Sense-giving	Exegetes—narrates the story, makes known the purpose, interprets the nature, and/or translates the intentions of the organization, both inside and outside the organization

organization at their disposal have the added advantage of combining the creative energies of constituents to produce even greater outcomes by providing the resources, structure, and support necessary to realize the potential change. This is in contrast to a leader or manager whose view is toward maintenance of tradition or who champions efficiency devoid of purpose or fulfilled vision.

### *A Logos-Inspired Leader Enlivens*

Contemporary study of Servant Leadership emerged from the writing of Robert Greenleaf (1977), who identified the test of a servant leader with this: “Do those served grow as persons? Do they, while being served, become healthier, wiser, freer, more autonomous, more likely themselves to become servants?” (p. 27). Spears (2010) added that one of the identifying signs of servant leaders is a commitment to the growth of people. Servant leaders recognize the intrinsic value of people beyond their work contributions, and are deeply committed to the growth of every individual in the organization. They do everything in their power to nurture the growth of employees and colleagues. This idea, in a more spiritual context, is reflected as well in Reagin’s (2018) *The Life-Giving Leader*, which he defines as one who looks beyond a posture that benefits them toward one that benefits others.

The *Logos*-inspired leader adopts a similar mindset, recognizing Christ as the source of all quality of life and leadership as the opportunity to be a conduit of that life to others. While it should go without mentioning that

constituents should be better technicians or even better managers because of a leader's influence, this model looks beyond that. An enlivening leader prioritizes people as people first, whether that involves their workplace lives or not. As such, a *Logos*-inspired leader seeks to add value to families, education, health, financial well-being, spiritual life, community relationships, and any other factor that elevates the quality of life for those he or she leads. This does not necessarily mean the leader is directly responsible for every facet of employee or volunteer life, but that the leader recognizes the ways in which he/she can be a hindrance or a help to the human potential of constituents.

### *A Logos-Inspired Leader Enlightens*

Enlightenment is a multifaceted concept, but in its simplest terms it means raising awareness. Hoopen and Trompenaars (2009) distinguish between practical and ideal enlightenment. Practical enlightenment involves seeing things or people in a clear light. Ideal enlightenment is more ambitious; it “requires an inspiring vision, integrated in a coherent conceptual framework, and devotion to a self-transcending cause” (p. 35). While enlightened leadership is not a formal theory, as far back as John Owen in 1800, leaders have sought to improve the lives of their employees while still earning a profit. These enlightened leaders, according to O’Toole (2019), distinguish themselves by (a) identifying higher purposes for their businesses than simply making a profit, (b) making decisions guided by a strong moral compass to meet the needs of constituents, (c) demonstrating respect for all people and creating frameworks to facilitate the pursuit of happiness, and (d) maintaining commitment to their values through good times and bad.

*Logos*-inspired leaders reflect a similar mindset, adding a spiritual dimension to their roles. As the self-described Light of the World (John 8:12), Jesus was the original model of “speaking the truth in love” (Ephesians 4:15). Those who follow his model act as a force for good that transcends self-interest or narrow views of organizational success. The primary means of doing this is by serving as examples and conduits of truth. That certainly involves open communication regarding matters of organizational value but goes far beyond that. *Logos*-inspired leaders intentionally seek ways to add value to constituents’ entire lives and, by extension, to their communities, regions, and the world. This approach to leadership seeks to bring multidimensional understanding, goodness,

deep happiness, and beauty into the world—beginning with those in closest proximity of relationship. The biblical word for that is “blessing”—the central theme of Jesus’ first public teaching in Matthew’s gospel.

### *A Logos-Inspired Leader Competes*

In language ranging from friendly competition to conflict management to outright warfare, leadership has been conceptualized as an advance against some sort of resistance. Advocates of Great Man Theory—the first theoretical distinction between leaders and followers and by no means extinct—believe that regardless of the innate talents potential leaders may possess, without the timely emergence of situational forces they will not become leaders (Cawthon, 1996). Those situations inevitably lead to confrontation, competition, or conflict and the emergence of leaders who marshal the intelligence, energy, and moral force of constituents to face them. Today’s competitive and innovative global environment calls for leaders and organizations who can create and sustain a competitive advantage (Manole, 2014). Petrick et al. (1999) propose a model that links such an advantage to leadership skills balancing four competing criteria of performance: (a) profitability and productivity, (b) continuity and efficiency, (c) commitment and morale, and (d) adaptability and innovation.

*Logos*-inspired leaders recognize the competitive, if not antagonistic environment in which their organizations or teams operate. The “light that shines in darkness” recognizes that such competitive or antagonistic entities engage along the same lines of John’s *katelaben* in v. 5—comprehension, speed, advantage, or disarming. This is no soft place for feel-good aspirations. This level of external conflict calls for performance that outsmarts, outpaces, and overpowers competitive or hostile forces from without. Sometimes this involves equipping an organization to “play defense” against such forces, but the spirit of a *Logos*-inspired leader is more offensive—making advances against competing organizations or ideas much as light would dispel darkness. This calls for discernment to recognize the difference between antagonist and ally—a distinction that is often overlooked in Christian circles. Moreover, it calls for diligence. As the light *continuously* shines in darkness (v. 5), *Logos*-inspired leaders recognize the ongoing vigilance necessary to succeed in an ever-competitive environment.

### *A Logos-Inspired Leader Understands*

Bell and Hall (1954) pioneered the exploration of empathy as a key leadership skill, defining empathy as the ability to perceive the needs of others by becoming aware of the other's phenomenological field. Rogers (1975) describes it further as entering into the private perceptual world of the other without prejudice and becoming thoroughly at home in it, laying aside one's own views and values. Pagonis (1992) identifies empathy and expertise as traits of effective leaders, while Garner (2009) traces the consistent emergence of empathy as a key component in leadership theory. Coffee and Jones (2000) distinguish between the soft kind found so much in the management literature and what they call "tough empathy"—giving people what they need, not what they want, and balancing respect for the individual with the task at hand. Leaders who demonstrate such empathy are those who care deeply about something and are not just playing a role.

All this and more are reflected in *Logos*-inspired leadership. As Jesus identified with all that is human, including sensibility, visibility, weakness, and mortality, this is anything but soft. Jesus understood the human heart (John 2:24), and as a great high priest he sympathizes with our weaknesses, having been tempted in every respect as we are, yet powerful enough to remain sinless (Hebrews 4:15). *Logos*-inspired leaders also engage in the work of identification and understanding. They listen and communicate with constituents from a place of empathy. This involves a soul exchange of ideas, feelings, and desires. Driven by a robust love and fueled by the pursuit of awareness, these leaders reject the notion of the aloof, uncaring authority figure. They also transcend empathy as a form of sentiment alone. *Logos*-inspired leaders intentionally enter into the world of those they lead, not just to feel with them, but to exchange understanding in all its dimensions.



### *The Logos-Inspired Leader Engages*

Research in relational approaches to leadership date back to 1939 with Lewin’s so-called Iowa studies in leader behaviors. This was followed by the Michigan and Ohio studies, then and Blake and Mouton’s Managerial grid, which conceptualized performance orientation and relationship orientation as two variable dimensions of leader behavior (Busse, 2014). Relational Leadership Theory emerged as its own discipline around 2000, viewing leadership and organization as “human social constructions that emanate from the rich connections and interdependencies of organizations and their members” (Uhl-Bien, 2006, p. 655). Hunt and Dodge (2000) note that relational leadership recognizes leadership wherever it occurs, despite formal roles. Uhl-Bien (2006) describes Relational Leadership Theory as an overarching framework for the study of the relational dynamics that focuses on the relational processes by which leadership is produced and enabled. Put simply, leadership takes place in the context of an ongoing, dynamic relationship, with or without formal roles.

At the heart of *Logos*-inspired leadership is an appreciation for this approach to relationships. Jesus turned first-century concepts of leadership on their head when he left all formal authority behind and “pitched his tent” among people with whom he yearned for relationship. Jesus was stirred with compassion for human needs he witnessed in the moment and took dramatic action to respond (cf. Matthew 9:36ff). This was possible because he moved freely among people that others in “leadership” took great pains to avoid. Much is made in the gospels of Jesus’ socialization habits—a point of criticism among the Jews and fascination among the common people. *Logos*-inspired leaders follow a similar example, authentically associating with people regardless of social status, formal position, ethnic background, or lifestyle choices. This is more than meeting for lunch or drinks, however; it is out of this association, socialization, and even collaboration that *Logos*-inspired leaders find a vision and strategy for moving forward.

### *A Logos-Inspired Leader Models*

Authentic Leadership emerged as a theory in the late twentieth and early twenty-first century in response to a string of ethical violations in organizational life, global world terrorism, and an economic downturn among developed countries. It was fueled by the conviction among

advocates that existing leadership styles were inadequate to address those issues (Margiadi & Wibowo, 2020). It emphasizes self-awareness, self-regulation based on internalized moral perspectives, transparency, and leading by example (Walumbwa et al., 2008; Edwards, 2013). The main principle of authentic leadership is the ability to create a good and sustainable organizational performance (Avolio & Gardner, 2005). This is done through building a strong foundation for decision making through self-knowledge, behaving consistently with beliefs and morals, listening to perspectives outside their own, open communication, and building trust. Authentic leadership has been broadly linked to employee attitudes, behavior and outcomes, creativity, a positive work climate, affective commitment at a group level, and organizational performance (Margiadi & Wibowo).

The world was in no less a desperate need for authentic leaders in the first century. Between legalistic religious leaders chasing power on the one hand, and a lord-it-over approach to secular authority on the other, the world yearned for a manifestation of grace and truth and found it in the person of Jesus Christ. He embodied the values, mission, and desired behavior of his followers by first revealing God's true nature. In other words, he communicated first with his life, then with his words. He now calls his followers to do the same. *Logos*-inspired leaders seek to model what Wood and Winston (2005) call leader accountability. This involves accepting responsibility for the leadership role, willingness to be openly identified with actions and words, and readiness to explain their beliefs, decisions, commitments, or actions to constituents. This approach to the leader-follower dynamic recognizes that leadership is first *beheld* (to use John's term), then heard and followed.

### *The Logos-Inspired Leader Exegetes*

While not the first to use the term, Gioia and Chittipeddi (1991) first gave structure to the idea of "sense-giving" in a leadership context to explain the use of vision, symbols, and hypothetical scenarios to introduce, support, and encourage organizational change. Sense-giving, according to Smerek (2009), involves giving meaning to a target audience in an effort to persuade or clarify. It is an intentional attempt to influence how people think (sensemaking) in terms of a preferred definition of reality. Sense-giving is largely viewed symmetrically with sensemaking, which is the actual meaning and sense that constituents make of those

change efforts. Researchers have identified various methods by which this takes place, including use of symbolism, metaphors, adapting explanation styles, narratives (storytelling), framing historical continuity, and emotional arousal (Gioia & Thomas, 1996; Hill & Levenhagen, 1995; Rouleau, 2005; Steuer & Wood, 2008; Brunninge, 2009; Vuori & Virtaharju, 2012).

*Logos*-inspired leaders recognize the role of communication as an act of leadership. As their Ultimate Example used storytelling, metaphors, practical explanation, historical framing, symbolism, and emotions to declare transformational truth, those who follow his example approach leadership in a similar way. Their approach to sense-giving transcends persuasion for the sake of an organizational agenda, however. *Logos*-inspired leadership is about transformation of the heart and fulfillment of individual and organizational purpose. To that end, the leader *exegetes* the identity, mission, message, and vision of the organization and its people. He or she narrates the story, makes known the purpose, interprets the nature, and/or translates the intentions of the organization, both internally and externally. *Logos*-inspired leaders provide clarity, insight, understanding, and direction to those in their frame of influence. They help define reality, target a destiny, and light a path forward in ways that capture the imagination and arouse the commitment of those who make sense of their message.

## SUMMARY

This chapter presents a model of leadership built on the Apostle John's description of the incarnation of Jesus Christ as the Word (*logos*) made flesh. *Logos* was a term with an unmistakable connection to deity, reflected by the Hebrew "word of the Lord" who acted as a change agent—a dynamic force—and by the Greek concept of logic and communication—the Word. As a dynamic force, Jesus Christ demonstrated the capacity to bring creative change to lives, teams, organizations, and communities. While we may not share his ability to create something out of nothing, *Logos*-inspired leaders can follow his example of innovation, providing creative energy, order, and execution to the fulfillment of a vision. His identity as a life-giver gives leaders a vision for improving the quality of life for those he/she leads. By following his light, leaders can act as a force for good, beyond self-interest or narrow views of organizational success, bringing truth, goodness, and beauty to the world. And by answering his

call to enter the fray, leaders find in him the capacity to overcome resistance and compete in the world of ideas, ever-increasing speed, and the pursuit of power.

As a leader the *Logos* communicated as a reflection of his incarnation, starting with the fact that he identified with humanity. He understood what was in the heart of individuals, and those who follow his lead do the same. They listen first and then communicate from a perspective of empathy and awareness of ideas, feelings, desires, and frailties. They freely and authentically engage on a personal, social, and professional level with constituents, just as the *Logos* freely associated with us. As Jesus embodied the values, mission, and desired behavior of a kingdom citizen, those who lead in his name are similarly challenged to lead by example and communicate with authenticity. And as Jesus became God's means of telling his story in a way that enables people to understand and participate in the story themselves, *Logos*-inspired leaders invite others to experience their story, purpose, passion, and vision in ways that make sense.

John's vision of Jesus in eternity past, who invaded the darkness on our behalf, serves as a gripping story of redemption, transformation, and hope. As this book will continue to show, the Fourth Gospel also reflects models and examples of leadership grounded in grace and truth. One thing is certain: Those who have encountered Jesus and "beheld his glory" have found in him to this day a profound source of change, and a life and leadership example to follow.

## DISCUSSION QUESTIONS

1. How do leaders reconcile the notion that Christian leadership is built on timeless and unchanging truths with the call for organizations and their leaders to innovate?
2. What does it mean when someone describes a leader as "life-giving?" How have you seen that quality demonstrated in the leaders you have observed?
3. What is the difference between typical interpersonal sympathy and "tough empathy?" How does "tough empathy" strengthen a leader's influence?
4. While authenticity and leading by example seem to be obvious expectations constituents would have of their leaders, why do these characteristics often seem so difficult or fleeting?

5. What communication tools used by leaders have you found most effective to help make sense of the leader's desires, values, and str?

## REFERENCES

- Allen, R. B. (1996). Affirming right-of-way on ancient paths. *Bibliotheca Sacra*, 153(1), 3–11.
- Avolio, B. J., & Gardner, W. L. (2005). Authentic leadership development: Getting to the root of positive forms of leadership. *Leadership Quarterly*, 16(3), 315–338.
- Barclay, W. (1979). *Great themes of the New Testament*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press.
- Beasley-Murray, G. R. (1999). *Word biblical commentary* (Vol. 36: John, 2nd ed.). Dallas, TX: Word Books.
- Bell, G. B., & Hall, H. E., Jr. (1954). The relationship between leadership and empathy. *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 49(1), 156–157. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0053927>.
- Bloomfield, S. T. (1840). *A Greek and English lexicon to the New Testament*. London: Longman, Orme, Brown, Green & Longmans.
- Borchert, G. L. (1996). John 1–11. In *The New American Commentary*. (Vol. 25a). Nashville: Broadman & Holman.
- Brown, R. B. (1965). The prologue of the Gospel of John: John 1:1-18. *Review and Expositor*, 62(4), 430–433.
- Brunninge, O. (2009). Using history in organizations: How managers make purposeful reference to history in strategy processes. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 22(1), 8–26.
- Bryant, B. H., & Krause, M. S. (1998). *John*. Joplin, MO: College Press.
- Burns, T., & Stalker, G. (1961). *The management of innovation*. London: Tavistock.
- Busse, R. (2014). Comprehensive leadership review: Literature, theories and research. *Advances in Management*, 7(5), 52–66.
- Cansi, D. (2015). Christ the Logos incarnate. *KAIROS—Evangelical Journal of Theology*, 9(2), 187–199.
- Carson, D. A. (1991). *The Gospel according to John*. Grand Rapids, MI: InterVarsity Press.
- Cawthon, D. L. (1996). Leadership: The great man theory revisited. *Business Horizons*, 39(3), 1–4.
- Coffee, R., & Jones, J. (2000). Why should anyone be led by you? *Harvard Business Review*, 78(5), 62–70.

- Conzelmann, H. G. (1964–). φῶς, φωτίζω, φωτισμός, φωτεινός, φωσφόρος, φωστήρ, ἐπιφάσκω, ἐπιφώσκω. In G. Kittel, G. W. Bromiley, & G. Friedrich (Eds.), *Theological dictionary of the New Testament* (Vol. 9, Electronic ed.). Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.
- Delling, G. (1964). λαμβάνω, ἀναλαμβάνω, ἀνάληψις, ἐπιλαμβάνω, ἀνεπίληπτος, κατα-, μεταλαμβάνω, μετάληψις, παρα-, προ-, προσλαμβάνω, πρόσληψις, ὑπολαμβάνω. In G. Kittel, G. W. Bromiley, & G. Friedrich (Eds.), *Theological dictionary of the New Testament* (Vol. 4, Electronic ed.). Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.
- Denti, L., & Hemlin, S. (2012). Leadership and innovation in organizations: A systematic review of factors that mediate or moderate the relationship. *International Journal of Innovation Management*, 16(3), 1–20.
- Dods, M. (1903). The Gospel of St. John. In W. Robertson Nicoll (Ed.), *The expositor's Bible: Luke to Galatians* (Vol. 5). Hartford, CT: S.S. Scranton Co.
- Edwards, N. T. (2013). The evolution of work autonomy in the modern and postmodern eras of business management. *International Journal of Economic Policy in Emerging Economies*, 6(2), 200–209.
- Estes, D. (2016). Logos. In J. D. Barry, D. Bomar, D. R. Brown, R. Klippenstein, D. Mangum, C. Sinclair Wolcott, L. Wentz, E. Ritzema, & W. Widder (Eds.), *The Lexham Bible Dictionary*. Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press.
- Gangel, K. O. (2000). *John*. In M. Anders (Ed.), *Holman New Testament Commentary* (Vol. 4). Nashville, TN: Broadman & Holman Publishers.
- Garcia-Morales, V. J., Jimenez-Barrionuevo, M. M., & Gutierrez-Gutierrez, L. (2012). Transformational leadership influence on organizational performance through organizational learning and innovation. *Journal of Business Research*, 65(7), 1040–1050. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2011.03.005>.
- Garner, H. C. (2009, November–December). Empathy: A true leader skill. *Military Review*, pp. 84–92.
- Gaston, T. E. (2014). Does the Gospel of John have a high Christology? *Horizons in Biblical Theology*, 36(2014), 129–141.
- Gioia, D. A., & Chittipeddi, K. (1991). Sensemaking and sense-giving in strategic change initiation. *Strategic Management Journal*, 12, 433–448.
- Gioia, D. A., & Thomas, J. B. (1996). Identity, image, and issue interpretation: Sensemaking during strategic change in academia. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 41(3), 370–403.
- Green, J. B., Mcknight, S., & Marshall, I. H. (1992). *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospel*. Downers Grive, IL: InterVarsity.
- Greenleaf, R. K. (1977). *Servant leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness*. New York: Paulist Press.
- Hill, R. C., & Levenhagen, M. (1995). Metaphors and mental models: Sense-making and sense-giving in innovative and entrepreneurial activities. *Journal of Management*, 21(6), 1057–1074.

- Hoopen, P. T., & Trompenaars, A. (2009). *The enlightened leader: An introduction to the chakras of leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Hunt, J., & Dodge, G. E. (2000). Leadership déjà vu all over again. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 11(4), 435–458.
- Karakas, F. (2007). The twenty-first century leader: Social artist, spiritual visionary, and cultural innovator. *Global Business and Organizational Excellence*, 26(3), 44–50. <https://doi.org/10.1002/joe.20143>.
- Kim, S. S. (2009). The literary and theological significance of the Johannine prologue. *Bibliotheca Sacra*, 166(4), 421–435.
- Kling, S. D. (2013). Wisdom became flesh: An analysis of the prologue to the Gospel of John. *Currents in Theology and Mission*, 40(3), 179–187.
- Lenski, R. C. H. (1961). *The interpretation of St. John's Gospel*. Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Publishing House.
- MacLeod, D. J. (2014). The incarnation of the Word: John 1:14. *Bibliotheca Sacra*, 161(1), 72–88.
- Manole, I. (2014). Virtual teams and e-leadership in the context of competitive environment: Literature review. *Journal of Economic Development, Environment and People*, 3, 3.
- Margiadi, B., & Wibowo, A. (2020). Authentic leadership: A bibliometric analysis. In W. A. Barnett & B. S. Sergi (Eds.), *Advanced issues in the economics of emerging markets*. Bingley, UK: Emerald Publishing.
- Maruya, S. (1981). *John's use of Logos in the Fourth Gospel*. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Western Conservative Baptist Seminary, Portland, OR.
- Miller, E. L. (1993). The Johannine origins of the Johannine Logos. *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 112(3), 445–457.
- Newman, B. M., & Nida, E. A. (1993). *A translator's handbook on the Gospel of John*. New York: United Bible Societies.
- O'Toole, J. (2019). *The enlightened capitalists: Cautionary tales of business pioneers who tried to do well by doing good*. New York: Harper Business.
- Pagonis, W. G. (1992). The work of the leader. *Harvard Business Review*, 70(6), 118–127.
- Paterson, J. (1954). *The book that is alive: Studies In Old Testament life and thought as set forth by the Hebrew sages*. New York: Scribner.
- Petrick, J. A., Scherer, R. F., Brodzinski, J. D., Quinn, J. F., & Ainina, M. F. (1999). Global leadership skills and reputational capital: Intangible resources for sustainable competitive advantage. *The Academy of Management Executive*, 13(1), 58–69. <https://doi.org/10.5465/ame.1999.1567322>.
- Reagin, T. (2018). *The life-giving leader: Learning to lead from your truest self*. Colorado Springs, CO: WaterBrook.
- Reynolds, H. R. (1909). The Gospel of St. John. In H. D. M. Spence-Jones (Ed.), *The pulpit commentary* (Vol. 1). New York: Funk & Wagnalls Company.

- Robertson, A. T. (1933). *Word pictures in the New Testament*. Nashville, TN: Broadman Press.
- Rogers, C. R. (1975). Empathetic: An unappreciated way of being. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 5, 2.
- Rouleau, L. (2005). Micro-practices of strategic sensemaking and sense-giving: How middle managers interpret and sell change every day. *Journal of Management Studies*, 42(7), 1413–1441.
- Schrenk, G., Debrunner, A., Kleinknecht, H., Procksch, O., Quell, G., & Kittel, G. (1964). λέγω, λόγος. In G. Kittel, G. W. Bromiley, & G. Friedrich (Eds.), *Theological dictionary of the New Testament* (Electronic ed., Vol. 4). Eerdmans: Grand Rapids, MI.
- Senior, D. (2008). The Word made flesh: The Gospel of John and the foundation of the Christian life. *The Bible Today*, 46(5), 306–311.
- Smerek, R. E. (2009). *Sensemaking and sense-giving: Leadership processes of new college presidents* (Publication no. 3354176). Doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan. Proquest Dissertations Publishing.
- Spears, L. (2010). Character and servant leadership: Ten characteristics of effective, caring leaders. *The Journal of Virtues & Leadership*, 1(1), 25–30.
- Spence-Jones, H. D. M., Ed. (1909). *St. John* (Vol. 1). New York: Funk & Wagnalls.
- Steuer, R., & Wood, T. (2008). Storytellers and their discursive strategies in a post-acquisition process. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 21(5), 574–588.
- Uhl-Bien, M. (2006). Relational leadership theory: Exploring the social processes of leadership and organizing. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 17(6), 654–676.
- Vincent, M. R. (1887). *Word studies in the New Testament* (Vol. 2., 2nd ed.). Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.
- Vuori, T., & Virtaharju, J. (2012). On the role of emotional arousal in sense-giving. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 25(1), 48–66.
- Waetjen, H. C. (2001). *Logos pros ton theon* and the objectification of truth in the prologue of the Fourth Gospel. *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, 63(2), 265–286.
- Walumbwa, F. O., Avolio, B. J., Gardner, W. L., Wernsing, T. S., & Peterson, S. J. (2008). Authentic leadership: Development and validation of a theory-based measure. *Journal of Management*, 34(6), 5–21.
- Wood, J. A., & Winston, B. E. (2005). Toward a new understanding of leader accountability: Defining a critical construct. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 11(3), 84–94.
- Youngblood, R. F., Bruce, F. F., & Harrison, R. K. (1995). “Word of God.” In *Nelson’s new illustrated Bible dictionary*. Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson, Inc.





## Jesus as Servant and Disruptor

*Debra J. Dean*

The overarching purpose of John's Gospel is found in verse 20:31. Jesus is the Son of God, the Messiah, Christ, Deity, and in believing that, you will have eternal life. Quite simply, when distilling work down to an overall purpose, each human is called to love God and love others (Matt. 22:36–40), honoring and glorifying God in all that is done (1 Cor. 10:31). Therefore, one's career path and life legacy is not about who we want to be when we grow up or a glorious job title with a handsome salary and benefit package. It is not about who you are, but whose you are (Tebow, 2016). It is about the legacy one leaves behind with regard to an eternal impact. This was clearly demonstrated in John 2:13–25 as Jesus cleared the Temple courts because they were conducting an irreverent, blasphemous, and greedy religious scam.

Research of this pericope revealed several themes. First, John 2:13–25 continues with the overall theme of contrast (Houdmann, n.d.). In John 2, the first historical event is about a wedding in Cana, which is joyful and quiet. The second event is the cleansing of the Temple, which

---

D. J. Dean (✉)  
Regent University, Virginia Beach, VA, USA  
e-mail: [debrdea@regent.edu](mailto:debrdea@regent.edu)

© The Author(s), under exclusive license to Springer Nature  
Switzerland AG 2021

J. D. Henson (ed.), *Biblical Organizational Leadership*,  
Christian Faith Perspectives in Leadership and Business,  
[https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-69929-1\\_2](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-69929-1_2)

is scolding and public. This contrasting theme is seen throughout the pericope. Another example was described by Flattery (n.d.) as “a sharp contrast between ‘My Father’s House’ and a house of merchandise.” Thomas (1930) calls it a double effect instead of contrast and said, “The disciples are helped, the traders are angered” (p. 573).

A second theme is replacement; whereby Lin (n.d.) notes that “At this Passover [John 2:13–25], Jesus performs a sign that points to his death and reveals his replacement of the Temple, thereby implying the fulfillment of the redemption of God that Passover itself represents.” Ruiz (2014) notes that Jesus’ body is the “new Temple that has come to replace the old one.” Brown and Soards (2016) explain that this pericope is “Jesus’ attitude toward the Temple,” and the theme is replacement (p. 120).

Taking the idea of attitude and moving forward with a theme offers two sides to consider. One is the attitude of Jesus, and the other is the attitude of everyone else, including the religious and government officials, the marketplace vendors, and all of the people in attendance. Flattery (n.d.) wrote that the attitude was “Who are you to do this” and “What authority do you have” as the Jews asked Jesus, “What sign can you show us to prove your authority to do all this” in John 2:18. Muncherian (2014) explained that “God deals with reality” and “God isn’t fooled by our actions and attitudes.” Steadman (1983) demonstrated that many Christians act like the Pharisees and make themselves look good; however, they continue to allow sinful habits to hide in their lives such as “pornography; a bitter, unforgiving spirit towards another; an evil lustful habit; a private indulgence; a compromise with expediency in business.” Stedman clarified that when this happens, God is jealous, angry, “no longer tolerant, understanding, and patient.” Swindoll (2018) explained that “those in the Temple had a standard roach letter attitude before the Man of zeal entered the Temple and woke them up.” A standard roach letter means “just going through the motions, lacking passion, being distracted, being unconcerned and indifferent to God and neighbor.”

The themes discussed throughout this pericope are (a) contrast, (b) replacement, and (c) attitude. Perhaps, the takeaway from this pericope in the twenty-first century is the examination of Christ-followers and their perception and treatment of the Temple, Jesus Christ. In other words, would Jesus be angry with Christians today based on the way they conduct their daily business? To understand this pericope in greater detail

and to comprehend how it relates to modern-day servant leaders, the socio-rhetorical critical approach to textual analysis is used to examine the (a) inner texture analysis, (b) intertexture analysis, (c) social and cultural texture analysis, (d) ideological texture analysis, and (e) sacred texture analysis (Robbins, 1996).

Inner texture analysis examines the linguistic dynamics of the text by detecting devices, patterns, repetitions, and structures used within the written content. Intertexture analysis explores how the written content interacts with the outside world. Social and cultural texture analysis describes how the written content supports social changes by reviewing customs and social norms during the time period of the original manuscript. Ideological texture analysis outlines how the written content positions itself compared to others through the mapping of obvious ideological beliefs and values. Sacred texture analysis observes how God is portrayed in the text.

## HISTORICAL CONTEXT

To understand the pericope of John 2:13–25, it is necessary to understand the historical context of the scripture. This includes who it was written to, why it was written, and what the historical events were prior to the pericope. The Jewish Passover, *Pesach* in Hebrew, was a festival with much familiarity to Jesus and the thousands, possibly millions that arrived in Jerusalem each year. The first Passover likely took place in 1528 or 1451 BC, as recorded in Exodus 12. The first event took place as a promise from God to Moses and Aaron that the Israelites would no longer be enslaved. The famous text, “Let my people go,” was said by Moses to Pharaoh in Exod. 5:1. Instead of releasing the Israelites, Pharaoh resisted, and God sent a series of ten plagues to persuade Pharaoh to change his mind. The final plague was a promise from God to kill the firstborn son of each Egyptian family (Exod. 11:4–6). To save the Israelites, God instructed Moses and Aaron to sacrifice a lamb and use the blood on the doorposts, marking the Israelite families so the angel of death would pass their homes and leave their children unharmed (Exod. 12).

Ainsworth (1843, p. 83) explains that the Israelites were in exile for a total of 430 years. Abram (now Abraham) and Sarai (now Sarah) were lone outcasts from Egypt for the first 30 years. The remaining 400 years included their offspring as refugees. The isolation started when the couple lied about their identity to Pharaoh. Genesis 12:10 explains that Abram

and Sarai went to Egypt to avoid the famine. Because of her beauty, Abram asked his wife to tell others that she was his sister. In return, Pharaoh initially treated Abram and Sarai quite well, and she became Pharaoh's wife. However, God afflicted Pharaoh and his house with great plagues, which revealed the truth that Sarai was not the sister of Abram, but his wife. Pharaoh sent them away from Egypt and into Negeb. In Genesis 15, Abram speaks of being childless, without an heir, and God promises Abram that he will have as many offspring as there are stars in the sky. In Genesis 15:13, God speaks to Abram, saying, "Know for certain that your offspring will be sojourners in a land that is not theirs and will be servants there, and they will be afflicted for four hundred years."

Shortly after that, an impatient Abram and Sarai agree that their Egyptian servant Hagar should bear their first child. At 86 years old, Abram named his firstborn Ishmael (Gen. 16). As explained, the penance for Abraham and Sarah began 30 years earlier than their descendants when they lied to Pharaoh and were forced out of Egypt. However, the bondage continued for the descendants of Abraham and Sarah another 400 years after Isaac was born and Ishmael laughed [mocked and persecuted] at Isaac (Gen. 21:9). Abraham was 100 years old when Isaac was born.

As described, the Passover is a sacred festival celebrating the release of the Israelites from bondage for 430 years. It is a festival that many Jews and Gentiles continue to celebrate. And it has many sacred rituals. To properly celebrate Passover, Jewish families meticulously go through their home to remove any yeast or substance that could cause fermentation. Many also make the pilgrimage to Jerusalem. According to Avey (2020), Passover food will include *beitzah* (a hard-boiled egg, symbolizing new life), *charoset* (a paste of fruit and nuts, symbolizing mortar the slaves used to build the Egyptian pyramids), *karpas* (lettuce symbolizing hope and redemption), *maror* (bitter herbs, symbolizing the bitterness of bondage), saltwater (symbolizing the tears of the slaves), and *zeroah* (a shank bone, symbolizing the sacrificial lamb). During the Passover dinner, also known as the Passover Seder, guests "sat on sofas around a low table, dining at leisure" and each participant was expected to "make a clever speech on a chosen topic and offer a toast" (Wyllen, 1995, p. 101). This banquet style is referred to as a symposium.

All of the Passover events were historically held at the Temple in Jerusalem. The Temple was the focal point for the entire memorial. To think of a holiday with such deeply rooted tradition as Passover, which has

existed for more than 3000 years, the significance of the Temple is monumental. Sacred text refers to the Temple many times, and it is evident that the Temple is a holy place to be treated with utmost honor and reverence. This backstory helps one to understand the reason Jesus would be so upset with the situation he witnessed as he made his way into Jerusalem for the Passover festival.

### THE EARTHLY TEMPLE AS A FOCAL POINT

The physical Temple in Jerusalem was considered sacred. Commonplace Jews were only permitted to approach as far as the outer edge of the Temple courtyard (Wyllen, 1995, p. 84). It was considered an honor to “set the wicks in the lamp or shovel the ashes from the altar” (pp. 84–85). While in exile, God commanded Moses and the Israelites to build The Ark of the Covenant (Exod. 25), which contained the shards of the first Ten Commandments and the second set of Ten Commandments, Aaron’s staff (Num. 17: 6–26), a jar of manna (Exod. 16:33–34), and a scroll Moses wrote before his death (Deut. 31:26). The Israelites carried the Ark with them for 40 years as they wandered in the desert. King David took the Ark to Jerusalem, and his son Solomon installed it in the first Temple, which he constructed on Mount Moriah between 833 and 827 BC (Kazen, 2004). It is said to have been in the Holy of Holies (the inner sanctuary where God’s presence appeared).

King Nebuchadnezzar destroyed the first Temple in 586 BC. The second Temple was erected around 515 BC at the same location as the first (Pioske, n.d.). When Jesus died on the cross, the ornate veil, which was decorated blue, purple, and scarlet (Exod. 26:31) was torn in the second Temple (Matthew 27:51). In 70 AD, the second Temple was destroyed by the Romans (Wyllen, 1995, p. 100). The earthly Temple was an important place. It was one that deserved the utmost honor, respect, and respect, especially to the Jews.

Papaioannou (2015) explains that “most Temple references in John refer to the Temple in Jerusalem.” The most commonly used word for Temple in the Book of John is *hieron*, used 11 times. The word *hieron* “carries a nuance of sacredness and holiness” and simply means “most wonderful” (Papaioannou). The Temple is the focal point for this pericope. It is also the focal point for Jesus as he knows the transformation from earthly Temple (a building of spiritual significance in Jerusalem) to Holy Temple (Jesus’ body) is soon to take place. In this regard, authentic

leadership theory is mentioned as a practical tip for leaders to remain true to themselves (authentic) and visionary as they cultivate strategic plans for the future. Spiritual leadership is another theory that reflects on the inner life of the leader. Leaders with authenticity and inner-life reflection will know who they are, who they are not, and will have the ability clearly articulate right from wrong as they reflect on the past and prepare for the future.

### *Jesus and the Temple: During Jesus' Childhood*

It is clear that Jesus was accustomed to the annual pilgrimage to Jerusalem for Passover. John references three or possibly four Passover's during Jesus' ministry (Lin, n.d). It is possible, however, that he may have made the journey each of his earthly years with his family. It would take many days to walk the 70 miles from Galilee to Jerusalem. In one historical account, Jesus was 12 years old when he went missing from the caravan returning from their Passover festivities. Luke 2:41–52 describes the search conducted by his parents. It took three days to find him. He was in the “Temple courts, sitting among the teachers, listening to them and asking them questions” (Luke 2:46). When questioned why he stayed behind, obviously causing his earthly parents to worry, he answered, “Didn't you know I had to be in My Father's House” (Luke 2:49). At such a young age, Jesus already knew that he was different than other children his age. Had this situation taken place with a child in the twenty-first century, parents may not be as understanding about such defiance. However, Mary and Joseph knew that Jesus was God's son, and while such an answer may hurt the heart of any parent, they would have understood that their son was obeying God's plan for his life.

### *Jesus and the Temple: At the Beginning of Jesus' Ministry*

In 28 AD, Jesus was at the beginning of his ministry. His impending crucifixion at the age of 33 was fast approaching, and Jesus was entirely focused on the mission at hand. At 28 years old, he had not performed a public miracle to date and had not yet formed his group of 12 disciples entirely. Jesus, as with all of his previous years, returned to Jerusalem for Passover. His family accompanied him as well as his shortlist of disciples. Carson (1991, p. 176) notes that the disciples were probably Andrew, James, John, Nathanael, Peter, and Philip, as described in John 1.

For a sense of travel distance, Jesus was at a wedding in Cana before the Passover. It would take about 18 miles to travel from Cana to their hometown of Capernaum (Whitacre, 1999). Capernaum to Jerusalem was another 85-mile journey (Barnes, n.d.). This itinerary was no small act, especially with their typical mode of transportation. The Passover festival was of utmost importance. Since walking was the most common form of transportation at this time, it would have taken about five days to make the trip, assuming they walked about 20 miles per day, as noted in the Book of Acts, where Peter walked from Joppa to Caesarea in two days.

### *Jesus Approaches the Temple with Holy Anger and Divine Fury*

John showed the miracle of conversion while Jesus was in Cana (changing water into wine) and then cleansing in Jerusalem (cleansing the Temple). This symbolizes how God works to first change the heart of a person and then cleanse their soul. Brown and Soards (2016) explain that Cana was the first of Jesus' signs, thus revealing his glory. The initial Cana miracle was where Jesus replaced water with wine, "a wine so good that the headwaiter wonders why the best has been kept until last" (p. 120).

John commonly used contrast. In this section of the Bible, he presents the first historical event that is joyful and quiet and then presents the second historical event that is scolding and public. One can imagine the emotional feelings of Jesus, those that witnessed his first miracle in Cana, and those that followed him to Jerusalem for the Passover. It must have been an emotional high with some realizing he is unique, set apart, different, and has supernatural powers. Therefore, to walk from the highest of highs in the land of Cana to the lowest of lows in sight of the Temple, Jesus' roller coaster of emotions encourages leaders today in that they too have good days and bad. Sometimes leaders and their teams have incredible wins, and other times they have failures. It is often in those moments of fantastic failure that one can learn the best lesson.

Henry explains that "the first public work in which we find Christ engaged, was driving from the Temple the traders whom the covetous priests and rulers encouraged to make a marketplace of its courts" (1997, p. 982). The miracle in Cana was more private than public. Carson writes, "Jesus' cleansing of the Temple testifies to his concern for pure worship, a right relationship with God at the place supremely designated to serve as the focal point of the relationship between God and man" (p. 180). Jesus' actions at the Temple were actions of purification and removing

distractions. He was vindicating the honor of the Temple, His Father's House.

Henry and Manser (2010) wrote that Jesus went into Jerusalem, and "He first cleansed what was wrong and then taught them to do what was right" (p. 1735). His holy anger and divine fury festered as he saw the people selling animals in the Temple with approval by the chief priests for dishonest gain. Henry and Manser explained that "great corruption in the church owes its rise to the love of money" (p. 1735). With each turn, Jesus confronted sin on his own without complaining to the government or religious officials since he knew they supported the corruption. Alone, Jesus drove out the animals and their handlers using a whip of small cords, the same instrument used by the merchants to move the animals into the Temple. Henry and Manser explain that "sinners themselves prepare the scourges with which they will be driven out of the Temple of the Lord" (p. 1735).

As the money changers are scandalous, Henry and Manser explain that in scattering the money, Jesus showed his contempt and displeasure toward those who make religion a matter of worldly gain. And, Jesus had every right to be upset. He had authority as the Son of God entering His Father's House. Henry & Manser wrote that defiling the Temple was "sacrilege, robbing God"; it was "making common what was solemn and should inspire awe," and Jesus could not bear to see the Temple defiled and his father dishonored (p. 1735). Whitacre (1999) explains that this is the first use of the term *Father* in Johannine literature. While it reveals Jesus' identity and authority, it also gives reason to his zealousness and defends his audacious activity. In comparison with Psalm 69, the zeal Jesus had for His Father's house consumed him. Before the crucifixion, the disciples would have understood the word consume (*kataphagetai*) as the extent of Jesus' zeal; however, after the crucifixion, it would have been interpreted as death itself (Whitacre).

Jesus' zeal to clean His Father's House was without resistance from any of his enemies. Henry and Manser state that a "divine power was displayed in this cleansing, a power over human spirits"; a zeal without consideration for one's "own reputation, comfort, and security"; a zeal that carries "our souls along so far and so fast as we do our duty that our bodies cannot keep up" (p. 1735). There is no rational human explanation of what happened as Jesus drove them all out of the Temple.

MacArthur explained that the Temple was a well-secured place and probably had 270–300 police on patrol. They also had built Fort Antonia



next to the holy site to keep watch on the area and protect the Temple. Wyles (1995, p. 98) explained that “Romans always brought soldiers into Jerusalem to control the mob,” and the Caesarea governor would attend to keep watch.

One can only imagine the divine rage in Jesus as he approached the Temple to find unholy marketplace activities taking place within the Temple walls, the holiest of all places. Imagine the noise and smell that preceded his visual confirmation of the clutter and confusion in His Father’s House. When a person has an intruder in their home, they may feel victimized. They may feel as though their safe place has been penetrated. They may view darkness and filth. For an average person, had they walked into a situation where their own home or the home of their parents was taken over by squatters and reeked of animals, they would probably be upset. They might gather reinforcements such as the police or friends to confront the trespassers. Or, they might bravely or foolishly approach all alone. Either way, few people would turn and walk away and leave something they cherished and valued to be taken over by heathens and looters.

## FIRM FOUNDATION

To know what is wrong, one must know what is right. Having a firm foundation built on God’s holy word is essential for Christians to discern right from wrong. Titus 2:10–15 reminds of many rebellious people in the world, full of meaningless talk and deception. Paul, the author of the Book of Titus, explains that “They must be silenced, because they are disrupting whole households by teaching things that ought not to teach” (v. 11). The debate between man’s worldview and God’s worldview is ongoing, especially as governments legalize activities such as abortion and homosexuality that are clearly against God’s plan. Paul’s letter to Titus continues in saying, “teach the older men to be temperate, worthy of respect, self-controlled, and sound in faith love, and in endurance.” He continues in saying, “teach the older women to be reverent in the way they live, not to be slanderers or addicted to much wine, but to teach what is good.” Younger women are instructed to “love their husbands and children, to be self-controlled and pure... so that no one will malign the word of God.” Young men are called to be “self controlled.” Paul teaches to “say ‘No’ to ungodliness and worldly passions, and to live self-controlled, upright and godly lives in the present age.” He closes his

thought by writing, “encourage and rebuke with all authority. Do not let anyone despise you” (Tit. 2:1–15).

Ham (2015) wrote about moral relativism and the “idea that there is not an absolute standard for right and wrong” in the world today saying, this idea has “created a generation that is morally sick” because there is “no agreed-upon standard to follow.” Judges 21:25 records how relativism is when “everyone did as they saw fit.” In other words, this generation has replaced God’s word with man’s word. To return to the basics and nourish the soil for a firm foundation rooted in Christ, we must return to the Bible, God’s word.

Do not conform to the pattern of this world, but be transformed by the renewing of your mind. Then you will be able to test and approve what God’s will is – his good, pleasing and perfect will. (Rom. 12:2)

Lisle (2008) confirms that to have a correct foundation for an accurate worldview, it must be built upon the inspired word of God, the Bible. To commence, the next five statements begin the narrative for all decision making. This practical exercise is helpful to Christian servant leaders as they reflect on their inner life and are reminded of whose they are and who they are authentically.

- First, I exist because God made me (Ps. 139:14).
- Second, there is a reality because God created it (Genesis 1:1).
- Third, God created my senses so that I might be able to probe and master the reality He created (Psalm 94:9, Genesis 1:26–28).
- Fourth, there are laws of logic which we can use (Isaiah 1:18).
- Fifth, because these laws of logic were used by Jesus Christ (Luke 24:39).

Further foundation building will enable one to make wise decisions based on a firm foundation rooted in a Biblical Worldview.

In John 2:13–25, Jesus stood out as Holy, set apart. Jesus was angry at all the right things. He did not harm people; He attacked the system. Jesus is the perfect example of a person with a firm foundation. Tebow (2016) encourages others to be different, stand out for the right reason. He inspires others to be bold, brave, and courageous, standing up for what is right. As a servant leader, character traits of authenticity, belief, Holy, loyal, obedience, and trust reinforce the concept of firm foundation.

Having a firm foundation is necessary for authentic, servant, and spiritual leaders.

*Principle One: This first of three concepts in this chapter is Firm Foundation. Followers of Christ are called to have a firm foundation so they know who they are and can discern right from wrong behavior. Character traits of this first principle include authenticity, belief, Holy, loyal, obedience, and trust.*

## HOLY DISRUPTION

“Christ’s purging of the Temple thus may just be reckoned among his wonderful works” (Henry, 1810, p. 87). He did so without the assistance of any friends. He, by himself, was able to remove the den of robbers (Matthew 21:13). In an organized and somewhat peaceful fashion, Jesus was righting the wrong that was taking place. Had he been loud, obstinate, and outlandish with his actions, Jesus would have been confronted by all of the security. Instead, He was able to purge the perverted Temple with love and compassion in a somewhat orderly fashion. This was indeed a miracle that Jesus did all that he did without an army of local enforcers. Carson explained that “this early [or first] Temple cleansing does not issue immediately in a conspiracy by the authorities to have him arrested and killed” (1991, p. 178). Jesus was armed with divine power and commission in that He purged the Temple by Himself, without an army or the help of others. As a servant leader, character traits of defend, discernment, duty, honor, jealous, judgment, veneration, vision, and zeal reinforce the concept of holy disruption. While some of these character traits such as discernment (De Pree, 1992) and vision (Dennis & Bocarnea, 2005) are discussed with servant leadership theory, most of these traits have not previously emerged in empirical articles.

*Principle Two: This second of three concepts in this chapter is Holy Disruption. Followers of Christ are empowered to disrupt when necessary so as to maintain a holy temple. Their actions are to focus on the system and not the people because God calls us to love all people. Additionally, they are required to maintain actions that are in accordance with the Bible. In other words, God owns, and we are called to manage his business. As Christ followers know they are working for God [and not for man or woman], it will help them to take proper action when necessary. Character traits of this second principle include defend, discernment, duty, honor, jealous, judgment, veneration, vision, and zeal.*

## COURAGEOUS CONVERSATIONS

“Open rebuke is better than secret love. Faithful are the wounds of a friend; but the kisses of an enemy are deceitful” (Proverbs 27:5–6). It is difficult to allow another person to criticize one’s actions or behavior without taking offense. Such interactions must take place; however, to hold a person accountable and redirect them to stay on the narrow path (Matthew 7:13–14). Many recommend a trust circle or personal board of directors of such confidants that are permitted to speak critically when needed.

In John 2:13–25, Jesus demonstrated servant leadership while using Courageous Conversations with a Holy Disruption. He spoke truth with love and compassion. He demonstrated how the Temple was set apart for the worship of God and how He was set apart to defend God’s glory. To know that the Temple was being used inappropriately, Jesus was educated on the discernment of what is right and wrong; He had a firm foundation. Modern-day servant leaders have just as much right to speak up and take action when they know something is not right. As a servant leader, character traits of assertiveness, courage, self-control, and service reinforce the concept of courageous conversation. To date, such character traits have not emerged in empirical articles other than courage (De Pree, 1992) and service (Dennis & Bocarnea, 2005).

### *On the Receiving End*

Tebow (2016) speaks of criticism and notes that it hurts. As a person on the receiving end of Jesus’ rage, they could have been offended or confused by his actions, after all, they had approval from the government to sell their goods in the marketplace. However, there are times a person needs to pay attention to their actions and listen to others that can help identify blind spots. When a person with sincerity and love confronts someone with good intentions of discernment, they offer genuine support by telling the truth in love. Such truth, hard truth, needs to be shared with others lovingly and compassionately. Tebow calls this Courageous Conversations. He said, “We must let our love for others be the reason they listen, and the truth be the reason they change” (p. 74). Servant leadership theory places the focal point on serving others. This service must include courageous conversations.

### *On the Giving End*

As the person on the giving end, in this case, Jesus, it takes firm conviction, courage, passion, and boldness to speak up when something is not right. The easy thing to do would be to go along with the activity or walk away quietly. But, to speak up takes courage, tact, and vulnerability. Jesus' veneration for the Temple could have turned out very different on both sides had God not taken the lead. With this example in mind, it should always remind servant leaders to put God first and pray for divine wisdom, especially when faced with a difficult situation.

*Principle Three: This final of the three concepts is Courageous Conversation. Followers of Christ are permitted to speak the truth and hold their fellow brothers and sisters accountable. Likewise, Christians are to humble themselves and seek wisdom from another Bible-believing Christian's. Their words should be truthful, uplifting, supportive, and encouraging while critically evaluating the issue with a Biblical worldview. Character traits of this third principle include assertiveness, courage, self-control, and service.*

## THE PROBLEM AT THE TEMPLE

The problem at the Temple likely did not happen overnight; similarly, to problems of unethical behavior at work, immoral behavior in a marriage, or unscrupulous behavior of a nation. To understand the problem, it is necessary to get to the root of the problem. Plato (375 BC) said, "necessity is the mother of invention." The first problem to solve was that millions of people were walking for days to the Temple for the festival of Passover. To properly offer their sacrifices, each family needed a lamb or goat. It had to be a male. And, it had to be without blemish. The sacrifice was to take place in the courtyard of the Temple on the afternoon of the 14th of Nisan. Josephus notes a sacrificial need for 256,500 animals for around 2,700,200 pure and holy people (Josephus et al., 1999, p. 906). During the Passover festival, other people may have also attended; however, if they were polluted with leprosy, gonorrhea, or other issues they were not permitted to participate. Foreigners could also not participate, nor could women on their monthly period.

If a family brought their animal to the festival, it needed to receive approval by the High Priest. Unfortunately, the priests rejected most animals brought, causing a need for millions of people to purchase a sacrificial lamb or goat while at the Temple; they must have a unique

coin to buy their sacrifice. Imagine that the Temple was set up as a modern-day church carnival. In one line, every person paid the money changer for their special currency or token since the foreign currency was not accepted, likely due to the image on the coin considered idolatry. In another line, people waited to buy a goat or lamb. John 2:13–25 records that people were selling cattle, doves, and sheep within the Temple courts. Wylen (2016, p. 85) notes that in addition to lamb, “there were offerings of grain, wine, and oil” (p. 85). Those that could not afford a lamb could substitute with pigeons or doves. There would have been many lines of people, tired and hungry from their walk, standing in very long lines waiting. Once they received what they wanted from one line, they would have to go and wait in another.

To add an extra layer of wait time and confusion to the festival, Jewish males over the age of 20 had to pay a tax using Tyrian coinage. The tax was generally half-shekel paid annually and gave each Jew an equal share to the daily offerings by the priest in the Temple (Wylen, 1995, p. 85). Carson explained that Tyrian coinage was considered pure because of its silver content (1991, p. 178). In addition to the tax, a service fee was charged for the tax collectors service. Many believe the prices for all of these services included exorbitant pricing of 10–12% more than usual, thus referring to the racketeers as schemers, swindlers, and thieves. MacArthur (1983) said the Jews were being extorted, fleeced, and taken by robbers. Steadman (1983) confirms that Jesus was primarily angry at the “extortion and racketeering that was going on.”

Government and religious officials gave their approval for the merchants to set up their shops in the Temple. Since Jerusalem was not located on a trade route, the income for the entire city depended greatly on religious festivals. In previous years, the craftspeople and shopkeepers “set up their stalls across the Kidron Valley on the slopes of the Mount of Olives, but at this point they were in the Temple courts, doubtless in the Court of the Gentiles” (Carson, 1991, p. 178). Carson explains that “Jesus’ complaint is not that they are guilty of sharp business practices and should therefore reform their ethical life, but that they should not be in the Temple at all” (p. 179).

## CLEAN YOUR TEMPLE

Overall, cleansing your Temple refers to cleansing the Temple in Jerusalem, purifying the home Temple in preparation of Passover, and examining the personal Temple (1 Corinthians 6:19–20) cleansing from

sin and removing every speck of unclean. One examination of cleansing your Temple is the traditional preparation for Passover. It is similar to spring cleaning and requires a person to clean their home and purge certain impurities from their environment. To properly celebrate Passover, Jewish families had to meticulously go through their home to remove any yeast or substance that could cause fermentation. This ceremonial cleansing is a purification rite and cleansing of sin that symbolically represents cleaning your Temple.

A second examination of cleansing your Temple is a reflection of one's inner self. In John 2:13–25, we see that the event itself was not bad, but the greed and selfishness that covered the land showed of darkness, sin, and temptation. This pericope is a solid reminder for examination of oneself. While it is possible that many begin a task with a good heart and the mission to serve God, they can find themselves conducting their work in an unworthy manner (1 Cor. 11:27, 31). As a question for self-reflection one can ask how holy are my dreams, integrity, money, and relationships. More than likely, the marketplace merchants did not begin their work in prior years with the goal of cheating, robbing, and stealing from fellow believers. However, years of working in an environment where one or more colleagues begin to cloud the lines between right and wrong can often lead a good person to stray. While we are all sinners (Rom. 3:23), we can strive to do better. As a practical tip for servant leaders, annual performance reviews to measure such matters of the heart are recommended to identify when employees begin to fall off course so that courageous conversations can take place to get them back on the narrow path before a major derailing takes place. The Fruit of the Spirit scale was used by Dean (2019) to measure the relationships between love, joy, peace, patience, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, and self-control with desired workplace outcomes of employee engagement, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment. It is believed that such a review on a routine basis will help employers identify unworthy behavior or ethical issues sooner rather than later.

Henry and Manser explained that because Jesus knew all men (their names and faces), he also knew their “nature, characters, attitudes, and intentions;” he also “knows their integrity and their weaknesses too” (2010, p. 1736). Henry wrote the following text in describing the deceitful heart of man (1997, p. 983):

Our Lord knew all men, their nature, dispositions, affections, designs as we do not know any man, not even ourselves. He knows his crafty enemies, and all their secret projects; his false friends, and their true characters. He knows who are truly his, knows their uprightness, and knows their weaknesses. We know what is done by men; Christ knows what is in them, he tries the heart. Beware of a dead faith, or a formal profession: carnal, empty professors are not to be trusted, and however men deceive others or themselves, they cannot deceive the heart-searching God.

Without God and a firm foundation of His word, one cannot discern what is right or wrong. Thomas examines the scripture as Jesus' "indignant outcry against the desecration" (1930, p. 572). In the case of the Jewish Passover, the government gave permission for such heresy to take place; however, it was irreverent and disrespectful of God. Just because it is legal does not mean it is the right thing to do. Thomas explains that the "traders had paid the Sadducees and Pharisees in the Sanhedrin for the concession as traffickers... they were within their technical rights" (p. 574).

### THE HEAVENLY TEMPLE AS A FOCAL POINT

When Jesus replaced the earthly Temple as the heavenly Temple, he became the new focal point. Jesus declared that he would destroy the Temple and raise it up in three days (John 2:19, Mark 14:58, Matt. 26:61). This assertion was taken literally by those in attendance of the Passover Festival in 28 AD and would be used at Jesus trial before his crucifixion in 33 AD (Matt. 26:61). The Jews responded saying the Temple took 46 years to complete (John 2:20), not understanding that Jesus' statement had much more meaning.

The Romans destroyed the Temple in 70 AD (Wynen, 1995, p. 100). Josephus (p. 888) proclaimed that the Roman General, Titus did not want to destroy the Temple saying,

I also appeal to my own army, and to those Jews that are now with me, and even to yourselves that I do not force you to defile this your sanctuary; and if you will but change the place whereon you will fight, no Roman shall either come near your sanctuary, or offer any affront to it; nay, I will endeavor to preserve you your holy house, whether you will or not.



The Siege of Jerusalem was a result of the first Jewish revolt and a four-year campaign to take hold of Jewish insurgency in Judea. The pericope of Matthew 24 is titled “The Destruction of the Temple and Signs of the End Times.” At the Mount of Olives, Jesus affirms, “Not one stone shall be left here upon another, that shall not be thrown down.”

After Jesus’ death, burial, and resurrection, he replaced the sacrificial lamb leaving no reason at all for animal sacrifices. The Gospel of John, according to Wylen (1995, p. 102), presents the Last Supper as an ordinary meal as Jesus was crucified on the following day, the eve of Passover and he died at the exact hour when the Passover lamb was to be sacrificed in the Temple. Servant leaders and all Christians are encouraged to keep Jesus as the focal point all the days of their lives (Ps. 23:6).

## SUMMARY

Calvin (2002) notes that “whatever deceptions Satan may employ, let us know that any departure—however small—from the command of God is wicked.” The pericope of John 2:13–25 reveals that servant leaders should stand up for what is right and offers the example where Jesus purged sin from the Temple by disassembling the system, not hurting the people. This exegetical examination calls for servant leaders to have a firm foundation and prepare for holy disruption and courageous conversation when the time is needed. In examination, a servant leader reviews their environment and relationships to determine if there needs to be separation from sin such as unethical behavior. Reflection by the servant leader can consider if their personal and career goals and dreams are focused on God or self. And, Matthew 6:24 reminds servant leaders to reflect on their money or any other idol that replaces God as the master in their life. Some servant leaders may think that their sin is not that bad. Conceivably they have done it for years and no one has noticed or said anything about it. Perhaps they have become numb to the moral corruption of the world around them. Stedman (1983) clarified that God “is not going to settle for clutter, compromise, extortion and racket, whatever may be defiling and corrupting the Temple courts.” Stedman continued, “He may leave you alone for a while” but, “if we mistake that delay for acceptance, we are in for a surprise.”

## DISCUSSION QUESTIONS

1. Would Jesus be angry with Christians today based on the way they conduct their daily business? Explain.
2. How often do you reflect on your worldview and the impact it has on your daily life?
3. Do you have a firm foundation? If not, what can be done to strengthen it so it can withstand temptation, trials, and tribulations?
4. Have you witnessed a business practice in need of a holy disruption? If so, what do you plan to do?
5. Are you aware of a courageous conversation that needs to take place? If so, when are you going to have the conversation and what will you say?
6. Do you have a personal board of advisors or a circle of trust? How often do you invite these people to have courageous conversations with you? Would this strategy benefit your future as a Christian business leader? Explain.

## REFERENCES

- Ainsworth, H. (1843). *Annotations on the Pentateuch or the five books of Moses; the Psalms of David and the song of Solomon* (p. 83). Glasgow, Scotland: Blackie & Son.
- Avey, T. (2020). *What is passover?—Learn all about the passover holiday*. <https://toriavey.com/what-is-passover/>.
- Barnes, D. (n.d.). *Distances from Jerusalem*. Retrieved February 16, 2020, from <http://www.biblecharts.org/biblelandnotes/DistancesFromJerusalem.pdf>.
- Brown, R. E., & Soards, M. L. (2016). *An introduction to the New Testament / edited and abridged by Marion L. Soards*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Carson, J. (2002). *Christian classics ethereal library*. United States. [Archived Web Site] Retrieved from the Library of Congress, <https://www.loc.gov/item/lcwaN0004026/>.
- Carson, D. A. (1991). *The Gospel according to John*. Nottingham: Apollos.
- De Pree, M. (1992). *Leadership Jazz*. New York, NY: Dell.
- Dean, D. (2019). Integration of Christian values in the workplace. *Journal of Biblical Perspectives in Leadership*, 9(1), 35–55. [https://www.regent.edu/acad/global/publications/jbpl/vol9no1/Vol9Iss1\\_JBPL\\_3\\_Dean.pdf](https://www.regent.edu/acad/global/publications/jbpl/vol9no1/Vol9Iss1_JBPL_3_Dean.pdf).

- Dennis, R. S., & Bocarnea, M. (2005). Development of the servant leadership assessment instrument. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 26(8), 600–615. <https://doi.org/10.1108/01437730510633692>.
- Flattery, G. (n.d.). *John 2:13–25—The temple merchants*. <https://globalchristiancenter.com/sermons/dr-g-flattery-sermons-on-what-jesus-said/26112-the-Temple-merchants>.
- Ham, K. (2015). *Moral relativism-who decides?* <https://answersingenesis.org/blogs/ken-ham/2015/04/07/moral-relativism-who-decides/>.
- Henry, M. (1810). *An exposition of all the books of the Old and New Testaments in five volumes. Wherein each chapter is summed up in its contents: The sacred text inserted at large in distinct paragraphs, each paragraph reduced to its proper heads; the sense given, and largely illustrated with practical remarks and observations*. London: W. Gracie.
- Henry, M. (1997). *Matthew Henry's concise commentary on the whole Bible*. Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson.
- Henry, M., & Manser, M. H. (2010). *The new Matthew Henry commentary: The classic work with updated language*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.
- Houdmann, M. (n.d.). *What does John 2 mean?* Retrieved February 16, 2020, from <https://www.bibleref.com/John/2/John-chapter-2.html>.
- Josephus, F., Whiston, W., & Maier, P. L. (1999). *The new complete works of Josephus*. Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel Publications.
- Kazen, R. (2004, June 29). *The destruction of the first holy temple*. Retrieved from [https://www.chabad.org/library/article\\_cdo/aid/144569/jewish/The-First-Temple.htm](https://www.chabad.org/library/article_cdo/aid/144569/jewish/The-First-Temple.htm).
- Lin, T. (n.d.). *The glory begins to be revealed*. Retrieved February 16, 2020, from <https://www.biblegateway.com/resources/commentaries/IVP-NT/John/Glory-Begins-Be-Revealed>.
- Lisle, J. (2008, April 10). *War of the worldviews*. Retrieved from <https://answeringenesis.org/worldview/war-of-the-worldviews/>.
- MacArthur, J. (1983). *Purging the perverted temple*. Retrieved from <https://www.gty.org/library/sermons-library/2351/purging-the-perverted-Temple>.
- Muncherian, S. (2014). *The cleansing of the temple*. Retrieved from <http://www.muncherian.com/s-jon2v13.html>.
- Papaioannou, K. (2015). *The heavenly temple in the Gospel of John*. Retrieved February 16, 2020, from <https://www.ministrymagazine.org/archive/2015/04/the-heavenly-Temple-in-the-gospel-of-john>.
- Pioske, D. (n.d.). *First temple*. <https://www.bibleodyssey.org/en/places/main-articles/first-Temple>.
- Plato. (1943). *Plato's the republic*. New York, NY: Books.
- Robbins, V. K. (1996). *The tapestry of early Christian discourse: Rhetoric, society and ideology*. London: Routledge.

- Ruiz, G. (2014). *Commentary on John 2:13–25 by Gilberto Ruiz*. [https://www.workingpreacher.org/preaching.aspx?commentary\\_id=1918](https://www.workingpreacher.org/preaching.aspx?commentary_id=1918).
- Shaich, R. (2018). *The founder of Panera Bread: 'I wish i'd fired more people'*. <https://www.entrepreneur.com/article/308427>.
- Steadman, R. (1983). *Message: The temple cleanser (John 2:12–25)*. <https://www.raystedman.org/new-testament/john/the-Temple-cleanser>.
- Swindoll, C. (2018). *Holy Zeal*. <https://idcraleigh.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/06/John-2.12-25B.pdf>.
- Tebow, T. (2016). *Shaken: Discovering your true identity in the midst of lifes storms*. Crown Publishing Group.
- Thomas, A. (1930). *Word pictures in the New Testament*. Nashville, TN: Broadman Press.
- Whitacre, R. A. (1999). *John: The IVP New Testament commentary series* (Vol. 4). Downers Grove, IL: Inter-Varsity Press.
- Wynlen, S. M. (1995). *The Jews in the time of Jesus: An introduction*. New York, NY: Paulist Press.



## Jesus and Emotional Awareness

*Carlo A. Serrano*

Leadership is frequently defined as one's ability to lead others in a particular direction. Yet, before one can lead others, they must first be aware of their own location within the greater scope of organizational life. Thus, it is no wonder that volumes now exist on the importance and efficacy of emotional intelligence (EI) as a metric for leadership effectiveness and practice. Since Jesus is arguably the most influential leader in history, it is essential that his life and leadership be constantly mined for principles and insight into current leadership frameworks such as emotionally intelligent leadership. The fourth chapter of the Gospel of John documents a pivotal season in the early days of Jesus' ministry in Samaria and Galilee. In this chapter, issues of race, religion, gender, and morality all collide in a narrative account of a day in the life of Jesus and his followers. In John 4, Jesus demonstrates the ability to transcend cultural complexities without being condescending or hurtful to his ultimate mission. The results of his vision-driven service changed an entire region and set the stage for the cross-cultural work of the early church. Since the actions

---

C. A. Serrano (✉)  
Manna University, Fayetteville, NC, USA  
e-mail: [cserrano@manna.edu](mailto:cserrano@manna.edu)

© The Author(s), under exclusive license to Springer Nature  
Switzerland AG 2021

J. D. Henson (ed.), *Biblical Organizational Leadership*,  
Christian Faith Perspectives in Leadership and Business,  
[https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-69929-1\\_3](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-69929-1_3)

of Jesus in John 4 take place in a cross-cultural context, the principles extrapolated from the chapter have broad application for leadership diversity and EI. The two accounts documented in this chapter reveal a connection between Jesus' leadership and the following principles: self-awareness (4:1–6), empathy (4:7–15), trustworthiness (4:16–26), and positive influence (4:27–45).

### THE CONFLUENCE OF TRAIT AND BEHAVIOR—EMOTIONAL AWARENESS

From 2005 to 2011 the average American learned about organizational leadership every week from two unlikely characters. These two “bosses” portrayed an often-hyperbolic style of leadership that, in some instances, left viewers wondering if the line between truth and fiction exists. One of these bosses exemplified the stereotypes of power, wealth, success, and transactional leadership as a means to an end. The other boss represented a complete lack of personal awareness and the dangers of taking “the organization as family” metaphor too far. Like it or not, these two bosses influenced what Americans thought of leadership. You may not be a fan of their programs, but it is highly likely that if you are reading a book on leadership, then you are aware of the fictional character Michael G. Scott of television’s *The Office* and of course, the 45th President of the United States and former star of television’s *The Apprentice*, Donald J. Trump. On *The Office*, Michael Scott modeled a style of self-serving leadership that used people as a means for self-actualization. On *The Apprentice*, Donald Trump used people as nothing more than cogs in a machine designed to increase the bottom line. Michael Scott did not want to fire anyone because he did not want them to think poorly of him. Donald Trump ended every show by firing someone because, well, that was the point of the show. Scott was so in touch with his personal needs that he was blind to the needs and wants of those he led. Trump was so focused on the bottom line that the only metric of success in his program was survival of the fittest. For six years (2005–2011), a captive audience saw leadership that was devoid of empathy, short on ethically centered truth, and flawed in vision. Unfortunately, this skewed caricature of leadership exists beyond television.

For decades, a false dichotomy between traits and behaviors influenced the direction of organizational leadership thought, and practice (Bass &

Bass, 2008). On one extreme, leadership refers to what a person accomplishes. On the other extreme, leadership refers to a series of traits that predetermine the potential and effectiveness of a leader. Both of these perspectives fail to account for the ontological and spiritual elements of leadership that both fuel behavior and frame traits (Crowther, 2012). “Who” a leader is may indeed be more important than “what” a leader possesses or “what” a leader accomplishes. Thus, there is room in the field of organizational leadership for a more in-depth exploration into the intersection of trait and behavior as they relate to leadership. Moreover, there is room within the concept of leadership for authenticity, ethics, and concern for organizational effectiveness that also considers the wants and needs of each follower.

Watt (2014) argues that effective leaders must demonstrate ethical leadership across a variety of subdomains, including intrapersonal and interpersonal emotional management. Although the subject of authenticity dates back to Ancient Greece, it interweaves with the current issue of leadership (Wilson, 2014). One area of relatively recent exploration in the behavioral science field is the concept of emotional intelligence (EI). In the same way that early theories emphasized charisma and trait, they also emphasized intelligence as a metric for leadership potential and success. However, recent literature suggests that EI is just as, if not more important, for leadership effectiveness as cognitive intelligence, which is measured through the intelligence quotient (IQ) score (Caruso et al., 2016; Zeidner et al., 2009). This point is accentuated by the flood of relatively new research on ethical leadership, servant leadership, authentic leadership, and transformational leadership. Leaders are servants, visionaries, and ethical agents, who influence others to accomplish objectives (Serrano, 2017). Yet, none of this happens in a vacuum. Before one can lead anyone anywhere, they must first have an understanding of their location within the context of organizational life. Before one can effectively lead others, they must be in tune with the unseen elements of leadership that influence the influencer. This is precisely where the concept of EI brings new life into the ongoing conversation of organizational leadership. In some ways, EI sits at the confluence of trait and behavioral theories of leadership. The emotionally intelligent leader is self-aware and socially aware in a manner that allows for positive self-management and relational management (Preston et al., 2015). From a psychosocial perspective, authenticity refers to one’s ability to own their feelings,

personal experiences, thoughts, personality traits, and cognitive strengths and weaknesses (Harter, 2005).

Simply put, an authentic person “keeps it real,” whereas a phony person often hides their thoughts and feelings and projects what they assume others want to see and hear (Harter, 2005). From the leadership perspective, authenticity connects with authentic leadership theory. Authentic leaders are those who are aware of their values, knowledge, and feelings and act in a manner consistent with their values, knowledge, and feelings, which includes the use of an optimistic, moral, and ethical character (Avolio & Gardner, 2005; Klenke, 2007). There are several connections between the concept of authenticity, EI, and awareness. Since there is room in the field of organizational leadership for further study into the confluence of trait and behavior, and since television characters and reality stars do not always paint the healthiest picture of leadership, it seems prudent to look at one exemplar of all things leadership: Jesus Christ.

Although the Gospel of John is indeed a historical account of the life of Jesus, it is essential to note that it was written as a testimony with a specific goal in mind. While Matthew, Mark, and Luke each wrote their historical accounts of the life of Jesus to argue for Jesus being the humanity focused servant Messiah-King, John wrote to testify that Jesus was, and is, and will always be the Son of God (John 20:31; Scaer, 2003). As mentioned in the introduction to this book on Jesus’ leadership, the Gospel of John is, first and foremost, a salvific book. In many ways, the Book of John is a legal argument whereby multiple witnesses are presented systematically to argue for the eternal life found only within the belief in Jesus (Maccini, 1994). Thus, before we can adequately extract leadership principles from John, we must first understand the thematic lenses through which the apostle viewed his content and his intended audience. This is important on the macro-level when exploring the entire book and even more prominent on the micro-level when examining the book passage by passage.

The fourth chapter of John represents a pivot point in the narrative of Jesus. In this chapter, we see Jesus move beyond the religious center of Israel and toward the future focus of the Gospel message, which included ministry to both Jew and Gentile (Maccini, 1994). Carson (1991) suggests that John 4 is a continuation of the arguments laid out in the previous chapter especially as they relate to baptism (John 1:24–34; 3:22–36), the calling of strangers to follow Him (John 1:35–51),



the water motif (John 2:1–12; 3:5), and dialogues related to Jesus’ true identity (John 1:45–51; 2:18–22; 3:1–20). John 4 is also unique in that it represents an early climax in Jesus’ upending of established religious structures, precisely the sacred well of Jacob at Sychar (Elwell, 1989). Finally, John 4 connects the theological framework created by the author with the practical and lived out the reality of life in Christ by showing that in the same way Jesus’ water replaced the wine in Cana and Jesus’ baptism replaced John the Baptist’s baptism, the water that Jesus would provide would satisfy in a way that the Well of Jacob at Sychar never could (Elwell, 1989; Kruse, 2004). There are critical contextual issues that are addressed in the next section regarding the Samaritan’s and their relationship with the Jews. However, of all of the background reasons that make John 4 an excellent case study into the leadership of Jesus, one important fact stands above them all. It is important to note that this chapter will not deal with John 4:46–54, as that passage takes place in a different locale and contact from the majority of the chapter. In John 4:1–45, we see the real beginning of Jesus’ public ministry (Carson, 1991; Kruse, 2004). Up until this point, Jesus had cleansed the Temple, performed one documented miracle, and made the decision to leave Judea for the Galilee. After his encounter with the woman at the well, his ministry accelerated throughout the region. Therefore, John 4 is an essential component to understanding how Jesus the leader interacted with others, given his sense of awareness.

### SAMARIA AND SELF-AWARENESS (JOHN 4:1–6)

The world is full of striking images of Jesus Christ. He is often depicted as a gentle rabbi ministering to the masses, a suffering savior hanging on a Roman instrument of torture, or a soon coming King sitting in the heavenly realm. When we think about Jesus, we typically think of power and confidence. Yet, the opening section of John 4 shows a side of Jesus that is often overlooked. The religious leaders in Judea were concerned that Jesus was starting to become more popular than John the Baptist (Milne, 2014). The ministry of John the Baptist was already problematic for the established ruling class because his teachings not only challenged the presumed religious authority of the Sanhedrin, they also confronted the credibility of the political leaders of the region, namely Herod the tetrarch (Kruse, 2004). For the Pharisees, Jesus represented a more significant threat than John the Baptist. Jesus, sensing this either by

way of hearsay or divine privilege, made the intentional choice to leave the power center of Israel for the Galilee region (Carson, 1991; Kruse, 2004; Milne, 2014). Some suggest that Jesus made this move to avoid any division between his work and that of John the Baptist (Kruse, 2004). Others argue that this move came from Jesus wanting to avoid persecution, which would have undermined his ministry prematurely (Carson, 1991). Regardless of why Jesus left Judea, it is apparent that he was aware of his presence and decided to move to a location where he could be more effective. To get from Judea to the Galilee, Jesus had to pass through a place where no Jew wanted to spend time: Samaria.

Scholars are conflicted as to which route Jews took when traveling from Judea to the Galilee. Some argue that traditional Jews would take a longer route to avoid traveling through Samaria (Draper & Mukansengimana-Nyirimana, 2012). Others suggest that Jews often took the quickest way, which involved traveling through Samaria (Kruse, 2004). Although the term “had to” in John 4:4 finds a connection with the divine plan of God, it also speaks to the practical issues of moving quickly from point A to point B (Carson, 1991; Victor, 2016). Simply put, Jesus’ journey through Samaria was both geographical and theological (Carson, 1991). The Samaritans were a type of pseudo-Jewish people group whose animosity with Israel dated back to the eighth century fall of the Northern Israelite Kingdom at the hands of the Assyrians (Kruse, 2004). Samaria would go on to play an essential role in the leadership, especially in how he used this people group to symbolize the breaking down of social, cultural, and racial dividing walls. Jesus was aware of the potentially dangerous situation in Judea, and he was mindful of his own need to travel through Samaria.

I have written extensively on the connection between the pressures of leadership and the concept of leadership fatigue in previous works (Serrano, 2017, 2020). However, I would be remiss not to mention the connection between leadership fatigue and the introduction to John 4. According to the scripture, “Jesus, wearied as he was from his journey, was sitting beside the well. It was about the sixth hour” (John 4:5–6, ESV). This is a famous passage that supports the essential doctrine of the deity of Christ. Yes, he was and is the Son of God. Yet, in this passage, we see his humanity on display. Jesus, aware of his fatigue from the long journey, stopped near a significant well to rest and recharge before continuing his important mission. Based on the religious and political tension that Jesus was mainly fleeing from in Judea, it is fair to assume that along

with physical fatigue, he most likely needed rest from the psychological and mental toll of his newly started public ministry. This is supported by his pattern of behavior as later articulated in the gospels. Jesus often withdrew to reflect and reenergize both before and after busy seasons of ministry, and he also took the time to tend to the most basic of human needs such as food and water (Matt.14:22–23; Mk. 7:24; Lk. 6:12–13).

Perceptions of ethical behavior, authenticity, and self-awareness all play a role in follower support of organizational objectives (Sharif & Scandura, 2014). Simply put, healthy leaders are aware. This awareness starts with a healthy self-awareness and moves out toward an awareness of others and an awareness of organizational objectives (Mathew & Gupta, 2015). Leaders who lack awareness are prone to moral and ethical failure, burnout, and a lack of trust from followers, all of which damages organizational effectiveness (Serrano, 2017). The self-awareness elements of EI are so important that several organizations have adopted and implemented training to develop emotionally intelligent leaders. Salovey and Mayer (1990) are often credited with bringing the term “emotional intelligence” into the lexicon of leadership theory. One could argue that Goleman’s (2005) model of EI contains the most comment elements of what people associate with EI behaviors. According to Goleman’s model, emotionally intelligent leaders demonstrate five skills: self-awareness, self-regulation, motivation, empathy, and social skills. Self-awareness refers to one’s ability to be aware of both mood and thoughts and feelings about one’s mood and thought (Goleman, 2005). According to Bar-On (2007), “people who are emotionally and socially intelligent can understand and express themselves, to understand and relate well to others, and to successfully cope with the demands of daily life,” all of which flows from emotional awareness and healthy expression of those emotions (p. 2).

In John 4, we see Jesus not only aware of the external pressures of leadership, but we see him also aware of his humanity and need for rest and recovery because of the challenges that ahead. It is easy to read an account of Jesus at a well and miss the circumstances that led him to that place. It is also easy and dangerous to lead without an awareness of self within the context of an awareness of others. If Jesus were not aware of his impact on the religious and political climate of Judea, he might not have departed for Galilee. Likewise, if Jesus were not aware of his divine mission, he may not have felt compelled to travel through Samaria.

Finally, if Jesus were not aware of his paradoxical limits as the only God-man, he might not have stopped at the strategic well of Sychar and waited for a drink.

*Principle One: Christ-like leaders are self-aware, and as such, they manage their emotional and physical health.*

### EMPATHY AS LEADERSHIP (JOHN 4:7–15)

According to tradition, women often went to wells to draw water early in the day or closer to evening, and typically in groups, to avoid the brutal middle eastern heat (Carson, 1991). One could argue that frequenting wells during popular hours would also add a measure of safety. Yet, the Samaritan woman, introduced in verse seven, came to the well alone in the middle of the day (John 4:6–7). Although the text does not explicitly say why she was alone at the well in the middle of the day, the public shame that is uncovered later in the chapter may offer insight into why she was not with other women (Enis, 2020). Jesus, hot and weary from his travels, initiated the conversation by asking the woman to give him a drink (John 4:7). The woman responded with a bit of shock at Jesus' request. Several cultural implications are worth exploring in this opening conversation.

It is important to note that there was no universal animosity between all Samaritans and the Jews (Bourgel, 2018). More often than not, it was the Jews who often showed explicit prejudice toward their Samaritan neighbors based on religious differences and the occupation of Jewish territory post-exile (Rodríguez, 1991). One of Jesus' most famous parables would have been scandalous to the original Jewish audience because it painted the Samaritan as being "good" and worthy of copying as opposed to Jewish religious leaders and scribes (Luke 10:25–37). One could argue that Jesus' request for water was a foreshadowing of the Gospel message crossing over from Jew to Gentile. This is especially true given the similarities between this account and the three other betrothal scenes found in the Hebrew scriptures (Gen. 24:10–61; 29:1–21; Exod. 2:15–22). According to Cook (1997), each of those accounts included "five plot elements: (1) the groom journeys to a foreign land; (2) he encounters a girl(s) at a well; (3) someone draws water; (4) the girl runs home to announce the visitor's arrival; (5) the visitor is invited to a meal" (p. 11). Thus, one could argue the account of Jesus and the Samaritan women was a foreshadowing of the "marriage" that would take place

between Jew and Gentile through the finished work of Jesus. However, Arterbury (2010) suggests that betrothal-type interpretations of John 4 misunderstand the way by which ancient exegetes viewed this and other stories. According to Arterbury, these passages should be viewed through the lens of ancient hospitality, whereby travelers were often associated with the gods, and offering food, water, or shelter was considered not only honorable but culturally obligatory. I believe that no matter how one views this passage, it is evident that Jesus moves beyond the social norms to engage with the woman.

Jesus did not seem at all concerned with the sociopolitical customs of the day when he asked the woman for something to drink. Plus, as noted in verse eight, the disciples had gone off looking for food. Otherwise, they might have helped Jesus with the water (Carson, 1991). His request of the woman could have been nothing more than the result of his thirst. Indeed, a trained carpenter from Nazareth and the eldest child of his family knew how to draw water from a well, something he may have done had he something from which to draw water (John 4:11). However, based on the rest of the conversation and the rest of Jesus' ministry, it is clear that he saw a need in the woman that only he could fulfill. Even though he saw clearly, she did not.

The rest of the conversation in this passage is a series of misunderstandings. Again, this conversational style closely mirrors the conversations that Jesus previously had with Nicodemus (John 3:1–17), his mother Mary (John 2:1–12), and Phillip (John 1:43–51). In the case of the Samaritan woman at the well, Jesus started by asking for something physical: a drink of water. The woman's response demonstrated to Jesus that there was an opening for spiritual conversation. Jesus then shifted the conversation toward the physical, but the woman kept moving the conversation back to the material. There is also a central water motif that dominated the conversation. Water is used throughout the Hebrew and Christian scriptures to symbolize the spirit of God (Isa. 44:3; 1 Cor. 12:13), cleansing power (Eph. 5:26), and new life (Isa. 12:3; Rev. 22:1–2). The woman was talking about physical water that could satisfy thirst and sustain human life. Jesus was talking about the spiritual water that only comes by His spirit and grants eternal life (Draper & Mukansengimana-Nyirimana, 2012). Later on in the life of Jesus, he made the bold statement on the high day of the Jewish Feast of Tabernacles that He is the water of life and that all who drink of Him will never thirst again, a sentiment first made to the woman at the well (John 7:37–39). Upon hearing this, the

woman asked Jesus for some of the “living” water, although still confusing spiritual water from physical water (John 4:15).

One could argue that Jesus was extremely patient with this woman because he was aware of her actual needs. In the same way that self-awareness regulates the impulses of a leader, empathy often regulates the reactions of leaders toward others (Parrish, 2015). Empathy is all about being able to read the emotions of others and then to respond with compassion, caring, and altruism (Goleman, 2005). Bar-on (2007) suggests that empathy is one of the most critical components of emotional intelligence. Spears (1998) lists empathy as one of the ten characteristics of a servant leader. Rohm and Osula (2013) state that servant leadership includes the values of listening, empathy, healing, awareness, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, commitment to people’s growth, and building community. According to Flaniken (2006), a servant leader can listen, empathize, and his or her interests aside to gain perspective. Of the four “I’s” of transformational leadership, individual consideration hinges on a leader’s ability to demonstrate empathy toward the needs of others (Barbuto & Burbach, 2006; Mathew & Gupta, 2015).

Moreover, research suggests a significant correlation between peer mediation, conflict resolution, and empathy (Şahin et al., 2011). If empathy aids in conflict resolution, then one could argue that empathy is more than just being able to put oneself into the shoes of another. Empathy also involves cross-cultural sensitivity, which allows leaders access to contexts that are ripe for change (Issah, 2018). In the Ancient Near East, women were not viewed as equals with men from a sociological or religious standpoint (Victor, 2016). This point was only exasperated by the fact that Jews and Samaritans had disdain for each other. Jesus was aware of his own need for rest. Yet he was more aware of the real needs of the Samaritan woman. Instead of continuing to serve his interests, which happened to be legitimate physical thirst, he turned the proverbial tables on the woman and took the position of one offering water.

*Principle Two: Christ-like leaders are empathetic and as such, they enter into the lived-out experiences of others.*

## WHEN TRUST LEADS TO TRUTH AND TRUTH SETS FREE (JOHN 4:16–26)

After hearing the woman's request for living water and seeing that she still did not quite understand the spiritual implications of Jesus' statements, Jesus escalated the conversation by confronting the real spiritual need of the woman. He told her to go and get her husband. Carson (1991) suggests that the abrupt change of direction in this conversation from water and toward marital relationship came from Jesus' awareness of the women's lack of true understating. Milne (2014) also agrees that Jesus' request was designed to shock the woman into an awareness of the relational and spiritual dryness of her own life and her need for living water. The woman responded to Jesus with a partial truth: "Sir, I do not have a husband" (John 4:17). Jesus quickly confronted her partial truth by revealing that he knew of her current living situation: "Jesus said to her, 'You are right in saying, 'I have no husband'; for you have had five husbands, and the one you now have is not your husband. What you have said is true'" (John 4:17–18). Without realizing it, the woman was slowly beginning to trust Jesus' authority, which stemmed from his use of the truth.

One might think that this type of blunt honesty would be a turn off to most listeners. However, the woman knew that Jesus was no ordinary man and that his ability to know her personal life meant that he was undoubtedly a holy man (John 4:19; Phan, 2010). Yet, her proclamation of Jesus as being a prophet did not stop her from once again shifting the topic away from Jesus' target, her heart, and toward another seemingly surface-level issue. In the same way that the first half of this passage focuses on a water motif, the second half focuses on the heart of true worship. Worship is an interesting concept within Christendom, especially in modern ecclesial constructs. For some, worship represents the singing portion of a worship gathering before the preaching. However, the word translated worship is a posture word that implies how one should respond when in the presence of one who is more significant (Elwell et al., 1988). The Samaritan woman quickly pivoted the conversation off of her personal life and toward the formation of Samaritan worship, particularly in comparison with Jewish worship—this debate centered on Mount Gerizim and Mount Zion. Mount Gerizim was the location of a special blessing immediately after the Israelites crossed the Jordan River during the latter days of the Exodus narrative (Deut. 11:29, 27:12; Elowsky, 2006; Josh. 8:33).

Mount Zion was the location of Solomon's temple and the official center of all Jewish worship (Kruse, 2004). The Samaritans only recognized the first five books of the Bible as canon, which is why they believed that Mount Gerizim was their most holy place (Carson, 1991).

Conversely, the Jews followed the lead of King David and Solomon and believed that Mount Zion was the only rightful place for worship. It may seem that the woman shifted the subject to avoid discussing the adulterous lifestyle. However, others argue that the reason the woman changed the subject was due to her trust and recognition of Jesus as a prophet and spiritual authority (Phan, 2010). Regardless of why the woman changed the subject, the important thing to note is that the subject shifted when the woman was confronted with the truth. By speaking the truth, Jesus further moved their conversation from the physical toward the ultimate spiritual practice: worship.

There are a couple of culturally, and theologically rich elements of this story found in Jesus response to her conversation shift that is worth noting:

Jesus said to her, "Woman, believe me, the hour is coming when neither on this mountain nor in Jerusalem will you worship the Father. You worship what you do not know; we worship what we know, for salvation is from the Jews. But the hour is coming and is now here when the true worshipers will worship the Father in spirit and truth, for the Father is seeking such people to worship him. God is spirit, and those who worship him must worship in spirit and truth. 25 The woman said to him, "I know that Messiah is coming (he who is called Christ). When he comes, he will tell us all things." 26 Jesus said to her, "I who speak to you am he." (John 4:21–26)

It is important to note that, according to the Jews, the Samaritans had, at best, a limited and a worst skewed view of God. Jesus used another tough truth to communicate to the woman that it did not matter where the Samaritans worshiped because they worshiped a God that they did not know, whereas the Jews had a true revelation of God and worshipped a God that could indeed be known (Carson, 1991; Phan, 2010). Since the Samaritans did not consider anything beyond the Pentateuch as scripture, the woman at the well would have more than likely been ignorant of the Davidic covenant and the detailed prophecies of Isaiah concerning the Messiah (Milne, 2014). In the sweeping statement Jesus gave in verses 21–26, he not only avoided taking a position on the Gerizim versus Zion debate, he pointed to himself as more than just a second Moses, but



he also declared himself the only correct vehicle for worshipping God (Milne 2014). Moreover, Jesus ended this phase of the conversation by using the familiar “I am” language that both Jews and Samaritans associated with Yahweh (Kruse, 2004). Every step of the way, Jesus consistently treated the woman at the well as a person of value. He set aside his own needs, empathized with her real needs, and used the vehicle of conversation to confront her with the truth (Milne, 2014). Because Jesus was honest with the woman about her real need, her real issues, and his identity, a conversation about water was able to turn into a discussion about life-change.

One would assume that honesty is an important element of leadership. However, the prevalence of ethical failure in leadership proves that “truth” is often easier theorized than lived out. Truth, honesty, and trustworthiness are interconnected through the literature on organizational leadership. For example, Fry et al. (2007) state that spiritual leadership consists of universal values such as trust/loyalty, forgiveness/acceptance/gratitude, integrity, honesty, courage, humility, kindness, empathy/compassion, patience/meekness/endurance, and excellence. According to Patterson (2003), trust is not only “a building block for servant leaders” it also involves seeing the untapped potential in others with confidence in other’s ability to act with integrity, goodwill, and honesty (p. 5). Goleman’s (2005) model of EI states that trustworthiness and integrity are integral parts of self-regulation. Mathew and Gupta (2015) state that trust is one of the conceptual and practical bridges that connect transformational leadership with emotional intelligence. According to Avolio et al. (2004), “Authentic leaders are persons who have achieved high levels of authenticity in that they know who they are, what they believe and value, and they act upon those values and beliefs while transparently interacting with others” (p. 802). Although authentic leadership finds overlap with transformational, servant, spiritual, and charismatic leadership, Avolio and Gardner (2005) suggest that authentic leadership forms the “root” of other positive forms of leadership as opposed to encompassing the theories as mentioned earlier (p. 328).

For example, one can be charismatic or visionary and not be authentic (Avolio & Gardner, 2005). However, one cannot demonstrate the self-awareness found in positive leadership theories without some measure of authenticity (Avolio & Gardner, 2005). Thus, one could argue that in many ways, authentic leadership and authenticity also form the “root”

of EI, which always involves truthfulness. Moreover, Bass and Steidlmeier (1999) argue that true transformational leaders are inspirationally authentic in nature. In Jesus' encounter with the woman at the well, it is evident that he not only had an awareness of self, but he also leveraged the confidence he had in himself to "keep it real" with the woman, all of which led to multiple layers of transformational.

*Principle Three: Christ-like leaders are trustworthy, and as such, they speak hard truths to complicated issues.*

### AWARENESS AS INFLUENCE (JOHN 4:27-45)

One of Jesus' most significant contributions to modern organizational leadership theory and practice is his consistent elevation of women. Women played a vital role in the ministry of Jesus by way of material support and mission expansion (Luke 8:1-3). The instructions of a woman precipitated Jesus' first miracle (John 2:3-5). Most importantly, the foundational truth of Christianity contains a phrase that was first proclaimed by a woman: He has risen (John 20:18). The Woman at the Well narrative is so vital to any conversation about Jesus' relationship with women because it not only gives us an example of the first female evangelistic effort, it shows Jesus confronting the sexism and gender bias of his day in a thoughtful, truthful, and empowering way. According to verse 27, the disciples interrupted Jesus' conversation with the woman when they returned from their quest for food. Remember, this is a first-hand account written by the Apostle John. Thus, John could speak to the internal dialogue of the disciples as they wondered about the woman's identity and, more importantly, to them, why Jesus was even talking to her in the first place (John 4:27).

Some suggest that the reason the disciples did not voice these concerns to Jesus in the presence of the woman was due to their trust in him as the great Rabbi (Carson, 1991). However, this view is not only premature as it relates to the time the disciples had spent with Jesus, but it is also inconsistent with their apparent lack of trust in Jesus' decision making later on during his ministry (Carson, 1991). A better explanation for their bewilderment is found within the cultural norms of the day. Simply put, a majority of Jewish people believed that it was a complete waste of time for a Rabbi to speak to a woman or to teach her directly (Scaer, 2003). According to some rabbinic thought leaders of the day, talking with a woman not only distracted the rabbi from studying the Torah,

but it could also lead to scandal (Kruse, 2004). Thus, it makes sense that the disciples were shocked to return and find Jesus having a conversation with the woman, especially given the personal and theological nature of the conversation.

What happened next exemplifies the influential power of an encounter with Jesus. Upon seeing the disciples: “The woman left her water jar and went away into town and said to the people, ‘Come, see a man who told me all that I ever did. Can this be the Christ?’” (John 4:28–29). This is significant for several reasons. First, the woman had a bad reputation in her town. Evidence for this assumption has already been given earlier in the chapter. An adulterous woman who had to draw water during the slow period to avoid the crowds is one who probably had no voice in her community (Enis, 2020). Yet after her encounter with Jesus, she hastily left her water pot and beckoned the town to come and see Jesus. Second, her actions show that Jesus’ teaching on living water and true worship must have made an impact. Although she may not have fully grasped what Jesus was teaching, she grasped enough to know that he was offering something more than literal water (Enis, 2020; Phan, 2010). Third, the fact that the entire community came to Jesus based on the testimony of an adulterous woman shows that actions of Jesus influenced a community as a whole to abandon their biases, if but for a moment, to seek spiritual truth (John 4:30).

While the townspeople came and went from Jesus’ presence, the disciples urged him to eat (John 4:31). Jesus followed the pattern of his conversation with the woman by once again shifting from the physical to the spiritual. Jesus replied, told the disciples, “I have food to eat that you do not know about” (John 4:32). This confused the disciples because he sent them on a mission to find food, yet now he claimed to have food (John 4:33). In the same way that Jesus taught the woman about living water versus limited water and false worship versus true worship, he taught the disciples about true sustenance:

Jesus said to them, “My food is to do the will of him who sent me and to accomplish his work. Do you not say, ‘There are yet four months, then comes the harvest’? Look, I tell you, lift your eyes, and see that the fields are white for harvest. Already the one who reaps is receiving wages and gathering fruit for eternal life, so that sower and reaper may rejoice together. For here the saying holds, ‘One sows, and another reaps.’ I sent you to reap that for which you did not labor. Others have labored, and you have entered into their labor.” (John 4:34–38)

Simply put, Jesus explained to his disciples that true fulfillment comes from accomplishing a God-ordained mission. Jesus was probably still thirsty since his request for water was interrupted, and he was no doubt physically hungry since the disciples had to encourage him to eat (Carson, 1991; Cook, 1997; Kruse, 2004). Nevertheless, although he was aware of his physical limitations, Jesus was more keenly aware of the needs of others. He knew there was more to life than just eating and drinking (Matt 6:25).

The story of the Samaritan woman ends with a perfect example of leadership awareness in action:

Many Samaritans from that town believed in him because of the woman's testimony, "He told me all that I ever did." So when the Samaritans came to him, they asked him to stay with them, and he stayed there for two days. And many more believed because of his word. They said to the woman, "It is no longer because of what you said that we believe, for we have heard for ourselves, and we know that this is indeed the Savior of the world." (John 4:39–42)

What started as a story about a man looking water turned into a story about a woman an entire town receiving living water (Cook, 1997). What began as a story about a group of men searching for food turned into an object lesson of how godly vocation leads to true satisfaction. Jesus overlooked the cultural and gender biases of the day, treated the Samaritan woman with dignity and respect, spoke tough truth into her circumstances, and in doing so, he empowered her to be a catalyst for change. None of this would have happened if Jesus only focused on his own needs or shown a lack of empathy toward the Samaritan woman and the townspeople.

*Principle Four: Christ-like leaders are influential, and as such, they promote positive change by inspiring and mobilizing others toward a greater good.*

## SUMMARY

Jesus Christ is the most influential leader in history. John 4:1–45 demonstrates the nuances of Jesus' leadership style and his influence on others. Furthermore, this passage offers practical principles for modern leadership theory and practice:

- Christ-like leaders are self-aware, and as such, they manage their emotional and physical health.
- Christ-like leaders are empathetic, and as such, they enter into the lived-out experiences of others.
- Christ-like leaders are trustworthy, and as such, they speak hard truths to complicated issues.
- Christ-like leaders are influential, and as such, they promote positive change by inspiring and mobilizing others toward a greater good.

According to Robbins (1996), “Every theology has a politics” (p. 192). Robbins goes on to say that “Ideology resides not only in biblical texts; it also resides in interpretive transitions that have been granted positions of authority” (p. 200). As stated throughout this book, the New Testament Scriptures, while applicable to twenty-first-century contexts, were not originally written with modern readers in mind (Osborne, 2006). Thus, sound hermeneutics involves a balanced treatment of the theological, cultural, and sociological elements of each passage (Robbins, 1996). I have tried to avoid sociological blindness during this discussion on the woman at the well by considering the original context of the narrative without ignoring the sociological, cultural, and interpretive complexities involved in extracting meaning from ancient texts. Thus, it is imperative to consider the simplicity and effectiveness of Jesus’ ideology toward women and their ability to lead change. Jesus, a man who had been rejected by his people, had an encounter with a marginalized woman at a well (Okure, 2009). His awareness of her real need and worth empowered her to move past sociocultural prejudices and into a new calling. Jesus did not view her as just another adulterous woman responsible for five broken marriages. Instead, he saw her as “a real, concrete person whose human condition looks like mine and yours—trapped in sin, desperately needing to be redeemed but afraid of redemption” (Bridges, 1994, p. 174). This chapter is not a call for radical feminism, nor is it a rebuke against well-intended complementarians. Rather, I hope that this simple exploration of the Samaritan woman narrative shows that emotionally intelligent and authentic servant leaders can influence positive change on both the individual and communal level.

## DISCUSSION QUESTIONS

1. How important is self-awareness in healthy leadership? What are some examples of self-awareness gone wrong?
2. Other than Jesus, what leader stands apart as being an exemplar of emotionally intelligent leadership? What makes them stand out?
3. What are some effective techniques for speaking “hard truths” in an emotionally aware manner?
4. Is empathy a trait that is inherited or a behavior that is practiced? Explain.

## REFERENCES

- Arterbury, A. E. (2010). Breaking the betrothal bonds: Hospitality in John 4. *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, 72(1), 63–83.
- Avolio, B. J., & Gardner, W. L. (2005). Authentic leadership development: Getting to the root of positive forms of leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 16 (*Authentic Leadership Development Getting to the Root of Positive Forms of Leadership*), 315–338.
- Avolio, B. J., Gardner, W. L., Walumbwa, F. O., Luthans, F., & May, D. R. (2004). Unlocking the mask: A look at the process by which authentic leaders impact follower attitudes and behaviors. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 15(6), 801–823.
- Barbuto, J. E., & Burbach, M. E. (2006). The emotional intelligence of transformational leaders: A field study of elected officials. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 146(1), 51–64.
- Bar-On, R. (2007). How important is it to educate people to be emotionally intelligent, and can it be done? In R. Bar-On, J. Marce, & M. J. Elias (Eds.), *Educating people to be emotionally intelligent* (pp. 1–14). Praeger.
- Bass, B. M., & Bass, R. (2008). *The bass handbook of leadership: Theory, research, and managerial applications* (4th ed.). Simon & Schuster.
- Bass, B. M., & Steidlmeier, P. (1999). Ethics, character, and authentic transformational leadership behavior. *Leadership Quarterly*, 10(2), 181–217.
- Bourgel, J. (2018). John 4:4–42: Defining a Modus Vivendi between Jews and the Samaritans. *Journal of Theological Studies*, 69(1), 39–65.
- Bridges, L. M. (1994). John 4: 5–42. *Union Seminary Review*, 48(2), 173–176.
- Carson, D. A. (1991). *The gospel, according to John*. InterVarsity Press.
- Caruso, D. R., Bhalerao, H., & Karve, S. (2016). Special issue on emotional intelligence. *Business Perspectives & Research*, 4(1), ix–xii.
- Cook, J. E. (1997). Wells, women, and faith. *Proceedings*, 17, 11–18.

- Crowther, S. (2012). *Peter on leadership: A contemporary exegetical analysis*. Steven Crowther.
- Draper, J. A., & Mukansengimana-Nyirimana, R. (2012). The peacemaking role of the Samaritan woman in John 4: 1–42: A mirror and challenge to Rwandan women. *Neotestamentica*, 46(2), 299–318.
- Elowsky, J. C. (2006). *Ancient Christian commentary of scripture: New testament, vol. IV A: John, 1–10*. InterVarsity Press.
- Elwell, W. A. (1989). *Evangelical commentary on the bible*. Baker Book House.
- Elwell, W. A., Beitzel, B. J., Buckwalter, H. D., Craigie, P. C., Douglas, J. D., Guelich, R., & Hearn, W. R. (1988). *Baker encyclopedia of the Bible (Vol. 2)*. Baker Book House.
- Enis, L. L. (2020). John 4: 1–42. *Interpretation*, 74(1), 71–73.
- Flaniken, F. (2006). Is the Bible relevant to servant-leadership? *Journal of Applied Christian Leadership*, 1(1), 32–39.
- Fry, L. W., & Matherly, L. L., Whittington, J. L., & Winston, B. E. (2007). Spiritual leadership as an integrating paradigm for servant leadership. In S. Sing-Sengupta & D. Fields (Eds.), *Integrating spirituality and organizational leadership* (pp. 70–82). MacMillan.
- Goleman, D. (2005). *Emotional intelligence* (10th anniversary trade ed.). Bantam Books.
- Harter, S. (2005). Authenticity. In C. R. Snyder, & S. J. Lopez (Eds.), *Handbook of positive psychology [electronic resource]* (pp. 382–394). Oxford University Press.
- Issah, M. (2018). *Change leadership: The role of emotional intelligence*. SAGE Open, 8(3), 1–5.
- Klenke, K. (2007). Authentic leadership: A self, leader, and spiritual identity perspective. *International Journal of Leadership Studies*, 3(1), 68–97.
- Kruse, C. G. (2004). *The gospel according to John: An introduction and commentary*. Eerdmans: Grand William B.
- Maccini, R. G. (1994). A reassessment of the woman at the well in John 4 in light of the Samaritan context. *Journal for the Study of the New Testament*, 16(53), 35–46.
- Mathew, M., & Gupta, K. S. (2015). Transformational leadership: Emotional intelligence. *Journal of Indian Management*, 12(2), 75–89.
- Milne, B. (2014). *The message of John*. Inter-Varsity Press.
- Okure, T. (2009). Jesus and the Samaritan woman (Jn 4: 1–42) in Africa. *Theological Studies*, 70(2), 401–418.
- Osborne, G. A. (2006). *The hermeneutical spiral: A comprehensive introduction to biblical interpretation*. IVP.
- Parrish, D. R. (2015). The relevance of emotional intelligence for leadership in a higher education context. *Studies in Higher Education*, 40(5), 821–837.

- Patterson, K. A. (2003). *Servant leadership: A theoretical model*. Doctoral dissertation. Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database (UMI No. 3082719).
- Phan, P. C. (2010). An interfaith encounter at Jacob's well: A missiological interpretation of John 4: 4–42. *Mission Studies*, 27(2), 160–175.
- Preston, G., Moon, J., Simon, R., Allen, S., & Kossi, E. (2015). The relevance of emotional intelligence in project leadership. *Journal of Information Technology & Economic Development*, 6(1), 16–40.
- Robbins, V. K. (1996). *The tapestry of early Christian discourse: Rhetoric, society, and ideology*. Routledge.
- Rodríguez, J. D. (1991). The challenge of Hispanic ministry (Reflections on John 4). *Currents in Theology and Mission*, 18, 420–426.
- Rohm, F. W., Jr., & Osula, B. (2013). Scouting and servant leadership in cross-cultural perspective: An exploratory study. *Journal of Virtues & Leadership*, 3(1), 26–42.
- Şahin, F. S., Serin, N. B., & Serin, O. (2011). Effect of conflict resolution and peer mediation training on empathy skills. *Procedia—Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 15(3rd World Conference on Educational Sciences—2011), 2324–2328.
- Salovey, P., & Mayer, J. D. (1990). Emotional intelligence. *Imagination, Cognition and Personality*, 9(3), 185–211.
- Scaer, P. J. (2003). Jesus and the woman at the well: Where mission meets worship. *Concordia Theological Quarterly*, 67(1), 3–18.
- Serrano, C. (2017). *Leadership fatigue: What new leaders can learn from an old king*. Westbow Press.
- Serrano, C. (2020). *Biblical principles for resilience in leadership: Theory and cases*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Sharif, M., & Scandura, T. (2014). Do perceptions of ethical conduct matter during organizational change? Ethical leadership and employee involvement. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 124(2), 185–196.
- Spears, L. (1998). *Insights on leadership: Service, stewardship, spirit, and servant leadership*. Wiley.
- Victor, R. (2016). Jesus and the Samaritan woman: Liberation of a Dalit. *Asia Journal of Theology*, 30(2).
- Watt, W. M. (2014). Relational principles for effective church leadership. *Journal of Leadership Education*, 13(2), 125–139.
- Wilson, M. (2014). Critical reflection on authentic leadership and school leader development from a virtue ethical perspective. *Educational Review*, 66(4), 482–496.
- Zeidner, M., Matthews, G., & Roberts, R. D. (2009). *What we know about emotional intelligence: How it affects learning, work, relationships, and our mental health*. MIT Press.





## Jesus as Mentor

*Sam Dobrotka*

From the very beginning of the Christian movement, it was understood that Jesus came to earth to heal the divide that existed between humanity and its creator God (Eph. 5:2; Titus 2:11–14). His death would once and for all atone for the sin of humanity (Matt. 1:21; John 1:29; Eph. 1:7; 1 Pet. 3:18; 1 John 2:2; Latourette, 1975; Thorsen, 2008). And yet, if that were the sole purpose for Jesus' human existence there would seem to be no need for his extensive earthly ministry. Jesus understood his purpose to be broader than a theological construct. "I came that they may have life and have it abundantly" (John. 10:10, ESV). The life and ministry of Jesus was intended to impact the here and now for people, not just settle their eternal destination. Accordingly, Jesus spent three years walking throughout first-century Israel "teaching in their synagogues and proclaiming the gospel of the kingdom and healing every disease and every affliction among the people" (Matt. 4:23).

Jesus knew his time on earth was limited (John. 7:33; 12:35; 13:1, 33; 14:19, 28; 16:16; 17:11). If his work was to continue after his

---

S. Dobrotka (✉)  
Grace Covenant Church, Cornelius, NC, USA  
e-mail: [sdobrotka@sbcglobal.net](mailto:sdobrotka@sbcglobal.net)

departure others would have to assume the responsibility. Thus, while Jesus had numerous followers throughout his ministry, he gave particular attention to twelve young men who would follow him wherever he went (Matt. 10:1–4; Mark 3:13–19; Luke 6:12–16). They shared meals together (Matt. 9:9–17; 12:1–8; 26:20–30; Mark 14:17–18; Luke 10:38–42; 24:41–48; John 2:1–10; 21:12–15), and they traveled throughout the region together (Luke 8:1; John 3:22). They became his friends and confidants (Lockyer, 1972). That Jesus expected the twelve to follow in his footsteps was evident in the last words spoken to them before he returned to heaven: “...you will be my witnesses in Jerusalem and in all Judea and Samaria, and to the end of the earth” (Acts 1:8, ESV). The long-term success or failure of the ministry of Jesus rested in the hands of these twelve men.

A Pew Research Center (2012) study determined that 80% of the world’s population identified with a religious group, and Christianity (32%) was the largest of those groups. Thus, it would appear that during his relatively short period of time with the twelve apostles, Jesus was very effective in his efforts to prepare and train them for the task ahead. How did he do it? The answer to that question should be of interest to every leader who wants to influence and prepare those who follow after them. Toward that end, this chapter explores the role of mentor as observed in the behaviors of Jesus when he fed five thousand men, plus women and children with nothing more than two fish and five small loaves of bread (John 6:1–13).

## THE ROLE OF A MENTOR

Homer (800 BCE) is considered to be the original source of the word *mentor* (Adams & Scott, 1997; Belsterling, 2006; Bradley, 2009). In his mythical legend, *The Odyssey*, Mentor is a wise friend and counselor assigned to teach and protect Telemachus, the son of Odysseus. As time went on, the name became a noun, understood as someone who is wise and has personal influence (Belsterling, 2006).

The type of relationship between Mentor and Telemachus would be difficult, if not impossible, to replicate in the twenty-first century (Young & Wright, 2001). Thus, over the years, various qualities and characteristics of a mentoring relationship have been highlighted for better understanding and application. A mentor has come to be known as someone who cares, coaches, guides, nurtures, and manages experiences

for the benefit of another individual (Adams, 1998; Young & Wright, 2001). Among the traits and characteristics of an effective mentor are authenticity, confidentiality, credibility, dependability, high moral and ethical standards, honesty, integrity, professional competence, and self-awareness (Bass & Bass, 2008; Bradley, 2009; Han, 2015; Johnson & Wilson, 2001; Minter & Thomas, 2000).

The use of mentoring relationships has a prominent place in the fields of education and business (Young & Wright, 2001). Within an organizational context, a mentor is a skilled visionary leader who will use the power of their position and experience to positively influence the development of a protégé's personal growth and career (Adams, 1998; Crow & Matthews, 1998; Lussier & Achua, 2013; Witzel, 2014; Yukl, 2013). Yukl (2013) identified mentoring as one of fourteen primary functions of an organizational leader (Cf. Blanchard & Hodges, 2003). Wells (1997) identified mentoring as one of nine value-driven roles for organizational leaders. In short, organizational mentors help advance the careers of others by helping them “learn and work up to their potential and to find new perspectives and meaning in their jobs” (Bass & Bass, 2008, p. 72).

Mentoring is not a one-size-fits-all approach to leadership development. Some benefit from it more than others (Bass & Bass, 2008). However, empirical organizational studies have shown that the career path of those with a mentor advanced further, faster and experienced fewer adjustment problems than those without mentors (Adams, 1998; Bass & Bass, 2008; Northouse, 2013). Turnover was found to be significantly lower among employees with a mentor (Grant, 2014; Ivancevich et al., 2014). Bennis and Nanus (1985) found that most leaders “were able to identify a small number of mentors and key experiences that powerfully shaped their philosophies, personalities, aspirations, and operating styles” (p. 188; Cf. King, 2015). The mentor-protégé relationship also has reciprocal benefits since an effective mentor generally finds great satisfaction from the accomplishments of their protégé (Gray, 1998; Wing, 2009; Yukl, 2013).

As defined by Bradley (2009), the ideal mentor/protégé relationship is one in which: (a) a compelling vision for life is cast and communicated; (b) the transfer of knowledge occurs via verbal instruction and experiential learning; (c) the protégé is allowed to determine some of the learning content based on questions and life circumstances; and, (d) the relationship is enduring, if not lifelong. In this regard, Jesus might be considered

the ideal mentor (Maxwell & Elmore, 2017). He was undeniably clear with his vision and his expectations for the apostles after he left. “I have given you an example, that you also should do just as I have done to you. Truly, truly, I say to you, a servant is not greater than his master, nor is a messenger greater than the one who sent him. If you know these things, blessed are you if you do them” (John 13:15–17, ESV).

We now know the twelve apostles took his words to heart and lived out their days in pursuit of fulfilling the mission given to them by Jesus (Lockyer, 1972). However, the transition from fishermen (Matt. 4:18–19) to seasoned apostles was not always easy. Nor was it certain they would eventually catch on (Mark 4:13; 7:18; 8:17, 21; John 3:10; 8:43; 10:38; 11:50). Jesus knew that some of what he taught might not be fully grasped until after he was gone (John 13:7), but he never stopped teaching them with understanding and patience (Bradley, 2009). In addition to proactively teaching them things he knew they would need (Matthew 5:1–7:29), Jesus also answered questions and addressed concerns brought to him by the apostles (John 13:6). He used unplanned circumstances to teach truth and understanding. In fact, some of those lessons, like bigotry observed in the Good Samaritan, still have profound present-day application (Murrell et al., 1999).

All four Gospel accounts contain the pericope of Jesus feeding five thousand men plus women and children with only two fish and five small loaves of bread (Matt. 14:13–21; Mark 6:30–44; Luke 9:10–17; John 6:1–13). In fact, as pointed out by Tenney (1981), this is the only miracle that is mentioned in all four gospels. At the same time, it should be acknowledged that John’s account (John 6:1–13) of this pericope does differ in some detail from the synoptic accounts (Matt. 14:13–21; Mark 6:30–44; Luke 9:10–17). These differences can be attributed to the overall intent of the authors. For Christians, the Bible, as a whole, is considered a *primary* source. It is a primary source, not because of its significance to the faith, but rather, because of its relationship to history. It belongs to the era being considered and offers the most direct access to the time (Bradley & Muller, 1995). However, each of the Gospel accounts can also be considered a *secondary* source. By their very nature, secondary sources of information are indirect as they include elements of selectivity and interpretation (Bradley & Muller, 1995). This does not minimize the value and trustworthiness of the account, but rather places it in proper context. For example, Luke was written for the benefit of a single individual so he would have certainty of things he had been

taught (Luke 1:1–4). John, on the other hand, was written not to provide comprehensive historical detail, but to convince the reader that Jesus was the Christ (John 20:30–31). Understood this way, the differences in the gospel accounts are able to stand on their own, each providing unique insight into the life and ministry of Jesus.

While references to the synoptic accounts will be made, the focus of this chapter will be concerned primarily with the gospel of John (John 6:1–13). John’s account provides certain details not contained in the synoptic accounts which help to inform our understanding of the mentoring practices of Jesus. As the words and actions of Jesus are considered, the following themes can be identified that point to his mentoring effectiveness and speak to one’s own leadership calling within organizational life today.

### MENTOR—PROTÉGÉ RELATIONSHIPS

The pericope begins with the reader being told that a large crowd was following after Jesus because they wanted to see more of the miracles he performed (John 6:2). As one might expect, when someone does the kinds of things Jesus did, it will not take long for a crowd to assemble. While teaching and healing the masses was a central part of his purpose, it also affected the time and attention Jesus had for investing in his chosen twelve leaders. Therefore, in order to put some space between them and the crowd “Jesus went up on the mountain and there he sat down with his disciples” (John 6:3, ESV). Finding time to be alone with his leaders was a common practice by Jesus. Some of these moments were intentional, as when he confirmed his identity as Christ (Mark 8:27–30; Luke 9:18–20) and shared his transfiguration experience (Mark 9:2). There were other times when being together as a small group allowed for unscheduled training (John 4). And there were times when Jesus pulled the twelve away from everyone simply to rest (Mark 6:31–32). Undoubtedly, the apostles observed Jesus in unguarded genuine moments. Such instances allowed Jesus to cultivate transformative authentic relationships with each apostle (Lewis & Demarest, 1996).

It’s important to distinguish between different types of mentoring relationships. They can be either formal or informal (Stanley & Clinton, 1992; Ragins et al., 2000). Stanley and Clinton (1992) identified three mentoring groups along a continuum of deliberateness. *Intensive* mentoring (dyadic discipleship, spiritual guide, coach) is the most

deliberate and allows for significant depth and awareness within the mentor-protégé relationship. *Occasional* mentoring (counselor, teacher, sponsor) is next, followed by *Passive* mentoring (contemporary and historical models), which is the least deliberate type of mentoring relationship. All three types have their place and function depending upon the desired outcome of the relationship. The type of mentoring between Jesus and the twelve apostles undoubtedly fits within the *intensive* group.

It's also important to clarify expectations at the very beginning of a mentoring relationship (Kochan & Trimble, 2000). While the relationship should be strong and based on mutual appreciation for one another (Stanley & Clinton, 1992), the mentor-protégé relationship does not require friendship (Young & Wright, 2001). While friendliness is to be expected, a friendship is a different type of relationship altogether, and should not be confused with a mentor-protégé relationship. That being said, the effective mentor makes a personal commitment to the protégé for an extended period of time, demonstrated by the mentor's accessibility (Lozinak, 2016; Young & Wright, 2001). While a mentor-protégé relationship should result in growth for both the mentor and the protégé (Allen & Poteet, 1999), the focus of the relationship is the development of the protégé (Daloz, 1986; Wittenberg, 1998; Young & Wright, 2001). Because the mentor-protégé relationship gives primary attention to the growth and development of the protégé, mentoring is often considered a form of transformational leadership (Northouse, 2013).

With regard to the mentor-protégé relationship, Stanley and Clinton (1992) posited that an effective mentor:

- Possesses the ability to see potential in a person
- Shows tolerance with mistakes, brashness, and abrasiveness in order to see that potential develop (Cf. Gehrke & Kay, 1984; Rowley, 1999)
- Maintains flexibility in responding to people and circumstances (Cf. Lindenberger & Zachary, 1999)
- Demonstrates patience, knowing that time and experience are needed for development
- Maintains perspective, having vision and ability to see down the road and suggest the next steps that a protégé needs
- Has the requisite gifts and abilities that build up and encourage others.

The twelve apostles were predominantly fishermen (Matt. 4:19). They were not accomplished orators or leaders (Acts 4:13). They were sometimes slow to grasp what Jesus was trying to teach them (Matt. 15:16). And yet, he never gave up on them and gave of himself to them until the very end (John 13:1). Leaders would be well served if they showed the same type of commitment to a protégé as Jesus did.

*Principle One: To lead like Jesus mentors are intentional about creating space for a protégé in their life.*

## ALTRUISTIC MENTORING

As John continues his account, he gives the reader the impression that Jesus sat down with his disciples for only a few moments when “lifting up his eyes, then, and seeing that a large crowd was coming toward him, Jesus said to Philip, ‘Where are we to buy bread, so that these people may eat?’” (John 6:5, ESV). Those who are already familiar with the story may lose sight of the fact that Jesus processed multiple thoughts between the moment he saw the people and when he spoke to Philip. First, he made note of the large size of the crowd coming toward him. Second, he connected the time of day with the probable physical manifestation of hunger. Matthew (14:14) and Mark (6:34) reveal that compassion for the people was what motivated Jesus. It can be assumed the same is true in John’s account even though John does not stipulate as such (Beasley-Murray, 1996). Lastly, Jesus connected the size of the crowd and their physical need to a learning opportunity for his disciples, particularly Philip.

Both compassion for the people and a learning opportunity for Philip suggest an altruistic posture by Jesus. His subsequent actions were for the sake of others, not for himself. Such behavior was characteristic of Jesus. Throughout the gospel accounts, we see Jesus as a leader who was follower-oriented and sacrificial (Atterson, 2019). The leadership behaviors of Jesus are in stark contrast to the dark side of leadership too often seen in some mentors today (Dube, 2008; Perry, 2018). While mentor-protégé relationships can go awry due to unrealistic expectations on the part of the protégé, not every accomplished leader is capable of being an effective mentor (Ivancevich et al., 2014; Perry, 2018). Some lack the skill and/or a sufficient level of self-awareness to properly manage the mentor-protégé relationship (Atterson, 2020). An ill-equipped mentor

may become jealous of the protege, undermine their work, be overcontrolling, show favoritism, betray the trust of the protege, or abandon the relationship altogether (Dube, 2008).

The self-aware mentor, on the other hand, seeks the good of the protégé, as well as, the good of the organization (Atterson, 2020). Winston (2002) maintained that such a leadership posture is reflective of *agapao* love, which altruistically seeks the good of the follower. Thus, the altruistic mentor finds fulfillment in the growth of the protégé and rejoices in their success. Belsterling (2016) posited that a mentor modeled after the example of Jesus: (a) truly cares for their protege, (b) is concerned about the issues that concern them, (c) is willing to confront them with truth, (d) from a position of humility, and (e) in order to help them adopt the same passionate purpose of living in relationship with God.

Jesus was not motivated by self-aggrandizement in his mentoring relationships. He found pleasure in helping others and watching his disciples grow in their capacity as leaders (Luke 10:17–20). Because of his self-awareness and altruistic posture, he was able to read the moment accurately and find a path forward that met the physical needs of the crowd, as well as, provide an opportunity for growth for Philip. Such behavior has its own rewards since an altruistic mentor finds great joy and considerable satisfaction in the growth and achievements of their protégé (Gray, 1998; Wing, 2009; Yukl, 2013).

*Principle Two: To lead like Jesus mentors are altruistic in their thinking and behaviors toward their protégé.*

## CAPACITY AND SELF-EFFICACY

The question addressed to Philip, “Where are we to buy bread, so that these people may eat?” (John 6:5, ESV), brings additional significance to the mentor-protégé relationship. If the reader stopped there, with no prior understanding of the complete story, it would appear as if Jesus was asking a genuine question, hoping to gain insight from Philip. And even though Jesus knew what he was going to do (verse 6), Philip did not. At that moment, Philip felt the weight of the situation, expressed in his response, “Two hundred denarii worth of bread would not be enough for each of them to get a little” (John 6:7, ESV). By posing the question to Philip, Jesus was engaging him with not just the problem, but also, the



responsibility for a solution. The question caused Philip to take ownership of the situation, if only briefly.

Within a mentor-protégé relationship, this type of exchange is significant since the ultimate goal of mentoring is to build capacity, not dependency, within the protégé (Bradley, 2009; Offstein et al., 2011). The development of capacity within an individual is directly influenced by their own internal locus of control and self-efficacy (Bradley, 2009). As determined by Bandura (1997), one's self-efficacy significantly influences the course of action chosen to pursue, the amount of effort put forth in the pursuit of that course of action, the length of time they will persevere in the face of challenges and failures, their resilience to adversity (Cf. Allen, 2007), how much stress and depression they experience in coping with taxing demands, and the level of accomplishments they will ultimately realize. In short, self-efficacy enhances motivation and increases the level of performance (Bandura & Locke, 2003). These qualities and characteristics were critical to the apostles as they would have to deal with problems they did not cause, make decisions with insufficient information, and attempt to fix things that were not theirs to fix (Crow & Matthews, 1998).

Bradley (2006) identified the following essential elements of, and barriers to, effective mentoring as related to the development of self-efficacy within a protégé:

- Belief in others—the protégé is viewed as capable and resourceful; the mentor's role is not to fix perceived deficiencies.
- Trust—the protégé views the mentor as trustworthy; the mentor does not break confidentiality. Without trust, a learning relationship will not occur (Cf. Bradley, 2009).
- Training—the mentor possesses professional competence and the requisite skill and training to effectively support the protégé.
- Process—the mentor and protégé have clear goals and a plan of action for their relationship.
- Communication—the mentor has a high level of communication and dialogue skills and uses them consistently.
- Time—both the mentor and protégé dedicate sufficient time and resources to meet, interact, and carry out their plan of action.

While Jesus may have been quick to intervene with his own solution, the very act of asking Philip to propose a course of action conveyed to him that Jesus valued his opinion. Jesus believed in him. Such belief would have enhanced the level of trust Philip attributed to Jesus. The combination of belief and trust at such a relatively early stage of their relationship would have increased Philip's level of self-efficacy and increased the quality of his future service (Blanchard & Hodges, 2003).

*Principle Three: To lead like Jesus mentors believe in and trust their protégé in order to increase their leadership capacity and self-efficacy.*

## TRANSFORMATIONAL COACHING

“He said this to test him for he himself knew what he would do” (John 6:6, ESV). This simply stated verse leaves the reader with a number of questions. If Jesus already knew what he was going to do, why did he bother asking Philip, “Where are we to buy bread?” in the preceding verse? And why ask Philip? Why not ask one of the more prominent apostles? Lastly, what was the test, specifically? While the text does not provide an answer to these questions, an understanding of the act of coaching may shed some light on Jesus' intent.

The difference between mentoring and coaching is less than clear since they both possess similar characteristics (Berry et al., 1993; Fehring & Rodrigues, 2017; Hawkins & Smith, 2013). Stanley and Clinton (1992) considered coaching to be a form of intensive mentoring. That being said, whereas mentoring is generally concerned with developing the protégé professionally, coaching is focused on development in specific areas or skills (Brounstein, 2000; Clinton, 2005; Hawkins & Smith, 2013). Hawkins and Smith (2013) delineated coaching on four levels: (1) acquisition of skills usually related to the role of the protégé; (2) raising the level of performance in skills already acquired; (3) longer-term development of the protégé that focuses on the whole person within the level of a life stage; and (4) transformation such that the protégé is able to shift from one level of functioning to a higher-order level.

As described by Hawkins and Smith (2013) transformational coaching has one primary outcome, to shift the “beliefs, attitudes, and assumptions that generate our reflex emotional reactions to certain situations in life” (p. 36). In other words, to change our behavior we must first recognize the emotions that are aroused under certain conditions, then change how we think about the assumptions generated by the emotions (Cf. Lee,

2014). If we change our assumptions, we are then able to change our behavior. Hawkins and Smith further postulated that insight alone will be insufficient to bring about the desired change in a protégé (Cf. Leyda & Lawson, 2000; Springle, 2009; VanDenburgh, 2007). Under pressure, our tendency is to revert to established behavioral norms. Thus, effective change will occur only when the desired new behaviors are rehearsed. Within an organizational context, Hawkins and Smith (2013) posited, “if we need to link transformational coaching of individuals to the transformation of the organization, then we believe this needs the added support of the outside perspective of an external coach” (p. 31).

Within the context of this pericope, Jesus was the external coach. While in most instances, the protégé will approach a potential mentor for specific coaching, it is common for a mentor to initiate a coaching opportunity if they see it will benefit their protégé (Clinton, 2005). Having already spent considerable time with Philip and the other apostles, it would be reasonable to think Jesus anticipated how they would respond—overwhelmed by the size of the crowd (emotion), they would believe the solution was beyond them (assumption), and consider only practical approaches to finding a solution (behavior). Philip’s response that the equivalent of eight month’s wages (Tenney, 1981) would be insufficient to meet the need confirmed as much. Jesus wanted to transform the manner in which Philip and the other apostles approached problems (Tenney, 1981). He knew that if his work was to continue after he left, the way they viewed challenging circumstances would have to change. By engaging them as he did, the apostles, knowing the miraculous was possible, would not be overwhelmed by adversity and would choose behaviors that gave God an opportunity to intervene on their behalf.

*Principle Four: To lead like Jesus mentors coach their protégé to expect God’s activity in their life by modeling such behavior themselves.*

## MENTORING & COACHING TEAMS

As the story progresses, a boy is found who is willing to share his lunch of five barley loaves and two fish (John 6:9). At this point, additional apostles are now involved (John 6:8) and Jesus is no longer giving his attention solely to Philip. In fact, from this point forward Jesus addresses the apostles as a group. He asked them to facilitate the seating of the crowd (John 6:10). After he gave thanks for the meal, the apostles distributed the food to about five thousand men, plus women and children (Matt 14:19; Mark

6:41; Luke 9:16). After everyone had eaten all they wanted, Jesus had the apostles gather up all of the leftover food (John 6:12–13). Jesus used the situation at hand to mentor not just one apostle, but all twelve.

That Jesus was mentoring a team, not twelve individuals in a group setting, is an important distinction. It's true that most mentoring relationships tend to be dyadic (Bass & Bass, 2008), and research into the mentoring of teams is limited (Hawkins & Smith, 2013). In addition, mentoring a team comes with two potential challenges: (a) Individual experience may be limited or diluted in order to give equal time and opportunity to all members of the team; and (b) the motivations and abilities of the group's individuals may be diminished for the sake of social conformity or groupthink (Stanley & Clinton, 1992; Hawkins & Smith, 2013). These challenges tend to be offset, however, by the energy and momentum derived from the group experience (Stanley & Clinton, 1992).

Nevertheless, when mentored correctly, a team can function as more than the sum of its parts if their mission is clear (Hawkins & Smith, 2013). In order to accomplish this the mentor/coach:

works with a whole team both when they are together and when they are apart, in order to help them improve both their collective performance and how they work together, and also how they develop their collective leadership to more effectively engage with all their key stakeholder groups to jointly transform the wider business. (Hawkins, 2011, p. 60)

Within the pericope of feeding five thousand men plus women and children, Jesus is observed mentoring at both the individual and group level, the apostles learned how to work together for a common purpose, and they observed how to be a transformational leader.

Surowiecki (2005) identified four basic conditions necessary for a team to be effective: diversity of opinion, independence, decentralization, and aggregation (mechanism for turning private judgments into a collective decision). Each of these characteristics can be observed within the team of apostles (Luke 9:46; 22:24; Acts 4:18–20; Acts 15:1–21; 36–41). Katzenbach and Smith (1993) defined a high-performing team as “a small group of people so committed to something larger than themselves that they will not be denied” (p. 259). History has shown that the apostles embodied this definition of a team to such an extent that other leaders, like the apostle Paul, soon joined their ranks (Acts 9:1–22). Through his team

approach to mentoring, Jesus was able to take twelve young men and influence them to become world changers.

*Principle Five: To lead like Jesus mentors embrace mentoring and coaching teams when the successful completion of a mission requires multiple diverse leaders.*

## SUMMARY

Spiritual transformation was the ultimate goal of Jesus for all people (John 17:20–23). Thus, for the Christian leader, there is value in using mentoring relationships to facilitate spiritual growth, in addition to the development of skill and performance in the professional life of a protégé. While some advocate for the practice of spiritual disciplines to facilitate spiritual transformation (Willard, 1998), individual discipline alone does not appear to be sufficient in replicating the life of Christ within all Christ-followers. Spiritual mentors are needed (McGrath, 1995; Shinohara, 2002). Faith may, indeed, be personal, but it was never intended to be individualistic.

While mentoring may not be the panacea for all leadership development (Bass & Bass, 2008), the actions of Jesus and the subsequent impact of the apostles should bolster the value of mentoring in the eyes of all organizational leaders. Toward that end, this chapter examined the leadership behaviors of Jesus observed in John 6:1–13 through the lens of a contemporary mentor. Table 4.1 is a composite of the principles that have been extracted from Jesus’ use of mentoring as depicted in John 6:1–13.

**Table 4.1** Mentoring principles of Jesus observed in John 6:1–13

<i>Principle</i>	<i>To lead like Jesus mentors</i>
1	Are intentional about creating space for a protégé in their life
2	Are altruistic in their thinking and behaviors toward their protégé
3	Believe in and trust their protégé in order to increase their leadership capacity and self-efficacy
4	Coach their protégé to expect God’s activity in their life by modeling such behavior themselves
5	Embrace mentoring and coaching teams when the successful completion of a mission requires multiple diverse leaders

## DISCUSSION QUESTIONS

1. Think back over your life and consider 2–3 leaders who have had significant influence in your life. What about those relationships made them significant?
2. Have you ever been part of a mentor/protégé relationship, either formal or informal? What about the relationship made it effective or ineffective?
3. Why do you think some Christian leaders are not intentional about establishing a mentoring relationship with a protégé?
4. As you consider younger leaders within your sphere of influence, who might be a candidate with whom you can form a mentor/protégé relationship?
5. What might be effective ways for a leader to initiate a conversation with a potential protégé to discuss a possible mentor/protégé relationship?

## REFERENCES

- Adams, H. G. (1998). *The mentorship briefing guide: Handbook for establishing and implementing a mentoring program*. Notre Dame: GEM Consortium.
- Adams, H. G., & Scott, S. K. (1997). *The fundamentals of effective mentoring*. Notre Dame: GEM Consortium.
- Allen, P. (2007). *Resources for learning mentors: Practical activities for group sessions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Allen, T. D., & Potect, M. L. (1999). Developing effective mentoring relationships: Strategies from the mentor's viewpoint. *The Career Development Quarterly*, 48(1), 59–74.
- Atterson, M. (2019). Turning from toxicity to healthy leadership environments. *Theology of Leadership Journal*, 2(1), 73–85. <http://theologyofleadership.com/index.php/tlj/article/view/43>.
- Atterson, M. (2020). Christian leaders as mentors: The challenge of emerging leaders. In J. D. Henson (Ed.), *Modern metaphors of Christian leadership: Exploring Christian leadership in a contemporary organizational context* (pp. 261–274). New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York, NY: W. H. Freeman.
- Bandura, A., & Locke, E. A. (2003). Negative self-efficacy and goal effects revisited. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(1), 87–99.

- Bass, B. M., & Bass, R. (2008). *The Bass handbook of leadership: Theory, research, and managerial applications* (4th ed.). New York, NY: Free Press.
- Beasley-Murray, G. R. (1996). *John*. In B. M. Metzger (Ed.), *Word Biblical commentary* (Vol. 36, 2 ed.). Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson.
- Belsterling, R. (2006). The mentoring approach of Jesus as demonstrated in John 13. *The Journal of Youth Ministry*, 5(1), 77–92.
- Belsterling, R. (2016). Youth-work, qualities of an adult’s mentoring approach and adolescent attachment: A new construct for measuring effective mentoring characteristics in ministry. *The Journal of Youth Ministry*, 14(2), 31–47.
- Bennis, W. G., & Nanus, B. (1985). *Leaders: The strategies for taking charge*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.
- Berry, D. L., Cadwell, C. M., & Fehrmann, J. (1993). *50 activities for coaching/mentoring*. Amherst: HRD Press.
- Blanchard, K., & Hodges, P. (2003). *The servant leader: Transforming your heart, head, hands & habits*. Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson.
- Bradley, A. P. (2006). *Study of implementation barriers and strategies for success to effectively mentor school administrators*. Doctoral dissertation, University of LaVerne, Proquest Dissertations Publishing.
- Bradley, A. P. (2009). Mentoring: Following the example of Christ. *ICCTE Journal*, 4(1), 1–13.
- Bradley, J. E., & Muller, R. A. (1995). *Church history: An introduction to research, reference works, and methods*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Brounstein, M. (2000). *Coaching and mentoring for dummies*. Hoboken: Wiley.
- Clinton, J. R. (2005). *Mentor reader—Clinton articles on mentoring*. Pasadena: Fuller Theological Seminary.
- Crow, G. M., & Matthews, L. J. (1998). *Finding one’s way: How mentoring can lead to dynamic leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Daloz, L. (1986). *Effective teaching and mentoring: Realizing the transformational power of adult learning experiences*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Dube, R. (2008, May 5). The dark side of mentoring. *The Globe and Mail*. <https://www.theglobeandmail.com/life/the-dark-side-of-mentoring/article671822/>.
- Fehring, H., & Rodrigues, S. (Eds.). (2017). *Teaching, coaching and mentoring adult learners: Lessons for professionalism and partnership*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Gehrke, N. J., & Kay, R. S. (1984). The socialization of beginning teachers through mentor-protégé relationships. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 35(3), 21–24.
- Grant, S. C. (2014). *Mentoring emerging leaders toward holistic health and longevity: A guide for seasoned leaders to intentionally invest in and influence*

- the next generation of ministry leaders*. Doctoral dissertation, Talbot School of Theology, Proquest Dissertations Publishing.
- Gray, J. (1998). Mentoring the young clinician-scientist. *Clinical and Investigative Medicine*, 21(6), 279–282.
- Han, S. S. (2015). *Developing an intentional leadership development process through mentoring in the local church*. Doctoral dissertation, Assemblies of God Theological Seminary, Proquest Dissertations Publishing.
- Hawkins, P. (2011). *Leadership team coaching: Developing collective transformational leaders*. London: Kogan Page Publishers.
- Hawkins, P., & Smith, N. (2013). *Coaching, mentoring and organizational consultancy: Supervision, skills and development* (2nd ed.). McGraw-Hill Education.
- Homer. (800 BCE). *The Odyssey* (S. Butler, Trans.). Published in 1900. [Electronic reference]. Retrieved May 20, 2020, from <http://www.online-literature.com/homer/odyssey>.
- Ivancevich, J. M., Konopaske, R., & Matteson, M. T. (2014). *Organizational behavior and management* (10th ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Johnson, W. B., & Wilson, P. F. (2001). Core virtues for the practice of mentoring. *Journal of Psychology & Theology*, 29(2), 121–130.
- Katzenbach, J. R., & Smith, D. K. (1993). The rules for managing cross-functional reengineering teams. *Planning Review*, 21(2), 12–13. <https://doi.org/10.1108/eb054404>.
- King, D. W. (2015). Reflection: Standing on the shoulders of others. *Christian Scholar's Review*, 44(2), 111–115.
- Kochan, F. K., & Trimble, S. B. (2000). From mentoring to co-mentoring: Establishing collaborative relationships. *Theory into Practice*, 39(1), 20–28. [https://doi.org/10.1207/s15430421tip3901\\_4](https://doi.org/10.1207/s15430421tip3901_4).
- Latourette, K. S. (1975). *A history of Christianity: Beginnings to 1500* (Vol. 1). San Francisco, CA: Harper & Row.
- Lee, M. J. (2014). Ancient mentors and moral progress according to Galen and Paul. *The Covenant Quarterly*, 72(3–4), 55–70.
- Lewis, G., & DeMarest, B. (1996). *Integrative theology* (Vol. 2). Grand Rapids: Zondervan.
- Leyda, R. J., & Lawson, K. (2000). Exploring a “coaching” model for promoting spiritual formation. *Christian Education Journal*, 4(2), 63–83.
- Lindenberger, J., & Zachary, L. J. (1999). Play ‘20 questions’ to develop a successful mentoring program. *Training & Development*, 53(2), 14–17.
- Lockyer, H. (1972). *All the apostles of the Bible*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.
- Lozinak, K. (2016). Mentor matching does matter. *Delta Kappa Gamma Bulletin*, 83(1), 12–24.
- Lussier, R. N., & Achua, C. F. (2013). *Leadership: Theory, application, & skill development* (5th ed.). Mason: South-Western Cengage.



- Maxwell, J. C., & Elmore, T. (2017). *The Maxwell leadership Bible* (6th ed.). New King James Version. Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson.
- McGrath, A. (1995). *Evangelicalism and the future of Christianity*. Downers Grove: InterVarsity.
- Minter, R. L., & Thomas, E. G. (2000). Employee development through coaching, mentoring and counseling: A multidimensional approach. *Review of Business*, 21(1/2), 43–47.
- Murrell, A. J., Crosby, F. J., & Ely, R. J. (1999). *Mentoring dilemmas: Developmental relationships within multicultural organizations*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Northouse, P. G. (2013). *Leadership theory and practice* (6th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Offstein, E. H., Shah, A. J. & Gnyawali, D. R. (Eds). (2011). Effects of CEO-BOD mentoring on firm competitive behavior. *Review of Business*, 32(1), 75–88.
- Perry, M. (2018). Choose wisely: The dark side of mentoring. *College and University*, 93(2), 43–44.
- Pew Research Center. (2012). *The global religious landscape*. <https://www.pewforum.org/2012/12/18/global-religious-landscape-exec/>.
- Ragins, B. R., Cotton, J. L., & Miller, J. S. (2000). Marginal mentoring: The effects of type of mentor, quality of the relationship, and program design on work and career attitudes. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43, 1176–1194.
- Rowley, J. B. (1999). The good mentor. *Educational Leadership*, 56(8), 20–22.
- Shinohara, A. (2002). Spiritual formation and mentoring: An approach from the Christian tradition of spiritual direction. *Christian Education Journal*, 6(2), 105–118.
- Springle, P. (2009). *Developing leaders in a postmodern world*. Leadership Network. [https://issuu.com/engagechurch/docs/developing\\_leaders\\_in\\_a\\_postmodern\\_](https://issuu.com/engagechurch/docs/developing_leaders_in_a_postmodern_).
- Surowiecki, J. (2005). *The wisdom of crowds*. New York, NY: Anchor Books.
- Stanley, P. D., & Clinton, J. R. (1992). *Connecting: The mentoring relationships you need to succeed in life*. Colorado Springs, CO: NavPress.
- Tenney, M. C. (1981). John. In F. E. Gaebelin (Ed.), *The expositor's Bible commentary* (Vol. 9). Grand Rapids: Zondervan.
- Thorsen, D. (2008). *An exploration of Christian theology*. Baker: Grand Rapids.
- VanDenburgh, D. (2007). Coaching for leaders. *The Journal of Applied Christian Leadership*, 2(1), 54–61.
- Wells, S. (1997). *From sage to artisan: The nine roles of the value-driven leader*. Mountain View: Davies-Black.
- Willard, D. (1998). Spiritual disciplines, spiritual formation, and the restoration of the soul. *Journal of Psychology and Theology*, 26(1), 101–109.

- Wing, K. T. (2009). Ready to pay it forward? Give mentoring a try. *Strategic Finance*, 90(8), 18–19.
- Winston, B. E. (2002). *Be a leader for God's sake*. Virginia Beach, VA: School of Leadership Studies Regent University.
- Wittenberg, P. M. (1998). Successful mentoring in a correctional environment. *Federal Probation*, 62(2), 75–81.
- Witzel, E. (2014). Mentor. *The Journal of Applied Christian Leadership*, 8(1), 90–94.
- Young, C. Y., & Wright, J. V. (2001). Mentoring: The components for success. *Journal of Instructional Psychology*, 28(3), 202–206.
- Yukl, G. (2013). *Leadership in organizations* (8th ed.). Upper Saddle River: Pearson.



## Jesus as Overcomer

*Alex G. Wright*

Christian leadership scholars have long argued that Jesus is the epitome of the perfect leader (Blanchard & Hodges, 2005, p. 4). In recent years, the application of Christian spirituality to organizational contexts has gained a great deal of popularity, especially in the United States (Mabey et al., 2017, p. 757). However, the existing literature regarding the application of Christian principles to organizational contexts “largely misconstrues and misapplies the teaching of its founder, Jesus. As a result ... there is a real risk that we lose the vital contribution of Christian thought, not least some of the timeless counter-cultural wisdom of Jesus” (Mabey et al., 2017, p. 757). For this reason, it is necessary to perform exegetically sound and rigorous scholarly research regarding Jesus.

This chapter looks specifically at how Jesus led during times of adversity and demonstrated his nature as an overcomer of adversity. Patterson and Kelleher (2005) noted that adversity is almost always viewed in a negative context and is often denied or covered up for fear that it be viewed as a weakness in leadership (p. v). However, adversity can be more adequately viewed as a storm to be weathered and experiences from which leaders

---

A. G. Wright (✉)  
Beacon Christian Church, Lexington, KY, USA

© The Author(s), under exclusive license to Springer Nature  
Switzerland AG 2021

J. D. Henson (ed.), *Biblical Organizational Leadership*,  
Christian Faith Perspectives in Leadership and Business,  
[https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-69929-1\\_5](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-69929-1_5)

may emerge even stronger (Patterson & Kelleher, p. v). In order to study how Jesus overcame adversity as a leader, this chapter examines the narrative of Jesus' miraculous resurrection of a man named Lazarus. It is a story that illustrates not only how Jesus dealt with adversity, but how he capitalized on it to accomplish goals and further endear himself to his followers. The themes yielded by the exegetical analysis of this narrative are then discussed in the context of contemporary organizational setting.

### EXEGETICAL ANALYSIS OF JOHN II:I-45

John 11:1–45 shares the narrative of Jesus raising Lazarus, the brother of Mary and Martha, from the dead. Mary and Martha sent Jesus a messenger saying, “Lord, behold, he whom You love is sick” (Jn. 11:3, NASB). Upon receiving this message, Jesus did not immediately leave to tend to Lazarus. Instead, Jesus waited until Lazarus had died before going to the village where he lived. Upon his arrival, Lazarus had already been in the tomb for four days. Mary and Martha both confronted Jesus with the statement that, if Jesus had been there, then their brother would not have died. Jesus responded with compassion, even being moved to the point of tears, and asked to be led to Lazarus' tomb. After praying to God, the Father, Jesus commanded Lazarus to come out of the tomb, and the dead man came back to life and walked out.

It is interesting to note that Mary and Martha did not present a request to Jesus; they did not say, “Please come and heal our brother,” but simply, “He whom You love is sick” (Bruner, 2012, p. 499). Whereas this may be viewed as a not-so-subtle tool employed by the sisters to get Jesus to respond to their message, it also demonstrates that Jesus' compassion was well-known. The fact that Jesus wept upon encountering the grief of the sisters and other mourners is further confirmation of this compassion (Michaels, 2010, p. 280). Whenever emotion is demonstrated in a Biblical text, it is important to examine why that emotion has been evoked and what that emotion means (Robbins, 1996, pp. 29–30). In addition to the weeping, though, the reader is told that Jesus is “greatly disturbed in spirit and deeply moved” (Jn 11:33). The proper understanding of these emotions is that Jesus was angry and somewhat indignant, both at the death of his friend and the unbelief of those around him (Blomberg, 1997, p. 300). According to Carson (1991), Jesus' sorrow and anger were both critical in this instance: “Grief and compassion without outrage

reduce to mere sentiment, while outrage without grief hardens into self-righteous anger and irascibility” (p. 416).

If Jesus was so compassionate, though, why did he wait two days after hearing the news of Lazarus’ illness before traveling to Bethany? Waiting to leave for two more days could very well have been viewed as being disrespectful to Mary, Martha, and Lazarus, who would have expected Jesus to leave as soon as possible after receiving the message (Keener, 2012, p. 839). When Jesus and the disciples arrived, Lazarus had already been dead and in the grave for four days. This means that even if Jesus had left immediately upon receiving the message, Lazarus would have already been dead by the time Jesus arrived (Thompson, 2015, p. 245). Interestingly, the Jews believed that the soul of a person lingered near their grave for three days, hoping for an opportunity to reenter the body, but the soul would leave when physical decomposition began (Osborne, 2018, p. 94). Had Jesus arrived and restored Lazarus to life within these three days, it certainly would have been miraculous, but, based on the belief of the lingering soul, it would have been something for which the Jewish people had a frame of reference. By waiting until the fourth day when the soul had supposedly departed, Jesus was ensuring that this miracle would have the maximum impact.

While Jesus was still on the way, Martha rushed to meet him. She expressed that, if Jesus had arrived sooner, Lazarus would still be alive (Jn. 11:21). This same sentiment would be echoed by Mary as well as by the other bystanders (Jn. 11:32, 37). Clearly, Jesus had built up credibility as one who was able to heal the sick. However, in this recognition of Jesus’ miraculous healing ability, there is also an accusation: Jesus’ failure to come immediately had allowed Lazarus to die.

When Martha made this accusation, Jesus assured her that Lazarus would rise again (Jn. 11:23). Martha responded, “I know that he will rise again in the resurrection on the last day . . . I believe that you are the Messiah, the Son of God” (Jn. 11:24, 27). Martha was referring to the belief in an eschatological resurrection. This was a doctrine taught in the Hebrew Scriptures. This doctrine held that, “God would look after the soul after death until, at the last day, God would give his people new bodies and remake the whole world” (Wright, 2014, p. 37). In the first century, this doctrine was rejected by the Sadducees but affirmed by the Pharisees. Since the common people tended to follow the ideology of the Pharisees, it is not surprising that Martha affirmed this doctrine (Kim, 2011, p. 58). Martha’s apparent confession of faith, calling Jesus

“the Messiah, the Son of God” was not a profession of Jesus’ deity, but rather a reference to the nationalistic messiah for whom the Jews had been waiting; the warrior king who would re-establish the nation of Israel (Blomberg, 1997, p. 300). Martha, and those around her, seemed to have no frame of reference that would allow for the physical resurrection of Lazarus at that point in time. Jesus was facing more than a problematic situation; he was facing a situation that those around him believed could not be remedied, a situation for which several people blamed him!

Despite the emotionally charged situation, Jesus continued to pursue the task at hand. He commanded that the stone be rolled away from Lazarus’ tomb, which drew protests that there would be a stench since he had already been buried four days. After the stone was rolled away from, Jesus prayed, “Father, I thank you for having heard me. I knew that you always hear me, but I have said this for the sake of the crowd standing here, so that they may believe that you sent me” (Jn. 11:42). Throughout Scripture, when an individual demonstrates that he/she has a special intimate relationship with God or the divine, it is important to pay attention to the actions which attest to this relationship (Robbins, 1996, p. 121). Jesus’ prayer in this narrative is illustrative of such a relationship. Brownlee (2019) characterizes this prayer as “odd” because, in it, Jesus does not pray for the dead man, nor the grieving sisters, or even for himself (p. 22). Instead, Jesus prays in order to demonstrate his communion with God the Father to the surrounding crowd, including both his disciples and his detractors (Swartley, 2013, p. 283). The prayer “also functions to set up the correct interpretation of the sign. There is only one reason why Jesus is able to perform a sign such as this and that is because he is from God and is God” (Lewis, 2014, p. 159). In other words, Jesus’ prayer was not a spiritual or religious exercise, but rather a form of spiritual leadership.

After saying this prayer for the benefit of bystanders, the narrative finally reaches its climactic point as Jesus said in a loud voice, “Lazarus, come out!” (Jn. 11:43). Lazarus emerged from the grave, still wrapped in the burial cloths. That Lazarus is still shrouded in his grave garments is a concrete metaphor for the firm grip which death had had on Lazarus, a grip which was broken by Jesus (O’Day & Hylén, 2006, p. 118). This event is effectively the conclusion of Jesus’ ministry: a mighty culminating miracle that illustrates his life-giving work (Smith, 1999, p. 123). Desiderius Erasmus noted that, though Jesus could have raised Lazarus with a soft word or even just a nod of his head, he chose to do so with

a great shout as a sign of the great power necessary to perform the task (Farmer, 2014, p. 426). This was not an attempt to show off or make the entire scene more dramatic, but rather it was an action befitting the incredible nature of the event that was unfolding. The bystanders had not considered the possibility that Jesus could raise Lazarus to life once again. Thus, when Jesus did the very thing that the bystanders believed to be impossible, it was appropriate to punctuate the event with a reminder that the power to perform this difficult task was because of Jesus' status as the Son of God.

It is no surprise that such an incredible miracle proved to be inspirational. Many individuals who had come to be with the sisters in their time of mourning believed in Jesus after seeing him raise Lazarus. Thomas Aquinas (ca. 1269/2010), in his commentary on the belief elicited by this event, put it plainly: "And no wonder, because such a miracle had not been heard of from the beginning of time" (p. 251). Jesus' performance of a seemingly impossible miracle inspired so many to follow him that the Pharisees were concerned that such a movement would draw the ire of the Roman Empire. So powerful was this response of faith and belief that it caused the religious leaders to decide that Jesus must die (Chennatu, 2013, p. 516). It seems that the story of this miracle spread quickly and that there was considerable popular interest in Lazarus as, again, one might expect regarding someone who had come back from the dead (Harrington, 2010, p. 94). So significant was the impact of the Lazarus story that the chief priests determined that they needed to put both Jesus and Lazarus to death (Jn. 12:10–11).

Despite the negative reactions of the religious leaders, Jesus' handling of the situation surrounding Lazarus' death is instructive in how to overcome adversity. The preceding exegetical study demonstrates how Jesus did this. The remainder of this chapter examines the themes yielded by this exegetical study and applies these themes to the context of organizational leadership.

## USING ADVERSITY TO ACCOMPLISH GOALS

Jesus used the sickness and death of Lazarus to perform a miraculous sign that demonstrated his nature as the Son of God. This took some intentional planning—i.e., waiting two days to go to Bethany—and the willingness to navigate the emotions of those who were upset with him. Likewise, research has demonstrated that "people, organizations, and

nations can not only be resilient but thrive in the face of adversity” (O’Leary, 1998, p. 442). Adversity in organizations offers the opportunity to accomplish goals in new and innovative ways, but it takes creative and resilient leaders to do this (Wilson & Rice, 2004, p. 5). These are not just leaders who seek to weather the storm, but rather leaders who seek to use adversity to accomplish goals which could not have been achieved without the adverse situation. Strycharczyk and Elvin (2014) argued that what is necessary to seize the opportunities presented by challenges is a leader with mental toughness (p. 52). Leaders will often be questioned and second-guessed for how they handle adversity, and they must have the confidence and mental toughness not to be dissuaded. According to Weick (1993), leadership in adverse situations requires an attitude of wisdom that is neither overly cautious nor overly confident and embraces curiosity and openness (p. 641). Similarly, Collins (2001) wrote of the “Stockdale Paradox” which combines faith that one will prevail regardless of the difficulties and the willingness to confront the brutal facts of reality (p. 86). Collins noted that this approach “has proved powerful for coming back from difficulties not weakened, but stronger” (p. 86). Rushing to patch whatever damage has been caused by the adversity might not always be the right approach and may even prevent more significant accomplishments. If Jesus had rushed to raise Lazarus, the act would not have had as significant an effect as it did after Lazarus had been dead for four days. Therefore, using times of adversity as an opportunity to accomplish goals does not mean ignoring challenges or pretending that they do not exist. Instead, it means confidently facing those challenges head-on and using wisdom to determine how adversity can serve the big-picture goals of the organization. This is the mark of exemplary leaders: that they can “turn adversity into advantage [and] setbacks into successes” (Kouzes & Posner, 2012, p. 156).

*Principle One: Biblical Christian leadership requires using adversity to accomplish goals.*

## DEMONSTRATING COMPASSION

Jesus demonstrated compassion by comforting the mourning sisters and by his tears for the mourners and the deceased. The concept of compassion is sometimes viewed as being incompatible with the focus on competition and productivity present in many organizational settings. However, researchers are increasingly recognizing the vital role that compassion



plays in successful organizational leadership (Caldwell & Dixon, 2010, p. 91). This is true under normal circumstances and even more applicable when facing adversity. An oft quoted adage, attributed to President Teddy Roosevelt, states that “Nobody cares how much you know until they know how much you care.” Knowledge is undoubtedly an essential aspect of leadership, but knowledge communicated without compassion may very well fall on deaf ears. Had Jesus reacted adversarially to the sisters, rather than with compassion, how would this have affected their—and the surrounding crowd’s—willingness to follow him? According to van Dierendonck and Patterson (2015), compassionate leadership leads to the behaviors of empowerment, authenticity, stewardship, and providing direction (p. 119). Boyatzis et al. (2006) argued that compassion consists of (a) empathy toward the feelings of others, (b) caring for others, and (c) being willing to act in response to those feelings (p. 13). Similarly, Sprecher and Fehr (2005) defined compassionate love as being “focused on caring, concern, tenderness, and an orientation toward supporting, helping, and understanding the other, particularly when the other is perceived to be suffering or in need” (p. 630). It is important to note that compassion is not just an ethereal feeling, but rather a characteristic which requires concrete action. This does not mean that a compassionate leader is soft or wishy washy; a leader who demonstrates compassion is still wise and tough (Winston, 2002, p. 18). Compassionate leaders are still determined to achieve organizational goals, just not at the expense of the well-being of followers. What Jesus did that was so remarkable, and what all leaders should aspire to do, was connect compassionate love for followers with organizational goals. Jesus’ raising of Lazarus was undoubtedly an act of compassion, but it also accomplished the goal of demonstrating his nature as the Son of God. This does not mean that acts of compassion should be done with ulterior motives, however. The motivation for compassion is always to serve the good of the followers rather than the leader (van Dierendonck & Patterson, p. 121). However, there are many opportunities to further organizational goals while at the same time acting compassionately toward followers. Therefore, compassion should not be viewed as an addendum to organizational leadership, but rather as an integral part of it.

*Principle Two: Biblical Christian leadership requires demonstrating compassion.*

## ESTABLISHING CREDIBILITY

The fact that the sisters sent for Jesus when Lazarus had fallen ill, as well as their individual statements that Lazarus would not have died if Jesus had gotten there sooner, demonstrated the credibility which Jesus had built. This credibility was further confirmed by those who had come to mourn with the sisters—people who were not part of Jesus’ immediate circle—who said, “Could not he who opened the eyes of the blind man have kept this man from dying?” (Jn. 11:36). The fact that these statements were thinly veiled criticisms does nothing to diminish Jesus’ existing credibility. In fact, had Jesus not previously developed credibility regarding his ability to heal there would be no basis for criticizing him. Just as credibility was important for Jesus to gain a following, credibility is an essential aspect of organizational leadership, because leaders cannot expect followers to follow a leader whom they do not believe to be credible (Men, 2015, p. 5). Though there is not a unanimous consensus in the scholarly literature as to the definition of credibility, scholars mostly agree that two major dimensions are expertise and trustworthiness (Swanson & Kent, 2014, p. 83). To be viewed as credible then, leaders must demonstrate competence in their fields and show that they can be trusted to act correctly based on that expertise. This is something that must be done consistently over time (Kouzes & Posner, 1993, p. 25). It is important to note that, even if a leader is inherently credible—if they have expertise in their field and are trustworthy—credibility only has a positive impact if it is perceived by the followers (Wright, 2018, p. 188). To an ever-increasing extent, followers are demanding that leaders prove their credibility rather than simply viewing a leader as credible because of his/her rank or position (Kouzes & Posner, p. 25). Indeed, Bennis and Nanus (1985) stated that, “Credibility is at a premium these days. Leaders are being scrutinized as never before . . . All are questioning and challenging authority” (p. 11). Followers want to be shown through consistent, practical action why they should follow leaders. In such a climate, leaders must ensure that they are establishing and demonstrating their credibility in ways that are recognized and accepted by followers.

*Principle Three: Biblical Christian leadership requires establishing credibility.*

## INSPIRATIONAL LEADERSHIP

Jesus' act of raising Lazarus from the dead inspired so many people to begin following Jesus that the chief priests decided that both Lazarus and Jesus needed to be put to death. This may not seem like a result which leaders would like to emulate. Hopefully, facing murderous opponents is not something that most organizational leaders will have to face. However, if a leader can be inspirational enough that everyone notices his/her followers' commitment, then that leader is undoubtedly doing something right. Inspirational motivation comprises "the ways leaders energize their followers by viewing the future with optimism, stressing ambitious goals, projecting an idealized vision, and communicating to followers that the vision is achievable" (Antonakis et al., 2003, p. 264). Inspirational leaders challenge followers with high standards, demonstrate optimism, and give meaning to organizational tasks (Judge & Piccolo, 2004, p. 755). Some critics have argued that inspirational leadership is unethical because it appeals to emotion rather than to reason and may exploit followers into sacrificing their personal interests (Michie & Gooty, 2005, p. 442). Whereas inspirational leadership can indeed be used for nefarious purposes—consider Hitler or various cult leaders who certainly inspired their followers—the fact that this is a tool that can be abused does not diminish its value when used correctly. Furthermore, Burns (2012) argued that leaders are most influential when they can arm their followers with moral inspiration to labor on behalf of a compelling cause (p. 34). Many a successful sports movie has been made using the model of an underdog team who is brought together and taught to win by an inspirational, though often enigmatic, coach. Inspirational leadership is not just for athletic teams and Hollywood, however. Inspirational leadership is an essential facet of successful leadership in any type of organization (Bass, 1988, p. 21). Inspirational leadership should provide followers with an energizing sense of purpose, which also builds identification with the leader and his/her vision (Avolio & Bass, 1999, p. 444). Thus, inspired followers are more likely to perform required tasks at a high level compared to those who are merely going through the motions. Rather than leaving followers to seek their own sense of inspiration, leaders must actively inspire their followers to strive for the vision and goals of the organization.

*Principle Four: Biblical Christian leadership requires the ability to inspire followers.*

## SPIRITUAL LEADERSHIP

After Jesus asked for the stone to be rolled away from Lazarus' tomb, he prayed a prayer that demonstrated that the event about to take place was an act of transcendent power made possible by his relationship with God. Through this prayer, Jesus showed that the act of raising Lazarus, though miraculous in itself, had even greater spiritual significance beyond bringing a dead man back to life. Likewise, those in organizational leadership positions should seek to demonstrate spiritual leadership. This does not mean that leaders need to perform miracles, but it does mean that they should help their followers understand the spiritual significance of their work and their membership within an organization. The application of spirituality to the workplace is becoming more popular despite the continued rise of secularism. Fry (2003) defined spiritual leadership "as comprising the values, attitudes, and behaviors that are necessary to intrinsically motivate one's self and others so that they have a sense of spiritual survival through calling and membership" (pp. 6954–6955). Similarly, Giacalone and Jurkiewicz (2003) argued that the purpose of spiritual leadership is to help followers to experience "transcendence through the work process [and] facilitating their sense of being connected to others in a way that provides feelings of completeness and joy" (p. 13). This sense of transcendent calling and membership was certainly visible in the followers of Jesus. Though this theme is based on the leadership of Jesus, spiritual leadership should not be confused with any particular religion. Fry et al. (2011) argued that the separation between religion and spirituality in leadership research is because religion is focused on theological tenets, while spirituality is focused on the recognition and core of the inner self (p. 260). Spiritual leadership does not involve seeking to proselytize for a specific religion, but rather seeking to give work and organizational membership meaning that reaches beyond the physical nature of the tasks being completed. This type of leadership has been shown to have positive effects on both individual followers and the organization as a whole. Fry and Cohen (2009) found that spiritual leadership increases the well-being and organizational commitment of employees and also increases organizational performance (p. 265). Spiritual leadership has also been shown to increase ethical behavior and have both social and economic benefits (Duthely, 2017, p. 67). Therefore, leaders must seek to be spiritual leaders by finding ways to give their followers both a sense of calling and membership.

*Principle Five: Biblical Christian leadership requires the ability to demonstrate spiritual leadership.*

## LEADING BY EXAMPLE TO ACCOMPLISH DIFFICULT TASKS

When Jesus determined that he would go to Bethany to raise Lazarus from the dead, he was met with objections from the disciples. They said, “The Jews were just now trying to stone you, and are you going there again?” (Jn. 11:8). In spite of the danger, Jesus went to do what he had purposed to do. Then, of course, Jesus performed the miraculous task of raising Lazarus from the dead. In the time after Jesus ascended to heaven, his followers followed this example by facing deadly persecution and performing miraculous deeds of their own. Once again, this does not mean that to lead in accordance with Biblical Christianity one must raise the dead or perform miracles. It does, however, mean that such individuals must lead by example, especially during times of adversity and when dealing with challenging tasks. Influencing by example has been shown to have a much greater impact than other types of influence (Nygaard et al., 2017, p. 134). In contribution experiments, allowing the leader to contribute to the public good before the followers did led to increased contributions as compared to groups in which the leader did not lead by example (Güth et al., 2007, p. 1023). However, most leaders seem to prefer to lead with words rather than leading by example (Dannenberg, 2015, p. 71). It is undoubtedly easier to tell someone what to do rather than show them how to do it, but it is much more effective to show rather than to simply tell. For this reason, Kouzes and Posner (2002) argued, “It’s not enough for leaders to simply deliver a rousing speech or talk about lofty ideals. . . Leading by example is how leaders make visions and values tangible. It’s how they provide the evidence that they’re personally committed” (p. 77). Studies have demonstrated that leading by example promotes group-level actions which lead to increased organizational effectiveness (Yaffe & Kark, 2011, p. 14). A leader who wants tasks done a certain way or desires to see certain characteristics demonstrated by followers must model those things himself/herself. Here, the old adage, “Actions speak louder than words,” is shown to be true. This does not mean that leaders should abandon words, but rather that they must be consciously and intentionally modeling the example they wish their followers to emulate.

*Principle Six: Biblical Christian leadership requires leading by example to accomplish difficult tasks.*

## SUMMARY

As was noted at the beginning of this chapter, Christian leadership scholars have long argued that Jesus Christ is the epitome of the perfect leader. In order to learn to lead in accordance with Biblical Christianity, this chapter examined an example of Jesus overcoming adversity. This chapter performed an exegetical analysis of the narrative of Jesus' raising of Lazarus from the dead, found in John 11, for themes and principles regarding Biblical Christian leadership. The principles outlined in this chapter apply to the contemporary global organizational leadership context because they can help leaders be more successful in leading their organizations, both in favorable and adverse situations.

## DISCUSSION QUESTIONS

1. Why should leaders seek to use adversity to accomplish goals rather than simply trying to "weather to storm?"
2. Why is it necessary for a leader to demonstrate compassion when seeking to overcome adversity? What are some ways in which a leader can do this?
3. How can a leader establish credibility so that he/she will be seen as credible when seeking to overcome adversity?
4. Jesus inspired followers with the miracle of raising Lazarus; short of raising people from the dead, how can contemporary leaders inspire their followers?
5. How can workplace spirituality and spiritual leadership be incorporated into organizational settings?

## REFERENCES

- Antonakis, J., Avolio, B. J., & Sivasubramaniam, N. (2003). Context and leadership: An examination of the nine-factor full-range leadership theory using the multifactor leadership questionnaire. *Leadership Quarterly*, *14*(3), 261–295. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1048-9843\(03\)00030-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1048-9843(03)00030-4).

- Aquinas, T. (2010). *Commentary on the Gospel of John, chapters 6–12* (D. A. Keating & M. Levering, Trans.). CUA Press.
- Avolio, B. J., & Bass, B. M. (1999). Re-examining the components of transformational and transactional leadership using the multifactor leadership questionnaire. *Journal of Occupational & Organizational Psychology*, 72(4), 441–462. <https://doi.org.ezproxy.asburyseminary.edu/10.1348/096317999166789>.
- Bass, B. (1988). The inspirational processes of leadership. *Journal of Management Development*, 7(5), 21–31. <https://doi.org/10.1108/eb051688>.
- Bennis, W. G., & Nanus, B. (1985). *Leaders: The strategies for taking charge*. Harper & Row.
- Blanchard, K. H., & Hodges, P. (2005). *Lead like Jesus: Lessons from the greatest leadership role model of all time*. Thomas Nelson.
- Blomberg, C. (1997). *Jesus and the Gospels*. B & H Academic.
- Boyatzis, R. E., Smith, M. L., & Blaize, N. (2006). Developing sustainable leaders through coaching and compassion. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 5(1), 8–24. <https://doi.org.ezproxy.asburyseminary.edu/10.5465/AMLE.2006.20388381>.
- Brownlee, A. (2019). *Preaching Jesus Christ today*. *Journal for Preachers*, 42(4), 22–25.
- Bruner, F. D. (2012). *The Gospel of John: A commentary*. Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing.
- Burns, J. M. (2012). *Leadership*. Open Road Media.
- Caldwell, C., & Dixon, R. D. (2010). Love, forgiveness, and trust: Critical values of the modern leader. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 93(1), 91.
- Carson, D. A. (1991). *The Gospel according to John*. Wm. B: Eerdmans Publishing.
- Chennatu, R. M. (2013). *Lazarus*. In J. B. Green, P. J. Brown, & N. Perrin (Eds.), *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels* (2nd ed., pp. 515–516). InterVarsity Press.
- Collins, J. C. (2001). *Good to great*. HarperCollins.
- Dannenberg, A. (2015). Leading by example versus leading by words in voluntary contribution experiments. *Social Choice and Welfare*, 44(1), 71–85.
- Duthely, L. M. (2017). Individual flourishing and spiritual leadership: An approach to ethical leadership. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 11(2), 66–68. <https://doi-org.ezproxy.asburyseminary.edu/10.1002/jls.21530>.
- Farmer, C. S. (2014). *John 1–12*. IVP Academic.
- Fry, L. W. (2003). Toward a theory of spiritual leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 14, 693–727. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2003.09.001>.
- Fry, L. W. & Cohen, M. P. (2009). Spiritual leadership as a paradigm for organizational transformation and recovery from extended work hours cultures.

- Journal of Business Ethics*, 84, 265–278. <https://doi-org.ezproxy.asburyseminary.edu/>, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-008-9695-2>.
- Fry, L. W., Hannah, S. T, Noel, M. & Walumbwa, F. O. (2011). Impact of spiritual leadership on unit performance. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 22, 259–270.
- Giacalone, R. A., & Jurkiewicz, C. L. (2003). *Handbook of workplace spirituality and organizational performance*. M. E. Sharpe.
- Güth, W., Levati, M. V., Sutter, M., & Van Der Heijden, E. (2007). Leading by example with and without exclusion power in voluntary contribution experiments. *Journal of Public Economics*, 91(5–6), 1023–1042.
- Harrington, D. J. (2010). *Historical dictionary of Jesus*. Scarecrow Press.
- Judge, T. A., & Piccolo, R. F. (2004). Transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic test of their relative validity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89(5), 755–768. <https://doi-org.ezproxy.asburyseminary.edu/10.1037/0021-9010.89.5.755>.
- Keener, C. S. (2012). *The Gospel of John: A commentary*. Baker Academic.
- Kim, S. S. (2011). The significance of Jesus' raising Lazarus from the dead in John 11. *Biblioteca Sacra*, 168, 63–62.
- Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (1993). *Credibility: How leaders gain and lose it, why people demand it*. Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2002). *The leadership challenge* (3rd ed.). Wiley.
- Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2012). *The leadership challenge* (5th ed.). Wiley.
- Lewis, K. M. (2014). *John*. Fortress Press.
- Mabey, C., Conroy, M., Blakeley, K., & De Marco, S. (2017). Having burned the straw man of Christian spiritual Leadership, what can we learn from Jesus about leading ethically? *Journal of Business Ethics*, 145(4), 757–769.
- Men, L. R. (2015). The role of ethical leadership in internal communication: Influences on communication symmetry, leader credibility, and employee engagement. *Public Relations Journal*, 9(1), 3–22.
- Michaels, J. R. (2010). *The Gospel of John*. Eerdmans.
- Michie, S., & Gooty, J. (2005). Values, emotions, and authenticity: Will the real leader please stand up? *The Leadership Quarterly*, 16(3), 441–457.
- Nygaard, A., Biong, H., Silkoset, R., & Kidwell, R. (2017). Leading by example: Values-based strategy to instill ethical conduct. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 145(1), 133–139. <https://doi-org.ezproxy.asburyseminary.edu/10.1007/s10551-015-2885-9>.
- O'Day, G. R., & Hysten, S. (2006). *John*. Westminster John Knox Press.
- O'Leary, V. E. (1998). Strength in the face of adversity: Individual and social thriving. *Journal of Social Issues*, 54(2), 425–446. <https://doi.org.ezproxy.asburyseminary.edu/10.1111/j.1540-4560.1998.tb01228.x>.
- Osborne, G. R. (2018). *John: Verse by verse*. Lexham Press.



- Patterson, J. L., & Kelleher, P. (2005). *Resilient school leaders: Strategies for turning adversity into achievement*. ASCD.
- Robbins, V. K. (1996). *Exploring the texture of texts: A guide to socio-rhetorical interpretation*. Trinity Press International.
- Smith, D. M. (1999). *John*. Abingdon.
- Sprecher, S., & Fehr, B. (2005). Compassionate love for close others and humanity. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 22, 629–651.
- Strycharczyk, D., & Elvin, C. (2014). *Developing resilient organizations*. Kogan Page.
- Swanson, S., & Kent, A. (2014). The complexity of leading in sport: Examining the role of domain expertise in assessing leader credibility and prototypicality. *Journal of Sport Management*, 28(1), 81–93. <https://doi.org.ezproxy.asburyseminary.edu/10.1123/jsm.2012-0253>.
- Swartley, W. M. (2013). *John*. Herald Press.
- Thompson, M. M. (2015). *John: A commentary*. Presbyterian Publishing Corp.
- van Dierendonck, D., & Patterson, K. (2015). Compassionate love as a cornerstone of servant leadership: An integration of previous theorizing and research. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 128(1), 119–131.
- Weick, K. E. (1993). The collapse of sensemaking in organizations: The Mann Gulch disaster. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 38(4), 628–652. <https://doi.org.ezproxy.asburyseminary.edu/10.2307/2393339>.
- Wilson, M. S., & Rice, S. S. (2004). Wired to inspire: Leading organizations through adversity. *Leadership in Action*, 24(2), 3–7. <https://doi.org.ezproxy.asburyseminary.edu/>, <https://doi.org/10.1002/lia.1059>.
- Winston, B. E. (2002). *Be a leader for god's sake*. Regent University School of Leadership Studies.
- Wright, A. G. (2018). Trust and empowerment in Jesus' sending of the 72: A sociorhetorical analysis of Luke 9:51–10:24. Doctoral dissertation, ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Global.
- Wright, N. T. (2014). *Surprised by hope*. HarperCollins.
- Yaffe, T., & Kark, R. (2011). Leading by example: The case of leader OCB. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96(4), 806–826.



## Jesus as Humble Servant

*Kamerin S. Lauren and Joshua D. Henson*

Whether we consider monarchies or corporate giants, there exists a legacy. Some legacies are powerful such as that of Nelson Mandela, former president of South Africa, who left a legacy of one that served and sacrificed for his people. On the opposite end of the spectrum, Adolph Hitler, chancellor of Germany, left a legacy of torturing and murdering upwards of 5.5 million Jewish people. As leaders we must recognize the value of legacy and operate in such a way as to create a legacy of service to those who follow our vision. Van Dierendonck (2011) offered six fundamental features of servant leadership including empowerment and development of others, humility, authenticity, acceptance of each unique individual, instituting of direction, and stewardship.

---

K. S. Lauren  
Oklahoma Wesleyan University, Bartlesville, OK, USA

J. D. Henson (✉)  
Regent University, Virginia Beach, VA, USA  
e-mail: [joshhen@regent.edu](mailto:joshhen@regent.edu)

© The Author(s), under exclusive license to Springer Nature  
Switzerland AG 2021

J. D. Henson (ed.), *Biblical Organizational Leadership*,  
Christian Faith Perspectives in Leadership and Business,  
[https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-69929-1\\_6](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-69929-1_6)

Servant leadership provides an important theological, social, and cultural model regarding ethical norms and principles in human interactions. This same theory may be applied across a multitude of organizations. The ability to serve others regardless of race or ethnicity has its roots in Scripture, but humanity has the roadmap through servant leadership to apply these values. According to Greenleaf (1977/2002) “The servant-leader is servant first...It begins with the natural feeling that one wants to serve” (p. 27). Furthermore, Greenleaf stated, “the servant always accepts and empathizes, never rejects” (p. 33). Finally, Hale and Fields (2007) defined servant leadership as “an understanding and practice of leadership that places the good of those led over the self-interest of the leader, emphasizing leader behaviors that focus on follower development, and de-emphasizing glorification of the leader” (p. 397).

Servant leaders create a shared bond and loyalty between leader and follower. This is done by setting an example. Bonds are created through the moral and ethical leadership behavior modeled by leaders. This bond is key as servant leaders often raise up future servant leaders by example and acting as servant mentors. An effective way to consider this dynamic is that the follower is a disciple and the leader is the apostle, the messenger; teaching and empowering. John 13:8: “Peter said to him, ‘You shall never wash my feet.’ Jesus answered him, ‘If I do not wash you, you have no share with me’ (ESV). Jesus models the way. Unless He served us and modeled the way for His followers, they truly cannot be a part of what He was doing. This philosophy applies across organizations. Lack of commitment and the passing down of values will fail to bond leaders and followers. Followers of servant leaders are invested in their organizations, and in their assigned roles, organizations and leaders create a positive culture with the power to create legacies.

One of the key distinctive features of servant leadership is its holy principal and heart. Horsman (2001) discovered a meaningful connection between private extents of spirit and servant leadership. Additionally, servant-led associations had advanced concentrations of workplace spirituality (Herman, 2008). This is due to the covenantal and morally grounded connections that servant leaders encourage (Sendjaya et al., 2008). Baba (2008) highlighted the core of holiness by stating, “true spiritual practice lies in joining hands and working for the progress of society as a whole” (p. 17).

This chapter will provide an exegetical analysis of John 13:7–17, Jesus washing the feet of His disciples. This act represents servant leadership,

servant mentorship and the equality between servant and master under Jesus' model. John 13:16 says: "Truly, truly, I say to you, a servant is not greater than his master, nor is a messenger greater than the one who sent him" (ESV). John 13:7–17 brings to light Jesus' servant nature. This socio-rhetorical evaluation brings forth such attributes aligned to servant leadership as: humility, authenticity, inclusiveness, and mentorship. Jesus taught His disciples the true meaning of serving others. Jesus knew His life was coming to an end and His washing of the feet, His role as servant, was the message He wanted to leave them with.

The servant leadership of Jesus, for the purpose of this chapter, should be considered through the lens of doularchy (leadership by servants), which was presented by Korean theologian Kim Yong Bock (1987) in addition to Greenleaf's (1977/2002) concept of servant leadership. Christians, according to Adiprasetya (2018), are able to straightforwardly comprehend doularchy as a rationalization to what Jesus communicated, in divergence to kyriarchy (leadership by masters). Both applications, doularchy and traditional servant leadership theory, hold value.

Servant leadership is countercultural. According to deSilva (2004), "Jesus explicitly contrasts the world's way of evaluating greatness, which has dominated the disciples' vision of Jesus and their own calling, and the way God measures greatness" (p. 206). Where the world defines leadership as power, for God, greatness is found in giving of one's self for others (deSilva, 2004; Gotsis & Grimani, 2016). Jesus is clear on this point: those that wish to lead must be servants even as the "Son of Man came not to be served but to serve, and to give his life as a ransom for many" (Mt. 20:26-28, ESV).

It is important as we engage Matthew 10:26–8, to consider that when Jesus expressed His call to forfeit His life as a ransom for many, it meant all people—Jews, Gentiles—all people. Jesus understood, served, and loved across boundaries; Jesus embraced diversity. This all-encompassing servant theology unsettled Jewish leaders; however, it should not have as this servant-Messiah was foretold in Isaiah 42:1–9. Isaiah prophesied that a Savior that will bring justice to the nations and the coastlands; that no one is left out.

There are significant considerations regarding the Gospel of John. For example, John reports far more of Jesus' ministries in the south, in Judea and Samaria, than in Galilee. In addition, the Synoptics do not mention Jesus' turning water into wine or the raising of Lazarus from the dead. Furthermore, John does not utilize parables, discuss the temptations of

Jesus, or His casting out of demons. The Gospel of John, also referred to as the Fourth Gospel, sought to drive home the divine nature of Jesus. John identified his theme with more clarity than the additional Gospel authors (Carson, 1991). John wrote so that his audience might recognize and embrace Jesus as the Son of God, in order to find their spiritual existence and identity in His name (John 20:31). To realize this goal, John offered a captivating and characteristic image of Jesus, one in comprehensive accord with the portrayals in the other three gospels, but one that also meaningfully enhances the Bible's exposure of Jesus Christ as God in the form of man. John 13:7–17 provides approachable themes as it pertains to servant leadership in a variance of spectrums.

### SOCIO-RHETORICAL ANALYSIS OF JOHN 13

The book of John is written in such a way as to keep the focus on the words and actions of Jesus. According to Harrison (1945), “everything in this opening word (John. 1:6-8) is so stated that attention will not be fixed upon John, but move readily to the Greater One that came after him” (p. 75). Harrison further indicated that “Jesus had a beginning (εγένετο); that One was (ἦν) in the beginning. John was sent forth from (alongside) God, but the Son was with Him, in His bosom. John came for witness; Jesus Christ, the world's true Light,” Jesus was the subject of that observer (p. 75).

John 13:7–17 provides rich insights into the servant leadership model offered by Jesus. The Johannine writing is said to have culminated into its final structure between AD 90–110 (Lincoln, 2005). We must note that John's Gospel, which was composed at a time when conflicting assertions for religious leadership existed. There existed worldly and human ideas of leadership. Jesus on the other hand was a distinctive and archetypal leader, who, by performing the deed of foot washing, exhibited that genuine leadership influence resides in lasting love for people, in humbleness and service (Kanagaraj, 2004).

The Gospel of John is written in Greek and two titles held by Jesus, *Lord* and *Teacher* convey the utmost amount of Jesus' love for and leadership over His disciples and His openhandedness to humble Himself as a servant. Jesus' status and provision highlight a leader with the purpose of inspiring the lives of His disciples and followers through the approach of serving them (Kanagaraj, 2004). In His proving to be a servant-leader, Jesus' enactment of servant leadership “puts an obligation on those

who received His service of love and humility to express the same love, simplicity, and service to the world (13:14-15)” (Kanagaraj, 2004, p. 19).

In reviewing the John 13:7–17 pericope, we should consider the events that preface Jesus’ washing of His disciples’ feet. In John 12, Jesus discusses His impending death and fulfillment of the Scriptures. Jesus goes on in John 12:26 to say, “If anyone serves me, he must follow me; and where I am, there will my servant be also. If anyone serves me, the Father will honor him” (ESV). As John 13 commences, prior to the commencement of the Passover meal, “Jesus knowing that his hour had come, that he should move from this world to the Father, loving His own in the world, He loved them to the end” (John 13; Green, 1984, p. 294). In structuring this narrative, the writer depicted a feast as the space through which Jesus’ central conversation with His disciples occurs, consequently highlighting the social undercurrents among Jesus and His disciples (John 13–16–17), grounded upon the social expectancies related to meals (Van der Watt, 2017). Furthermore, as social occurrences, meals created accounts regarding the associations, distinctiveness, intimacy, and honor of the attendees (Smith, 2002).

John 13 indicates that the foot-washing event occurs after the feast (John 13:4). This divergence from the standard custom of washing feet prior to the commencement of a meal may rather signify exceptional or representational meaning beyond the expected practice (Kobel, 2011). Performing the deed at an unanticipated occasion may aid in underscoring the deed itself. The account in Chapter 13 commences with a short foreword, “structured as a ring composition that focuses on the concept of time (ἡ ὥρα), as well as the return of Jesus to his Father” (Van der Watt, 2017, p. 27). According to the Van der Watt, the breakdown is as follows, “(A—v. 1) ὅτι ἤλθεν αὐτοῦ ἡ ὥρα ἵνα μεταβῆ ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου τούτου πρὸς τὸν πατέρα<sup>7</sup>. (A1—v. 3) καὶ ὅτι ἀπὸ θεοῦ ἐξῆλθεν καὶ πρὸς τὸν θεὸν ὑπάγει<sup>8</sup>” (p. 27). Two key themes are unearthed through the utilization of this ring structure within the meal narrative. The initial and overarching theme is love, “*second* is the reference to the devil, which has already entered the heart of Judas so that he would betray Jesus” (p. 28). Two counterparts, “namely love on the one hand and betrayal on the other, come into focus, highlighting the two attitudes towards Jesus that qualify behavior as being of God or of the devil” (pp. 27–28).

deSilva (2004) indicated that learners of the Fourth Gospel “are called most dramatically to be servants one to another, specifically following Jesus’ example in John 13:2-17. In this scene Jesus takes on the role

of a domestic slave, bending down to wash and dry the disciples' feet" (p. 433). The first major scene of John 13 depicts Jesus cleaning the feet of His disciples (13:3–17). Due to the dialogue between Peter and Jesus (13:6–10), the impression of the act emerges to be that of the "disciples gaining and retaining a spiritual connection with Jesus (13:8–'share [μεροῦς] with me')" (Brouwer, 1999, p. 110).

According to Rainbow (2014), during dinner Jesus took off His vestments, swathed Himself in a towel, and began to *wash* (νίπτειν) the disciples' feet (John 13:5–8, 12, 14). Since they were already bathed and clean (John 13:10), it made Peter's request unnecessary (Rainbow, 2014). Furthermore, the disciples "had been made clean" by receiving the word, the Gospel of Jesus (John 15:3). According to 1 John 1:7, Jesus' blood cleanses from sin all those who walk in the light. The ideas of servanthood, leading by example, and putting others first are all prevalent in servant leadership.

The currency of Heaven is service and servanthood is pleasing to God. Jesus humbled Himself to the point of death to set an example. One of Jesus' last acts was to wash the feet of His disciples; a final way of modeling the behavior that the disciples should follow after His death and resurrection. According to Bennema (2014), the foot washing narrative in John 13 is comprised of a two-fold meaning: "in 13:1–11 Jesus speaks of the disciples' spiritual cleansing that he will complete for them on the cross, whereas in 13:12–17(20) Jesus explains the foot washing in terms of humble, loving service that needs ongoing repetition" (pp. 263–264).

John's rich narrative of Jesus' activities "builds up to the mimetic imperative that follows in 13:14–15, which suggests that one can only imitate what is observed first. In other words, showing is the *basis* for mimesis" (Bennema, 2014, p. 265). This is not a new concept. According to the Bennema, Jesus mirrors the practices of His Father: just as the Father revealed to Jesus what to do (John 5:19–20), so Jesus lives out His life, displaying to the disciples what they are called to do. The whole point of the referenced mimesis is for followers to mirror the actions of their leader, living a life of servanthood, sacrifice, and love.

*Principle One: Christ-like leaders are to lead and love as Christ did, taking on the role of a servant.*

## A SERVANT IS HUMBLE

The nature of a servant is that of humility; regardless of one's organizational role or societal standing. Jesus, as both King and Savior of the world, lived as a servant. John 13:16–17 (ESV) says: “Truly, truly, I say to you, a servant is not greater than his master, nor is a messenger greater than the one who sent him. If you know these things, blessed are you if you do them”. It is important to note that Jesus made this statement after washing the feet of His disciples. He said this after setting the example of humble service to be echoed after His crucifixion. Jesus lived an intentional life and His instructions carry with them both the import and perspective of eternity.

Consider the act of foot washing, the physical posture of bowing, lowering one's self to your followers, paints a pure picture of a humble stature. The implication of the foot washing in John 13 resides in recognizing the necessity for humble and devoted service to one another (Bennema, 2014). How, then does this posture apply to leaders today? Humans often deal with issues of pride and, obtaining positions of power, often highlight these issues. What is the answer? The furtive correlation between servanthood and leadership is also highlighted by the Johannine portrayal of Jesus by conjoining His act of foot washing the two respected titles, the Lord and the Teacher (13:13–14). Jesus rendered this humble service as an eminent leader in Jewish society, as His followers themselves acknowledged (Bennema, 2014; Kanagaraj, 2004, p. 19; Van der Watt, 2017). The designation of Lord identifies Jesus as a leader who carries a distinctive influence over their lives, since He alone is praiseworthy of all righteousness and adoration owed to God only (John 5:23; 12:20–26). According to Kanagaraj (2004), the book of John depicts “Jesus as the Lord in the sense that He is the revelation of the Lord God, the object of human worship and faith, and the one who has overcome ‘the prince of this world’ (12:31–32; 20:28)” (p. 19). Bauckham (2007) contends that Jesus' washing of His disciples' feet is an act that not one person but a servant might, under any circumstances, be expected to execute for another. If someone other than a slave did it, exceptionally, it was as an expression of the deepest love, the love that makes one willing to be a slave to the beloved, to perform the most humiliating of acts of service.

It is our human pride that creates barriers to servant leadership. Essentially, leadership crises are created through the mindsets through which leaders purpose and employ their influence. In the time of Jesus, there too



existed a leadership crisis with those in power confiscating liberty from the Gentiles, subjugating their innovation, and lording their supremacy over them (Van der Watt, 2017). Jesus' model of leading completely controverts human nature. While reflecting on His actions, Jesus refers to Himself as "Lord" and "teacher", not a humble servant (John 13:13). This denotes that Jesus as the leader "washed the feet of his disciples not to humiliate himself, but, precisely in his function as the more important person, to illustrate the extent of intense (εἰς τέλος) love" (Van der Watt, 2017, p. 32). This love depicts servant leadership as others-focused.

*Principle Two: Love for our followers creates a space to set aside pride and ego for the benefit and growth of others.*

### SERVANTS LEADERS SET THE EXAMPLE

In John's telling of Jesus' act of washing His disciples' feet, it is clear that Jesus was setting the example (John 13:15). We recognize through the act of foot washing that Jesus placed human needs first and strived to bring out the best in His disciples. He also addressed their mindsets and interpersonal connections through the same deed of love and humility. The modeling of foot washing, according to Kanagaraj (2004), indicates that "the Johannine Jesus is portrayed as a group-centered leader, the one who showed a genuine interest in the development of the group and in the achievement of its goal" (p. 18). Servant leaders take accountability for the organization in relations with assorted stakeholders, "modeling ethical behavior so that others might emulate them, and in turn, serve others, accepting other people for who they are, and seeking ways to fulfill and empower others" (Kiker et al., 2019, p. 194). Leaders that set the example earn authority with followers and likely have the ability to have more influence due their personal commitment and engagement by practicing what they preach. Kouzes and Posner (2012) suggested *modeling the way* included "clarifying values and setting the example by aligning actions with shared values" (p. 10).

One cannot stress enough the value of leading by example. Servant leaders inherently recognize the import and value-added by living out their guidance. Words carry no value if actions are contradictory. When leaders generously offer support and authority, followers observe in order to see the ways that the leader practices it. Is the support and power utilized in a self-interested fashion? Leaders that expend authority for the follower's advantage will naturally garner trust. On the opposing

side, when a leader selfishly utilizes authority, the support of followers recedes. A servant leader is a leader who lays aside personal ego and “subordinates herself or himself by trusting people and letting them act” (Nobles, 2019, p. 3). Finally, there can be no dual standards or special privileges, which can become like a cancer to an organization’s culture (Davids et al., 2019).

*Principle Three: Leading by example builds trust and organizational culture.*

## SERVANT LEADERS RAISE UP OTHER SERVANT LEADERS

As servant leaders are others-focused, it makes sense that one outcome is the development of other servant leaders. Servant-leaders highlight the knowledge and enlargement of others more than economic results (Frick, 2004). Humans often echo familiar behaviors, and followers are no different. Through the foot washing of His followers, Jesus taught Peter that to be a servant of others is a consistent outcome of being Jesus’ friend. This depiction of servanthood by Jesus realigns Peter’s single-mindedness to forfeit His existence for Jesus to His call to serve followers of Christ: from being a companion who “martyrs his life to a pastor who faithfully cares for others. Jesus teaches Peter not only to have courage to die for Jesus, but rather to have courage to live meaningfully for others” (Adiprasetya, 2018, p. 51). According to Sengupta and Sengupta (2018), “A particular strength of servant leadership is that it encourages everyone to actively seek opportunities to both serve and lead others, thereby setting up the potential for raising the quality of life throughout society” (p. 7).

Servant leaders not only lead by example but also mentor their followers; creating a model that develops followers into future servant leaders. A key role of an organizational leader and mentor is to “pass on the culture of an organization. Culture plays a key role in an institution’s makeup” (Pearson, 2013, p. 347). Furthermore, “maturing leaders understand that they can leave a lasting impact through the intentional act of pouring their knowledge and experience into the life of another, much like the master and apprentice of old” (Pearson, 2013, p. 347).

Mentoring is the process of passing on job comprehension and proficiency (Ragins et al., 2000). The servant leader interprets the mentoring correlation as a chance to pass on his or her passion, the value entombed in the exertion, and commitment within the organization. People play a

significant role in the servant-leader's attitude to living. In concert, it is the mentoring aspect of servant leadership that helps lead to the maturing of each individual's uniqueness. Yet the paramount focus and satisfaction for the servant-leader is found within the actual act of serving (Batten, 1998). "Mentoring plays a key role in the servant-leader's ability to serve the next generation" (Pearson, 2013, p. 353).

In the narrative of the Good Samaritan in Luke 10:30–37, a man was robbed, beaten, and left for dead. Dying on the road he was passed by and avoided by a priest and a Levite—men called in service of God—and was left to die. It was not until the Samaritan came upon him that help was given and a life saved. Regarding the compassion and care provided by the Samaritan, Jesus reveals to His disciples that the mercy given by the Samaritan was the posture favored by God. Jesus states: "Which of these three, do you think, proved to be a neighbor to the man who fell among the robbers?" He said, "The one who showed him mercy." And Jesus said to him, "You go, and do likewise" (Luke 10: 36–37, ESV). All of the lessons Jesus passed down—His teachings and behavior—served as mentoring sessions for His disciples such that they would carry this servant leadership throughout the establishment of the New Testament Church.

*Principle Four: As creators of organizational culture, servant leadership is passed down through the development of other servant leaders.*

## SERVANT LEADERS SERVE ACROSS ALL LEVELS

Jesus, the Son of God, served across caste systems elevating human need. Consider His healing, forgiving, and restorative ministry: a leper, a soldier's servant, and an adulteress all transformed by Jesus (Matt. 8:1–4; Luke 7:1–7; John 8:1–11). Purpose trumped posture. This theme is of particular import due to the highly diverse global community organizations operate within. Each person carries within them intrinsic value, and servant leaders not only recognize it, but celebrate it. Servant leaders focus on key servant personality characteristics to realize all-encompassing goals. A servant leader's conviction in the intrinsic value of each person will enable subordinates to realize their true potential (empowering and developing people), properly benefiting from diverse employees' experiences (humility) (Gotsis & Grimani, 2016, p. 252). Additionally, servant leadership aids in mirroring one's genuine purposes and promises: "cognitively adopting the perspectives of diverse others, exhibiting empathy and

compassion toward disadvantaged group members (interpersonal acceptance), as well as enabling new approaches (providing direction), and stimulating others to act and behave for the common good (stewardship)” (pp. 252–253).

*Principle Five: Servant leaders inherently seek to serve all people. Servant leaders embrace diversity and culture, creating an enveloping and celebratory ideology amongst the groups they are invested in.*

## SUMMARY

In closing, it is important to remember that Jesus provides the ultimate model of servant leadership. Efrain Agosto (2005) correctly argued, “At the heart of Gospel message... lies the cross of Jesus Christ, the ultimate symbol of service, sacrifice, commitment...” (p. 120). The most valuable take away is that servant leadership offers modern-day applications. The biblical account echoes comparable leadership issues to those that exist today. Additionally, the merits of modern “managerial literature speaks of are similar to those of the ancient world, and hence the old narrative becomes a ‘formative metaphor’ or source for a contemporary ethic” (Harris, 2002, p. 67).

Let us consider Proverbs 31:9, “Open your mouth, judge righteously, defend the rights of the poor and needy” (ESV). This passage is a short instruction to King Lemuel by his mother regarding his duty to serve and care for those that cannot do so for themselves. Regardless of position; King, CEO, or Son of God, servant leadership is close to the heart of God. The act of Jesus washing the feet of His disciples represents love through service, inclusiveness, and a humble example for all of us to mirror. The heart of this passage is that Jesus, as the Lord washes the feet of His disciples. Keener (1993) highlighted the point that, in contrast to Greco-Roman culture, Judaism stressed unpretentiousness; but similar to other cultures, it also maintained common roles. Jesus upsets views of social standing. During this period, the slave should wash the feet of the master. Bauckham (2007) stated that “for a superior to perform the act for an inferior would be an incomprehensible contradiction of their social relationship” (p. 193). Bauckham (2007) further indicated that “if foot washing is not beneath one’s dignity, then nothing is” (p. 195).

We must remember that God’s ways are above human ways. The prominence and glory that humans seek does not align with the calling of God. “In God’s sight greatness consists in serving others and pouring

oneself out for them, even as Jesus Himself came “not to be served but to serve, and to give his life as a ransom for many” (deSilva, 2004, p. 206). Jesus’ life provides many examples of servant leadership and it is our responsibility to serve as His hands and feet. Sun (2013) categorizes four key characteristics encompassing a servant character: calling, humility, empathy, and agape love. Furthering this idea, van Dierendonck and Patterson (2015) theorize that a leader’s agape love encourages honorable positions (humility, appreciation, compassion and self-sacrifice) that ultimately inspire servant leadership behaviors.

Finally, Lumpkin and Achen (2018) stated that “Effective leaders use awareness, empathy, fairness, integrity, moral values, motivation, trust, relationship management, respect, and self-management contributing to needs satisfaction in followers’ autonomy, competence, and relatedness” (p. 6). These traits are associated with servant leadership. Characteristics of servant leaders include listening, understanding, restorative behavior, attentiveness, encouragement, conceptualization, insight, stewardship, duty to followers’ growth, and constructing community (Spears, 2004). It is the emphasis on others in the organization that supports the formation of a protected leader/follower relationship (van Dierendonck & Heeren, 2006).

## DISCUSSION QUESTIONS

1. In what ways does pride hinder leaders from serving their followers?
2. How can leaders model qualities such as service and sacrifice in a contemporary organizational context?
3. Why do you think Peter was opposed to Jesus washing his feet? Are there any implications for contemporary followership in this example?
4. If servant leaders develop other servant leaders, how does this happen in an organization in which leaders have many followers or with whom followers have little interaction?
5. How can contemporary organizational leaders “serve across all levels”? What does this look-like from a practical workplace perspective?

## REFERENCES

- Adiprasetya, J. (2018). Pastor as friend: Reinterpreting Christian leadership. *Dialog*, 57(1), 47–52.
- Agosto, E. (2005). *Servant leadership: Jesus and Paul*. St. Louis: Chalice.
- Baba, B. S. (2008). *Sri Sathya Sai speaks*, Vol. 1–33, Sri Sathya Sai Sadhana Trust, Publications Division, Prasanthinilayam.
- Batten, J. (1998). Servant-leadership: A passion to serve. In L. C. Spears (Ed.), *Insights on leadership* (pp. 77–84). New York: Wiley.
- Baukham, R. (2007). *The testimony of the beloved disciple: Narrative, history and theology in the Gospel of John*. Grand Rapids: Baker.
- Bennema, C. (2014). Mimesis in John 13: Cloning or creative articulation? *Novum Testamentum*, 56(3), 261–274.
- Brouwer, W. (1999). *The literary development of John 13–17: A chiasmic reading* (Doctor of Philosophy, Dissertation, McMaster University, Hamilton). <https://macsphere.mcmaster.ca/bitstream/11375/6598/1/fulltext.pdf>.
- Carson, D. A. (1991). *The Gospel according to John (The Pillar New Testament Commentary [PNTC])*. Eerdmans Publishing Co—A. Kindle Edition.
- Davids, B., Carney, B. M., & Getz, I. (2019). *Leadership without ego*. Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan.
- deSilva, D. A. (2004). *An introduction to the New Testament: Contexts, methods, and ministry formation*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press Academic.
- Frick, D. M. (2004). *Robert K. Greenleaf: A life of servant leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.
- Gotsis, G., & Grimani, K. (2016). Diversity as an aspect of effective leadership: Integrating and moving forward. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 37(2), 241–264.
- Green, J. P. (1984). *The Interlinear Greek-English New Testament*, Vol. IV. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers Marketing, LLC.
- Greenleaf, R. K. (with Covey, S. R., & Senge, P. M.). (2002). *Servant leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power & greatness* (50th anniversary ed.). (L. Spears, Ed.). Paulist Press (Original work published 1977).
- Hale, J. R., & Fields, D. L. (2007). Exploring servant leadership across cultures: A study of followers in Ghana and the USA. *Leadership*, 3(4), 297–417.
- Harris, J. I. (2002). The king as public servant: Towards an ethic of public leadership based on virtues suggested in the wisdom literature of the older testament. *Journal of Theology for Southern Africa*, 113(July 2002), 61–73.
- Harrison, E. F. (1945). The son of god among the sons of men I Jesus and John the Baptist. *Bibliotheca Sacra*, 102(405), 74–83.
- Herman, R. L. (2008). *Servant leadership: A Model for organizations desiring a workplace spirituality, culture* (Doctor of Philosophy, Dissertation, Capella University).

- Horsman, J. H. (2001). *Perspectives of servant leadership and spirit in organizations*. Gonzaga University. Retrieved from: <http://www.olagroup.com>.
- Kanagaraj, J. J. (2004). Johannine Jesus, the supreme example of leadership: An inquiry into John 13:1–20. *Themelios*, 29(3), 15–26.
- Keener, C. S. (1993). *The IVP Bible background Commentary: New Testament*. IVP Academic.
- Kiker, D. S., Callahan, J. S., & Kiker, M. B. (2019). Exploring the boundaries of servant leadership: A meta-analysis of the main and moderating effects of servant leadership on behavioral and affective outcomes. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 31(2), 172–197.
- Kim, Y-B. (1987, July 15). Minjung and power: A biblical and theological perspective on doularthy (servanthood). *The Christian Century*, 628–630.
- Kobel, E. (2011). *Dining with John: Communal meals and identity formation in the Fourth Gospel and its historical and cultural context*. Leiden: Brill.
- Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2012). *The leadership challenge: How to make extraordinary things happen in organizations* (5th ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Lincoln, A. (2005). *Gospel according to St John: Black's New Testament commentaries*. New York, NY: Continuum.
- Lumpkin, A., & Achen, R. M. (2018). Explicating the synergies of self-determination theory, ethical leadership, servant leadership, and emotional intelligence. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 12(1), 6–20.
- Nobles, B. (2019). Use hierarchy for “liberating servant leadership” instead of controlling employees. *Journal of Organization Design*, 8(1), 1–7.
- Pearson, N. (2013). The servant-mentor: Raising up the next generation of servant-leaders. *The International Journal of Servant-Leadership*, 8/9(1), 345–360.
- Ragins, B. R., Cotton, J. R., & Miller, J. S. (2000). Marginal mentoring: The effects of type of mentor, quality of relationship, and program design on work and career attitudes. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43(6), 1177–1194.
- Rainbow, P. A. (2014). *Johannine theology: The Gospel, the epistles and the apocalypse*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, Kindle Edition.
- Sendjaya, S., Sarros, J. C., & Santora, J. C. (2008). Defining and measuring servant leadership behavior in organizations. *Journal of Management Studies*, 45(2), 402–424.
- Sengupta, J., & Sengupta, S. S. (2018). Service-oriented leadership style for CSR: A perceptions-based view. *IUP Journal of Business Strategy*, 15(2), 7–30.
- Smith, D. E. (2002). *From symposium to Eucharist: The Banquet in the early Christian world*. Minneapolis: Fortress.
- Spears, L. C. (2004). Practicing servant-leadership. *Leader to Leader*, 34, 7–11.
- Sun, P. Y. T. (2013). The servant identity: Influences on the cognition and behavior of servant leaders. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 24(4), 544–557.

- Van der Watt, J. G. (2017). The meaning of Jesus washing the feet of his disciples (John 13). *Neotestamentica*, 51(1), 25–39.
- Van Dierendonck, D. (2011). Servant leadership: A review and synthesis. *Journal of Management*, 37, 1228–1261.
- Van Dierendonck, D., & Heeren, I. (2006). Toward a research model of servant-leadership. *The International Journal of Servant-Leadership*, 2(1), 147–164.
- Van Dierendonck, D., & Patterson, K. (2015). Compassionate love as a cornerstone of servant leadership: An integration of previous theorizing and research. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 128(1), 119–131.





## Jesus as an Exemplary Leader

*Craig A. Bell*

For denominations that consider foot-washing as an ordinance, the 13th Chapter of John is considered sacrosanct. In this chapter, Christ is shown as instituting the doctrine that supports the ordinance of the washing of the saints' feet. In addition to the doctrinal significance is the fact that, within this Chapter, Christ provides an example of conduct that disciples are to emulate. This is important because organizational behavior (leadership), according to Kuhn (2012), is akin to the scientific method in that paradigms—"accepted laws, theory, applications, and instrumentations"—are critical (pp. 11, 18). Paradigms in Kuhn's estimation were required for leadership. Perhaps as important, however, as the establishment of structure and a set of practices is Christ's paradoxical approach. Similar to Waldman and Balven's (2014) admonishment to researchers, Christ can be seen as warning leaders "against the temptation to immediately put forth normative approaches and then proclaim them as the way forward" (p. 232). Christ clearly understands that a standard is critical

---

C. A. Bell (✉)  
Bell, Griffin & Associates, Charlotte, NC, USA  
e-mail: [craig.bell@bellgriffin.com](mailto:craig.bell@bellgriffin.com)

© The Author(s), under exclusive license to Springer Nature  
Switzerland AG 2021

J. D. Henson (ed.), *Biblical Organizational Leadership*,  
Christian Faith Perspectives in Leadership and Business,  
[https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-69929-1\\_7](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-69929-1_7)

at this stage of the disciples' development. A thus the example given is worthy of explanation.

To appreciate the degree to which paradox is presented within the leadership of Jesus a standard set of principles must be established. As a method of juxtaposing the unique characteristics of leadership expressed in the 13th Chapter of John, Kouzes and Posner's (2012) *The Leadership Challenge: How to Make Extraordinary Happen in Organizations* will be used as a framework. Within this seminal book, Kouzes and Posner present five practices of exemplary leaders. The acceptance of these practices and their applicability to ecclesial leadership is heralded by theologians and scholars, such as Thomas Woodruff and George Barna. While researching the specific nature of effective leadership within the local church, Woodruff (2004) utilized George Barna's *Turn-Around Churches* as the basis of his contention of the applicability of "secular" leadership theory to churches. He felt that the principles denoted in Kouzes and Posner's *Leadership Challenge* and Naus and Dobbs' *Leaders Who Make a Difference* were particularly salient. He agreed with the inference made by Barna that the models of leadership encapsulated within those books are "evident" in the lives of leaders within ecclesial organizations. Utilizing terms often associated with secular leadership principles, Watts (2014) asserted that they were required for effective ecclesial leadership. According to Watts (2014), relational principles of effective church leadership included: (a) mission, (b) conflict management, (c) power and influence, (d) collaboration, (e) emotions as facts, (f) forgiveness, (g) reconciliation, and (h) love. For these reasons, Kouzes and Posner's writing is considered required reading for budding Christian scholars in leadership.

The relevance of these principles as a framework for the exegesis of John is echoed in Mottram's (1989) assertion that the style of the writers "invites biblical comparison" (p. 90). He further comments that managers in search of an encouraging ethic read this book (Mottram, 1989, p. 91). In line with the paradoxical treatment of the principles in this chapter is Dirker's (2000) acknowledgment that while the principles are universal, their application is just as salient even when they contradict standard methods of a given organization.

## JOHN 13:1–17

While an in-depth discussion of the principles of Kouzes and Posner will be presented later, in an effort to develop the themes critical to the exegesis and leadership comparison later in the chapter, a baseline must be established. Thus, foundational information is provided on this chapter given its focus on the role of Christ as an example and the cultural norms as they relate to foot-washing.

### *Brief Overview of John 13*

As presented earlier, the Gospel of John was written specifically to present Christ as the Eternal Word that became flesh for our redemption (Ironside, 1942). Although Christ is shown to be God, He also came from the womb of a woman, which established him as fully human. This will become critical as we look for leadership examples. Ironside (1942) describes this as “God and Man in one blessed, glorious Person – the eternal Son manifest(ed?) in flesh” (p. 12). These two claims are the foundations for the rest of the book of John (O’Day, 2015). DeSilva (2004) contributed that the focus of this gospel, unlike the others, seems to offer an extended and sophisticated reflection on the relationship of the One from above to the Father. In particular, O’Day (2015) noted that the true concern of this book is the Revelation of God in Jesus (p. 425).

DeSilva (2004) points out that the 13th chapter of John is contained within the “Book of Grace”: John 13–20. In addition to opening this book, Culpepper and O’Day (2015) described the first verse of this chapter as presenting:

a transition in the orientation of the Fourth Gospel’s narrative. Prior to this verse, Jesus’s hour has been anticipated (2:4; 7:30; 8:20) or acknowledged as imminent (12:27, 27), but 13:1 signals its arrival. (p. 612)

He contends that the chapter can be read as interconnecting passages with recurring themes that lend itself to principles of leadership. The theme of discipleship and the notion of paradox are observed throughout the chapter. For example, Culpepper and O’Day highlighted that there is the “tension between Jesus’s gift of himself in love and the betrayal and rejection of that gift by those whom Jesus loves” (p. 613). It is this paradoxical

nature of Jesus's relationship with man that is at the core of the principles extracted from John 13 below.

### *Foot-Washing*

The act of foot-washing is one of the most distinctive portions of the 13th chapter of John. Before discussing its significance or the common social and cultural topic of honor depicted in Jesus's washing of the disciples' feet, it is critical to understand the cultural norms associated with foot-washing. Oyemomi (2012) noted that as an act of hospitality, the custom in ancient civilization was for the host to provide water for the guests' feet. He further asserts that the background of this custom was that travelers were wearing the common footwear of the time, sandals, and would end up with extremely dusty feet while walking the roads of Jerusalem. The custom as pointed out in his article dates back to Abraham in Genesis 18:4. Other Old Testament references to this custom include Genesis 19:2, 24:32; 43:24 and 1 Samuel 25:41. What is critical to the later analysis is, as Oyemomi (2012) points out, that in addition to providing water, the host would also provide a servant to wash the feet of their guest. He continues that foot-washing was indeed relegated as the duty of a servant or the lowliest of slaves. Oyemomi (2012) also noted that in homes without servants, a submissive wife (or child) would perform this duty. As noted within this culture, the social hierarchy was well-established and the boundaries were seldom crossed. Finally, he notes that it was unheard of for someone socially superior to wash feet or serve anyone that was regarded as socially inferior.

From a cultural perspective, Barclay (1975) reminds his readers of the inference to the first ordinance of the church "baptism." This reference can be found in Jesus's refusal of Peter's request to wash not only his feet, but also his hands and his head (John 13:9). Jesus retorted that those who have bathed need only to wash their feet, was a direct comment on the custom that before a person went to a feast, they bathed. Thus, only their feet would have gotten dirty in the journey to the host location. Barclay (1975) noted that this was a reference to "Christian baptism. A way of saying 'Unless you pass through the gate of baptism, you have no part in the Church'" (p. 141). In actuality, this chapter presents all three ordinances.

## MODELING THE WAY BY CHARTING A DIFFERENT PATH

As the first practice of exemplary leadership, Kouzes and Posner (2012) present the practice of modeling the way (pp. 41–76). Leaders are to set the standard by which all actions will be measured. They further break down this practice indicating it is done through clarifying values and setting an example. One component of clarifying values is the establishment of who you are as a leader. As shown earlier, Christ fulfills the first practice by clearly acknowledging His relationship to God. Christ’s actions and words in John 13 are a textbook example of this practice. Additionally, Christ indicated that though the disciples may not understand it, what He was doing was being done as an example/pattern of what they should do.

One departure from Kouzes and Posner (2012) is that Christ often demonstrated actions whose primary purpose was not imitation. Friedell (2008) states that the real meaning behind the washing of the feet was an act of faith and obedience. He points to the use of the word “hypodeigma,” which is interpreted as “paradigm” (p. 24). Thus, he concluded that this story and others like it were done as paradigms rather than acts to be explicitly followed (Friedell, 2008).

Wood and Hilton (2012) support the notion that oftentimes, decision-making within an organization is not simply one-dimensional. They extolled the virtue of paradigms because imitation of a previous leader is not always required or best. While discussing leadership within educational institutions, they cited Hellmich (2007) as having noted that “leaders confront complex, multidimensional, and dynamic moral issues in their everyday practice. They also cited Davis’s assertion that “responsible stewardship necessitates navigation around numerous potential pitfalls which are compounded by ongoing change (e.g., dwindling resources, accountability, demographic shifts)” (Davis, 2007a, 2007b).

Lauder and Marynissen (2018) posited that while numerous conversations and discussions begin with the phrase “in a perfect world” or “all else being constant” (p. 319), rarely is either of those the case. The reality is more akin to a state of chaos in which true cause and effect are difficult, if not impossible, to truly determine. In such situations, each of these authors prescribes the use of paradigms or practices that allow a manager to react and lead. The notion that Jesus does not seek imitation can be found throughout His ministry in which he points not to himself, but to The One that sent him. Though not in this chapter, in John 14:12, Jesus encourages them by indicating that they should do greater things than He

has done. In essence, do what you have seen me do; but use it as a floor, not a ceiling.

*Principle One: Christlike leaders provide a paradigm for leadership rather than an insistence on imitation.*

The clearest example of common and social topics of honor within this text can be found within Verses 4–5. As highlighted earlier, the act of foot-washing was a duty reserved for the lowest slave/servant, woman, or child. This noted act of humility and service is done within the backdrop of Christ’s proclamation of His placement in God. Thus, the Sovereign of the universe takes the place of a slave (Ironsides, 1942, p. 551). He not only performed the duty of a slave, but took on the form of a slave by girding himself with a towel. Furthermore, Ironsides notes that since it was customary and there was no one there to wash the disciples’ feet, Christ showed up as a leader. When there is a void, you must do whatever it takes to get the job done. The Interpreter’s Bible notes that as each of the disciples entered the room—knowing the customs and had undoubtedly performed them previously for one another, on this night they chose to stubbornly ignore the water and the basin that was placed there (Buttrick, 1952). He proposes that Jesus’s act was done as a reminder of the lesson concerning humility and their place in the kingdom. The lesson is that “there is only one kind of greatness, the greatness of service” (Barclay, p. 139).

Donaldson (2002) chronicles the rise of three new entries to the Black Enterprise (BE) 100—top 100 Black-owned businesses in the United States. As noted by the title of the article—*Going against the grain*—the path taken by all three was nontraditional. From starting a firm by partnering with other firms to purchasing an auto dealership during a gas crisis to opening a bakery given the high rate of closure of such businesses, these entrepreneurs did something other than what would have typically been done and succeeded. It was the very fact that they were willing to go against the conventional wisdom to which they credit their success (Donaldson, 2002). Similarly, Labarba (2000) chronicled the story of Cogent Communications’ nontraditional approach to the telecommunications market. Rather than offering services to a broad range of customers, they decided on a narrow approach of attempting to corner the market in one specific area—high-speed internet service to multitenant commercial buildings. Contrary to the prevailing plans at the time, Cogent would not give away their equipment. This meant that the cost efficiencies of the new technology would not immediately be realized by the client. Despite

this, a fiber optic network was born and has become the default high-speed medium that is currently in use. Two prominent truisms can be found within this divergent from the norm. Firstly that Jesus does not consider station (the discussion of who is first and last with the brothers in Mark 10:35–45, and secondly the insistence that he can to serve and not be served.

*Principle Two: Christlike leaders understand the value of purposefully diverting from the norm.*

## INSPIRE A SHARED VISION OF SOMETHING GREATER

The second of Kouzes and Posner's five principles, *inspiring a shared vision*, supports the notion that the successes of past leaders can serve as a mechanism to cast a vision of future possibilities. Like the first, this principle is also broken down into two parts: namely, envision the future and enlist others. The acts and focus of Jesus can be described as ultimately providing visionary insight. Having recognized that His time on the earth was ending, He sought to ensure the disciples were able to take hold of the vision—even if it was outside of what they could comprehend in their present state. It is noteworthy that Jesus does not insist on their understanding of the vision, just their acceptance of it (Belsterling, 2006). The role of leadership is about the ability to cast the vision and continuing to function until it is understood and accepted. This can be observed in verses 6–10 where Peter's protest and the ensuing dialogue places the reading within the challenge-response genre of common and social topics (Robbins, 2012). While Jesus continued to wash the feet of the disciples, they must have grown uneasy with Jesus's action, yet one no stopped Him or offered to take His place (Buttrick, 1952). No one that is, but the impulsive, outspoken Peter. As noted by Robbins, this conversation took place within the relatively public arena in the presence of the other disciples. Thus, fulfilling the first component required for this genre—the challenge. Peter, recognizing the complete departure from the norms, objected to Jesus washing his feet. The second component of response can be noted by Jesus's refusal to engage in the debate with Peter. Re-establishing His superiority, He simply retorts that not being washed will result in Peter not having a part in Him. Peter's reaction, the third component of the conversation—response, underscores that he had come to accept the lesson. According to Eshbach (1969), similar to the show of humility of Christ washing their feet, it was also a sign

of humility to receive such service (Eshbach, 1969). Peter's next statement goes directly to dyadic personality. He acknowledges that being linked with Jesus is essential. It is so critical that Carson (1991) notes that he responded with "unrestrained exuberance"—requesting to be washed completely (p. 464).

This passage also lends itself to the consideration of Reciprocal Intertexture in that Christ moved forward based on His complete understanding of the wider perspective of the plan of salvation (Henson et al., 2020). Michaels denotes at least three inconsistencies that would be present when viewed by Peter. In verse six, what is translated into English from the original Greek would be considered improper, "Lord, You? Of me? Wash the feet?" (Michaels, 1989, p. 167). Within the tenth verse, there are two references—baptism and uncleanness of Judas—that can only be understood later in the passage as the disciples come to understand the "wider application" of the sentiments of Jesus (p. 168). O'Day (2015) noted Jesus's response in the 7th verse eludes to a time when Peter will come to understand at a later date, specifically after His "hour" had come. It is this same sense of the Spirit revealing the completed understanding in the future that is found in Acts 2:22 and Acts 12:16 (p. 615). Finally, "only Jesus's sacrificial death on the cross can make sense of foot-washing" (Florer-Bixler, 2019, p. 20).

In philosophic circles, this notion of being action-oriented is detailed in a discussion on Arendt Principle. As a leading political theorist of her time, Muldoon popularized the notion that "instead of basing action on an immediate response to emerging problems, it should spring from and be guided by broader principles that would provide standards and orientation" (Muldoon, 2016, p. 133). She further concluded that "principles offer a degree of stability and continuity in their ability to put forth basic criteria that arise internally to the performance of an action, against which future endeavors can be judged and guided" (p. 133). Muldoon went on to assert that, with the correct principle, one does not have to obtain a detailed understanding of all facts before moving toward action.

As a component of a debate around the true knowledge, Hilton and Aramaki (2014) observed that "knowledge needs to go beyond the verbal, for to know facts is to have used them. As an ancient Chinese saying puts it, 'I hear and I forget, I see and I remember, I do, and I understand'" (p. 100). In this respect, they support the notion of a call to action as a means to garner the full impact and importance of experience.



*Principle Three: Christlike leaders are action-oriented and push for action even when the vision is not fully understood by the follower.*

The main teaching point of John 13 is the idea that because Christ so loved the disciples, they should likewise, love one another (Belsterling, 2006). Considering the act of foot-washing that is so central to the text, Christ uses words like “ought” and “blessed” to underscore His actions. In doing so, He demonstrated that by doing them, the disciples would receive a benefit beyond their immediate need. The extent of Jesus’s concern and desire for oneness with and between the disciples is on display via the symbolic nature of the act of foot-washing in the 8th verse. It is “symbolic of eschatological hospitality through which Jesus shares His home, that is, the Father’s house – with His disciples. The foot-washing is an eschatological act because through it Jesus manifests the unity and intimacy of God, Jesus, and the believer that marks full relationship with God” (O’ Day, 2015, p. 615).

In agreement with Kouzes and Posner’s proposition that leaders must appeal to a common idea (p. 131), Adams (2001) supports the existence of a common human ideal. Notably, Adam posited:

Human beings, in any civilization, are, at least to some extent, rational agents and thinkers, for civilization, requires rational action in cooperative endeavors, rational action requires some measure of success in decision-making and knowledge-seeking, and success in decision making and knowledge-seeking requires rational thinking. Rational thinking presupposes the basic principles of normative logic. So the basic principles of normative logic are neither subjective nor culturally relative, for they are embedded in the normative constitution of a thinking mind and presupposed in rational thinking, regardless of whether they are ever articulated or reflected on. (p. 37)

Furthermore, while not completely free of negative connotations, the economic model of Sharing Economies (SE) has been shown to contribute toward the sense of share ideals promoted by Kouzes and Posner. Some of the more benign examples of economic-sharing are firms like Uber, Lyft, and Airbnb. Despite the potential for cheating that is inherent in these economies, empirical research has confirmed that the introduction of SE reduces the desire to cheat the system (Guo et al., 2019). Participating in SE enhanced individuals’ interpersonal closeness, which in turn led to less self-interest cheating. Such results were in line with findings from previous research that the more people engaged in SE,

the more they would adopt altruistic values and care about others (Roos & Hahn, 2017). Ultimately, having a part with Jesus is presented as the existential goal, not just the notion of being clean.

*Principle Four: Christlike leaders create a sense of belonging to something greater than the self to create a sense of shared destiny.*

## CHALLENGE THE PROCESS BY PURPOSEFULLY BREAKING NORMS

The fourth principle of challenging the process, according to Kouzes and Posner, involves being vigilant for opportunities that are ripe for change. This step also involves a willingness to take a risk. If nothing else, Jesus's actions in John 13 showed that He fully expects leaders to challenge the process. Throughout the ministry of Jesus, believers were called upon to abandon the cultural norms of the day. They were instructed that to lead means to serve and to get means to give. In this chapter, He demonstrated a total reversal of accepted norms by having a superior washing the feet of inferior subjects (John 13:12–14). In performing this ritual, Jesus's actions conflicted with the social and textual component of honor (Robbins, 2012). The conflict in honor existed because The One who was the Incarnation of God was performing the duties of a servant. Further, within this narrative, there is the ultimate challenge of the process in that the Sovereign Being of the Universe takes the place of a slave (Ironsides, 1942, p. 551).

Empirical evidence from a study conducted around gender discrimination revealed both the inherent necessity and the benefit of challenging the norm. The resulting discovery concluded that with a challenge to these norms, the perspective of underrepresented populations goes unobserved. Additionally, persons in these populations, when “attempting to meet the expectations of “the iconic leader,” often questioned their competence and belonging or felt forced to overcompensate...and were subsequently perceived and evaluated negatively” (Rogers & Rose, 2019, p. 46). As a measure of challenging the process, Rogers and Rogers offered that, rather than attempting to assimilate, they would be better served to simply be “leaders on their own and equally valuable terms” (p. 46). Pettitt described the choice that dissenters must make is either exit or voice. One can choose to simply leave the environment/organization or to remain and express their discontent and work to change the organization (voice) (Pettitt, 2007). In this chapter,

Jesus chooses the former. He considers the cultural norm and makes a conscious decision to divert from it to show forth His Sovereignty over it.

*Principle Five: Christlike leaders recognize the need to challenge the status quo and are willing to go against the established norms.*

It should be noted that being a part of Christ's inner circle during this time was a risky proposition. This is noted in Leszai's writing in which he indicates that, similar to the prophets of the Old Testament, the way of the disciples involved the risk of exterior persecution (Leszai, 2011). More specific to this text, the chapter opens with "imminent betrayal, suffering, and death. Understandably, we tend to envision the scene with somber images. Sobriety is called for; the cross and the bitter irony of Jesus being "raised up" is at hand" (Keck, 2015, p. 22). Thus, in addition to the generic inherent dangers of the day, even the screen in which the discourse takes place is filled with foreboding. Yet, it is precisely this setting that Jesus chose to encourage the heart of His disciples by lifting the prospect of being part of His Divine Ministry—including a destiny that is calvary bound. This aspect of challenging the process is not included in Kouzes and Posner's writing; however, it is significant to Christ's approach.

In one of his last letters, noted leader and theologian Dietrich Bonhoeffer exclaimed that importance of examples is that they give words their power (Kelly & Nelson, 2003). While chronicling Bonhoeffer's life, Kelly and Nelson observed that Bonhoeffer exemplified the notion that when the authenticity of the scripture was at stake, responsible action was required. Action that, per his status as a martyr, could require the ultimate sacrifice. Jackson and Daly (2011) have a similar notion regarding the cost of leadership. They open their writing on leadership with the following statement:

To lead is to live dangerously because leadership counts when you lead people through difficult change, you challenge what people hold dear—their daily habits, tools, loyalties, and ways of thinking—with nothing more to offer perhaps than a possibility...And people resist in all kinds of creative and unexpected ways that can get you taken out of the game: pushed aside, undermined, or eliminated. (p. 26)

Within this chapter, Jesus is clear that, even within His inner circle, some would betray him. In that way, He establishes that leadership is a costly proposition.

*Principle Six: Christlike leaders must be willing to bear the personal cost of leadership.*

## ENABLE OTHERS TO ACT THROUGH HUMBLE SERVICE

The practice of enabling others to act underlies a leader's ability to foster a sense of collaboration with those that they lead. It includes the ability to create a trusting relationship between the leader and the followers. Additionally, inherent in this practice is the will and ability to strengthen others. All that Christ did in the three-year training process of His disciples was designed to ensure that they were able to function with power and authority. Leszai concludes that the commission of the disciples did not happen by chance; rather, that before sending them out, Jesus gave them the required authority (Leszai, 2011). The requirement to accept this act of humility in John 13 and its associated promise of having a part with Him was done as an act of empowerment—a component of authority to act. Christ knew that they could not have a part with Him if they were “defiled with unconfessed sin” (Ironsides, 1942, p. 555).

In verses 11–17, John turns the reader's attention back to the lesson of humility, and thus, the precepts of honor. Jesus's acts and subsequent words were indicative of Him giving them both an example and a pattern (Carson, 1991). Throughout scripture, Jesus was seen attempting to teach the disciples about humility, even to the point of telling them that He came to serve—not to be served. On this occasion, He was determined to demonstrate it to them (Oyemomi, 2012, p. 50). He has effectively removed any excuse for them not being humble; for not only had He instructed them, but He had also shown them. In this way, Jesus was indicating that He understood the disciples' need for more than an example of action but also one of attitude (Guzik, 2017). Jesus used their knowledge and acceptance of the cultural norms as a method of pointing to a greater lesson. He confirmed and affirmed His belief that the slave is not greater than the Master, but then pivoted to The One that was sent not being greater than The One that sent Him. In so He states, if the Master and Lord could be humble, then so could they. He punctuated this lesson with the promise of the blessing of obedience.

When promoting fairness and diversity, many corporations highlight the notion that the company is a meritocracy—promotions are based on merit. Murphy (1996) noted that this often has resulted in individuals overlooking the accomplishments of the organization and only

looking to their efforts. As a component of the seven guiding principles for successful leaders, Murphy included the concept of “strategic humility” (Murphy, 1996). In developing this concept, Murphy underscores that it is only through an awareness of a leader’s ignorance that they can sustain the desire for continuous learning. Likewise, Kerfoot (1998) noted that “Only when one openly admits to oneself how little one knows, how much there is to learn, and how we need others to be successful will growth as a leader occur” (p. 238). Kerfoot continued that high performing leaders were differentiated from others by the presence of humility and the absence of both pride and self-indulgence. In his speech before the National Prayer Breakfast, the Forty-Fourth President of The United States included a thought from President Lincoln regarding humility. President Obama reminded the audience that in the eyes of President Lincoln, the humbling factor in his life was his faith (Obama, 2013). This, comparable to other forms of humility, allowed him to embrace his limits. Therefore, to think of humility as the absence of confidence or lack of recognition of one’s self-worth is inaccurate perception. Jesus underscores that humility is the presence of an awareness that does not require self-aggrandizement.

*Principle Seven: Christlike leaders are God-empowered and encourage others through the power of authentic humility and self-awareness.*

## ENCOURAGE THE HEART: AUTHENTICITY NOW AND BRIGHTER FUTURE LATER

This final practice was the primary focus of the portion of Jesus’s discourse in which He referenced the disciples’ ability to have a part in Him. Understanding the service and sacrifice that He was calling the disciples into, Jesus sought to reassure them of the ultimate victory of their obedience. Ironside concluded that there was nothing more critical and reassuring to the disciples than knowing that Jesus understood and that they could take anything and everything to Him (Ironside, 1942, p. 555). It is precisely this sense of community and personal involvement that Kouzes and Posner recommend for all leaders. In a slight departure from the two scholars, Jesus doesn’t seek to encourage through soft words or immediate reward. He appears to be more concerned with future benefits. He simply stands on the truth of His proclamation and ensures that the disciples understand that they are not exempt from any task that their master has performed. He looks more at the cheerfulness of the master as an

indication of the spirit in which servants should serve (Friedell, 2008). Christ's understanding of the purpose and meaning behind His action reassures them. This encouragement is not done by way of currently tangible benefits. Rather, the disciples are to exercise their faith and find encouragement in the benefits of the future. While this chapter is focused on the 13th chapter of John, O'Day (2015) noted that Jesus's reference to future understanding and benefits is displayed throughout the book of John (John 2:22; 12:16; 13:19, 29; 16:4, 25). Moreover, Guzik (2017) teaches that the motivation to look toward future benefits is encapsulated in the fact that being a part of Jesus is focused on what you receive from Him—not what you gain for yourself.

Perhaps the closest one can currently come to the notion of the motivation displayed in Jesus's discourse is that of our altruism. Fehr and Fischbacher (2003) exalted altruism as the distinguishing factor between man and all other animals. The result of altruism in humans is unlike other animals, we have a “detailed division of labor and cooperation between genetically unrelated individuals in large groups” (p. 785). Among other animals, the concept of reciprocal altruism—the mutual benefits that ensure the survival of the genetic unit—is the basis of interaction. Similarly, transformational and servant leadership are perhaps the closest that one can get to this motivation in leadership. Sosik et al. (2018) stated that:

Transformational leadership entails four behaviors: inspirational motivation—inspiring collective action through the articulation of an evocative vision; idealized influence—modeling high levels of ethics and performance; intellectual stimulation—challenging thinking processes through the questioning of assumptions and consideration of different perspectives; and individualized consideration—coaching and mentoring subordinates while recognizing and appreciating their unique differences. (pp. 7–8)

Further, servant leadership is predicated on the notion that the motivation of the leader extends beyond their self-interests to the benefit of the follower (Greenleaf, 1977). In addition to the motivational component, servant leadership is the closest in alignment with the paradoxical approach that is noted throughout the chapter. The paradox is found in the notion that leadership can be demonstrated through both service and influence (Northouse, 2013). The ten characteristics associated with this type of leadership are focused outside of the leader and extend beyond the

here and now. Through principles that are unlike other leadership styles, these two styles seek to encourage the heart of followers, with what might be considered nontraditional or even paradoxical methods.

*Principle Eight: Christlike leaders motivate followers by presenting and then requiring fidelity to a vision beyond their immediate reach.*

## SUMMARY

As significant as John 13:1–17 is for many denominations that continue to perform the sacrament of foot-washing, so is its significance to leadership theory. This scripture allows the critical examination of the best practices outlined within Kouzes and Posner’s writing. Though Christ’s ministry fully supports these practices, it also shows that their implementation is varied and complex. By performing a task traditionally reserved for servants and slaves, Christ reaffirms and expands the practices outlined by Kouzes and Posner. In the true sense of the paradoxical nature of Christ’s approach, we find that He *models the way* by showing that leaders often must purposefully divert from the norm. Jesus’s paradoxical approach to *inspiring a shared vision* is to require action toward a vision that is not fully understood (Belsterling, 2006). He *challenges the process* by highlighting a devotion to becoming a part of Him when doing so would result in persecution (Leszai, 2011). Concerning Kouzes and Posner’s fourth principle of *enabling others to act*, in John 12, we find Him promoting the principle of humility as a form of empowerment (Leszai, 2011). Finally, Jesus *encourages the heart* not by the traditional lure of immediate gratification often associated with success; instead He does this by showing concern for future benefits. It is the cheerfulness of The Master that is highlighted as the spirit in which servants/leaders should serve (Friedell, 2008). Christ, however, as the ultimate leader, presents the extent to which leaders must be willing to implement these practices in paradoxical ways to ensure success. Finally, in true leadership form, Christ never attacks the norm nor does He disparage those that follow them. Rather, having respect for them, He presents a leadership style that is not constrained by them.

## DISCUSSION QUESTIONS

1. With respect to leadership theory, is there a difference in having a paradoxical approach and simply being a nonconformist? Please explain.
2. What characteristics are required for a leader to successfully implement a paradoxical approach?
3. Do you think Jesus would have been as successful or perhaps more successful had His approach not broken as many culture norms? If so, please define your definition on success.
4. What can be made from how a paradoxical approach to leadership can be extracted from a chapter of the Bible dedicated to showing Christ as the Son of God?
5. For leaders with a Christ centered worldview, is it approach for consider Christ a Paradoxical Leader. It is more appropriate to consider His understanding as the norm and the approach promoted by Kouzes and Posner the departure.

## REFERENCES

- Adams, E. M. (2001). In defense of a common ideal for a human life. *Midwest Studies in Philosophy*, 25(1), 35–47.
- Alan Culpepper, R., & O'Day, G. R. (2015). Volume VIII: Luke and John. In E. Leander & E. Keck (Eds.), *The new interpreter's Bible commentary* (pp. 421–742). Abingdon Press.
- Barclay, W. (1975). *The Gospel of John, volume 2 (Chapters 8 to 21)* (Rev. ed.). Philadelphia: The Westminster Press.
- Belsterling, R. (2006). The mentoring approach of Jesus as demonstrated in John 13. *Journal of Youth Ministry*, 5(1), 77–92.
- Buttrick, G. A. (1952). *The interpreter's Bible*. Nashville: Parthenon Press.
- Carson, D. A. (1991). *The Gospel according to John*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans.
- Davis, G. (2007). A guide to ethical decision-making by presidents and Boards. In D. M. Hellmich (Ed.), *Ethical leadership in the community college: Bridging theory and daily practice* (pp. 154–165). Bolton: Anke.
- Davis, G. (2007). Why presidents and trustees should care about ethics. In D. M. Hellmich (Ed.), *Ethical leadership in the community college: Bridging theory and daily practice* (pp. 40–46). Bolton: Anker.



- DeSilva, D. A. (2004). *An introduction to the new testament: Contexts, methods & ministry formation*. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press.
- Dirker, L. A., Jr. (2000). The leadership challenge (Book Review). *FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin*, 21.
- Donaldson, S. A. (2002). Going against the grain. *Black Enterprise*, 32(11), 185–190.
- Eshbach, W. M. (1969). Another look at John 13:1–20. *Brethren Life and Thought*, XIV(2), 117–125.
- Fehr, E., & Fischbacher, U. (2003). The nature of human altruism. *Nature*, 425(1), 785–791.
- Florer-Bixler, M. (2019). Living by the word: April 18, Maundy Thursday (John 13:1–17, 31b–35). *Christian Century*, 18–21.
- Friedell, V. (2008). A community of friends: John 13:1–17. *Brethren Life and Thought*, 53(3), 23–32.
- Greenleaf, R. (1977). *Servant leadership*. New York: Paulist Press.
- Guo, S., Huang, Z., Yuan, Y., & Gao, D. (2019). Sharing economy promotes morality, not impedes it. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, 22(1), 84–92.
- Guzik, D. (2017). *Study Guide for John 13*. Retrieved from BlueLetter Bible: [https://www.blueletterbible.org/Comm/guzik\\_david/StudyGuide2017-Jhn/Jhn-13.cfm](https://www.blueletterbible.org/Comm/guzik_david/StudyGuide2017-Jhn/Jhn-13.cfm).
- Hellmich, D. M. (2007). *Ethical leadership in the community college: Bridging theory and daily practice*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Henson, J. D., Crowther, S. S., & Huizing, R. L. (2020). *Exegetical analysis: A practical guide for applying biblical research to the social sciences*. Kendall Hunt Publishing.
- Hilton, J., & Aramaki, A. (2014). Encouraging students to act: Helping students apply principles learned in a religious education setting. *Teaching Theology & Religion*, 17(2), 99–111.
- Ironside, H. A. (1942). *Address on the Gospel of John*. Pasig City: Lifeline Philippines.
- Jackson, D., & Daly, J. (2011). All things to all people: Adversity and resilience in leadership. *Nurse Leader*, 9(3), 21–22, 30.
- Keck, D. (2015). Living by the word: April 2, 2015, Maundy Thursday: John 13:1–17, 31b–35. *Christian Century*, 20–23.
- Kelly, G. B., & Nelson, F. B. (2003). *The cost of moral leadership: The spirituality of Dietrich Bonhoeffer*. William B. Eerdmans Publishing.
- Kerfoot, K. (1998). The strategic use of humility. *Nursing Economics*, 24(4), 238–239.
- Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2012). *The leadership challenge: How to make extraordinary things happen in organizations* (5th ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Kuhn, T. S. (2012). *The structure of scientific revolutions: 50th anniversary edition*. Chicago: University Of Chicago Press.
- Labarba, L. H. (2000). Going against the grain. *Telephony*, 238(10), 16.
- Lauder, M. A., & Marynissen, H. (2018). Normal chaos: A new research paradigm for understanding practice. *Journal of Contingencies and Crisis Management*, 26(2), 319–323.
- Leszai, L. (2011). The mission of the disciples. *Sacra Scripta*, 9(1), 65–83.
- Michaels, J. R. (1989). *Understanding the Bible commentary series: John*. Grand Rapids: BakerBooks.
- Mottram, R. (1989). The leadership challenge-how to get extra-ordinary things done in organizations. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 62(1), 90–91.
- Muldoon, J. (2016). Arendtian principles. *Political Studies*, 64(1), 121–135.
- Murphy, E. (1996). *Leadership IQ*. New York: John Wiley.
- Northouse, P. G. (2013). *Leadership: Theory and practice* (6th ed.). Los Angeles: Sage.
- Obama, B. (2013). Remarks at the National Prayer Breakfast. *Daily Compilation of Presidential Documents*, pp. 1–4.
- O'Day, G. R. (2015). John. *The new interpreter's Bible commentary volume VIII* (pp. 421–742). Nashville: Abingdon Press.
- Oyemomi, E. (2012). Foot washing in John 13:1–7 and its exegetical implications for the church in Africa. *Ogbomoso Journal of Theology*, 43–56.
- Pettitt, R. T. (2007). Challenging the leadership: The party conference as a platform for dissenting membership voice in British and Danish Parties of the Left. *Scandinavian Political Studies*, 30(3), 229–248.
- Robbins, V. K. (2012). *Exploring the texture of text: A guild to socio-rhetorical interpretation*. New York: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Rogers, E. B., & Rose, J. (2019). A critical exploration of women's gendered experiences in outdoor leadership. *Journal of Experiential Education*, 42(1), 37–50.
- Roos, D., & Hahn, R. (2017). Does shared consumption affect consumers' values, attitudes, and norms? A panel study. *Journal of Business Research*, 77(1), 113–123.
- Sosik, J. J., Arenas, F. J., Chun, J. U., & Ete, Z. (2018). Character into action: How officers demonstrate strengths with transformational leadership. *Air & Space Power Journal*, 32(3), 4–25.
- Waldman, D. A., & Balven, R. A. (2014). Responsible leadership: Theoretical issues and research directions. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 28(3), 224–234.
- Watts, W. M. (2014). Relational principles for effective church leadership. *Journal of Leadership Education*, 13(2), 125–139.

- Wood, J. L., & Hilton, A. A. (2012). Five ethical paradigms for community college leaders: Toward constructing and considering alternative courses of action in ethical decision making. *Community College Review*, 3, 196–214.
- Woodruff, T. R. (2004). *Executive pastors' perception of leadership and management competencies needed for local church administration*. Ph.D. Dissertation, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary: ProQuest Dissertations Publishing.



## Jesus as an Authentic Leader

*Stuart W. Boyer*

Crisis and trauma provide both a time of trial and testing within leadership and virtually all relationships—a form of war on the soul, battling against relationships. The trial may prove either the intimacy and strength, or the distrust and conflict which destroys otherwise seemingly good relationships. Precipitating events which cause crisis and trauma remain the platform that strains intimate relationships to the breaking point; dissolving and decimating formerly healthy and intimate relationships (Wright, 2003). In different circumstances, stressful events—including crisis and trauma—together have historically provided the arena which intimate, lasting relationships forge.

War and battle provide a metaphor concerning the effects that crisis and trauma encompass within leadership. Yet, even in war, close relationships are forged. Beck (2019) recalls this happened with 14 friends during the Vietnam war. Likewise, this familiar scenario might recall the Band of Brothers non-fiction story of World War II (Ambrose, 2001). Too often, sin remains a connecting point, or genesis of the destruction of relationships. However, relationships which are intertwined with the grace of God

---

S. W. Boyer (✉)  
Calvary Chapel Bible College, Murritta, CA, USA

© The Author(s), under exclusive license to Springer Nature  
Switzerland AG 2021

J. D. Henson (ed.), *Biblical Organizational Leadership*,  
Christian Faith Perspectives in Leadership and Business,  
[https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-69929-1\\_8](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-69929-1_8)

often recognize God uses trials for the betterment of relationships (Luke 22:28). Chapter 14 provides a setting rife with trouble, crisis, and trauma involving an intimate small group anticipating separation and loneliness (Borchert, 2002; Morris, 1995).

The chapter revolves around some of the most familiar settings, with the most cherished eleven of disciples (John 13:30), involving the most intimate and important dialogue with Jesus had with his disciples. With the agony of the cross a near reality, Jesus explains the disciples will not follow him on his next journey—troubling the hearts of the eleven (7:34; 8:21; 12:8, 35; 13:33), Jesus would die (12:32–33), a traitor remained among them (13:21), the threefold denial of Peter (13:38), the devil working against all of them (Luke 22:31–32), and that all would fall away (Matt. 26:31) leaving Jesus alone in his time of great trouble (Blum, 1985).

### COMMUNICATING AN OPTIMISTIC EXAMPLE

Jesus is placed into the role of consoler and comforter before he is able to resume the most intimate instructions (Carson, 1991). Within this backdrop John provides some of the most impactful portions of discipleship. Boyer (2019) stated “discipleship remains an intentional, interactive, relational, dedicated and disciplined pattern of being transformed into the likeness of Jesus (Rom. 8:29; 12:1-2).” Within this section of the gospel, one of the main purposes of the ministry of Jesus is fulfilled. One of the main focuses of Jesus, during his life on earth, concerns making a small group of disciples (Eims, 1978). Jesus selected from a larger group, those who became the inner group, the apostles (Ogden, 2003), who became leaders that developed other leaders, even to changing the world (Coleman & Graham, 2006). This chapter includes a pioneer, or Global Positioning Satellite (GPS) or perhaps a God Positioned Spirituality involving three sections (vv. 1–4; vv. 5–14; and vv. 15–31), which provides one principle and five accompanying sub-principles.

*Primary Principle: Leading like Jesus provides an effective and optimistic example through communicating perceived difficulties, providing hope, presence, power, and rewards even through times of trouble and anxiety.*

## PEACE AMIDST FUNCTIONAL CONFLICT

Jesus begins immediately attending to the disciples within this small group and commands “Let not your hearts be troubled” (John 14:1 ESV). The repeated (Deut. 31:6, 8; Joshua 1:9; Ps. 27:1; Matt. 10:29–31; Mark 6:49–50; Luke 12:32) appropriate command from God—do not fear—comes very timely, even as Jesus’ statement to his disciples here (John 14:1). Jesus’ former statement (13:38) had agitated the hearts of the disciples to the point of being “tossed like waves in the wind” (Robertson, 1933, p. 248).

The first principle fittingly adjures a redirect. Akin to the path of a pioneer, or Global Positioning Satellite (GPS) or perhaps a God Positioned Spirituality, Jesus redirects the heart of the disciples. At this point, the small group needs redirection—from fear to faith. Tenney (1981) stated “The form of the imperative *mē tarassesthō* implies that they should ‘stop being troubled.’ ‘Set your heart at ease’ would be a good translation” (p. 143). This altruistic behavior Jesus provides, even during personal crisis—Jesus remains troubled (Carson, 1991) in heart and spirit (12:27; 13:21) which allows a glimpse toward authentic leadership including transparency and openness, (Gardner et al., 2005, p. 361).

The primary aspects regarding the life and ministry of Jesus concern providing atonement for forgiveness, establishing the church (Matt. 16:18) and ushering in the kingdom of heaven (Cairns, 1996, p. 54). Given this, Jesus formed a small group of followers (Peter, James and John, including the 11 here) toward instruction on kingdom purposes (Larkin, 1920) and starting other small groups (Comiskey, 2015; Mayer, 1976). From an organizational perspective, the plan of implementing small groups effectively produced massive multiplication with a global impact—great success! Practically the redirect happens frequently, as with them and so with us. One example of a redirect includes, on more than one occasion, the apostles found arguing about who would be the greatest in the Kingdom of heaven (Matt. 18:1, 20:20–28; Mark 9:33–41; Luke 22:24; John 13). Nevertheless, a redirect necessarily is not bad news. Conversely, a change of direction generally happens due to conviction. The word convict means to totally disapprove, to refute an adversary. “The word does not mean only ‘to blame’ or ‘to reprove,’ nor ‘to convince’ in the sense of proof, nor ‘to reveal’ or ‘expose,’ but ‘to set right,’ namely, ‘to point away from sin to repentance.’” It implies educative discipline” (Büchsel, 1964, p. 474). Thus “In the New Testament to

convict, to prove one in the wrong and thus to shame him” Zodhiates, S. (2000, p. 562). In this setting, the redirect or conviction and reproof paved the way for the disciples to receive some of the most profound teaching in the New Testament. The need for redirection, conviction, and thus reproof in leadership remains standard if the concept of bounded rationality is accepted.

Nobuo (2015) reported the concept of bounded rationality was derived from Herbert A. Simon, the author of *Administrative Behavior* (Simon, 1947, 1957, 1976, 1997). Nobuo notes that the term bounded rationality does not appear in the book *Administrative Behavior*. Nobuo states that concept became through the analogy of triangle of limits, that of skills, values, and knowledge. Nobuo declares Simon found “bounded rationality” in an individual who is bounded by his triangle of limits or limits to rationality (p. 73). The desire of organizations remains toward complete and faultless decision making. The experience of organizational leaders remains contrary. Bounded rationality remains the pattern and experience. All understanding and knowledge come from God (Exo. 31:3). “Good sense is a foundation of life...” (Prov. 16:22 ESV). Only God has infinite understanding (Isa. 40:28). Given this, the idea that managers and leaders can make perfect decisions remains deceptive. Any time a manager or a person does make a perfect decision, that decision must be credited to God (1 Cor. 2:13). The apostle Paul recognizes that our own decisions and judgments are often wrong therefore he encourages judgment to be left to God (1 Cor. 4:3). To be sure, the apostle Paul endured many conflicts (Acts 13:45; 14:2; 15:2; 16:22) as well as with the apostles Barnabas and Peter (Acts 15:39; Gal. 2:11).

Conflicts are best handled according to the Biblical parameters set forth in the Scriptures (Matt.5:23–24; 18:15–20). Sande (2004) posited, relationships before issues except after trust. Conflict resolution ought to be extensively pursued and greatly encouraged. Conflict resolution is an exercise of scriptural authority for which the church is responsible (Matt. 18:17). The goals of conflict resolution are to honor God; to protect the purity of the Church/organization; to guard others from being tempted, misled, divided, or otherwise harmed; and to bring fallen Christians to repentance (Matt. 18:20; 1 Cor. 5:12; 6:3; 2 Cor. 2:7). It is to be exercised with mercy, grace, and forgiveness (2 Cor. 2: 8; Eph. 4:32). However, not all conflict is bad (Ivancevich & Konopaske, 2010). One of the greatest, notable leadership conflicts in Scripture positively influenced the formation, nature, and composition of

the most influential and successful organization in history—the church (Acts 15). The type of conflict the early church experienced is called “functional conflict” whereas “dysfunctional conflict” provides organizational harm (Ivancevich & Konopaske, 2010, p. 311). One method of conflict resolution management includes four steps including “accommodating” (altruism), “problem solving” (interpersonal), “avoiding” (dispassionate, or forgiving), and “compromising” (reciprocal) (Ivancevich & Konopaske, 2010, pp. 319–321). Ideally, all organizational disagreements will work toward functional conflict. The command of Jesus to redirect the conflict (fear versus faith) within the apostles provides the desirable affect—faith in Jesus (John 16:30), evidenced through church history.

*Principle One: Leading like Jesus provides an example of effective leadership through redirecting self, and others toward trusting God with the best path forward.*

## KEEPING THE MAIN THING THE MAIN THING

Having captured the hearts and minds of the apostles, Jesus redirects their fear to faith, focusing on the future—heaven. Jesus states that heaven is My Father’s house—it’s a place for family. The term mansions or dwellings “*monē*’; gen. *monē*’s, fem. noun from *ménō*” is often used with the meaning: “to remain, dwell, a mansion, habitation, abode a place where one dwells permanently” (Zodhiates, 2000, p. 995). Unfortunately, mansions bring the wrong image into our minds. “So if the *monai* are in God’s house, the NIV’s ‘rooms,’ or perhaps ‘apartments’ or ‘flats,’ would be much closer to the meaning of the text here” (Borchert, 2002, p. 104).

The second image in keeping with God Positioned Spirituality (GPS) now reveals a threefold direction. This remains congruent with organizational strategic planning (Credo, mission, vision, values) (Malphurs, 2005). Establishing and maintaining a strategic plan remains hugely beneficial to any organization. Saffold (1994) posited a biblical pattern of planning (a) purpose, (b) strategy, and (c) action (p. 5). The Bible remains replete with references revealing the planning and setting goals which provide benefits toward accomplishing God’s purposes (Luke 14.28–32; Judges 17.6b; Prov. 29.18; Matt 28.19–20; Acts 2.42–44; Rom 1.16; 15.20). To be sure, this reveals the route the GPS provides, rather than suggesting many routes or roads lead to heaven. Jeffress (2016) superfluously addresses the exclusivity of the gospel in this inclusive world.



The metaphor (threefold direction) reveals three things simultaneously happening while on the road to heaven.

The gospel is not universal nor inclusive but rather exclusive as Jeffress (2016) clearly and articulately exclaimed. Morris (1995) noted Jesus' statement "I am the way, the truth and the life. No one comes to the Father except through me" (John 14:6 ESV) provides a threefold description emphasizing the way (vv. 4-6). "Jesus is not one among many ways to God but the only way to God. The early church was even called 'The Way' because of its insistence upon this point (Acts 9:2; 19:9, 23)" (Dockery [Ed.], 1992, p. 624). Interestingly Toussaint (1985) noted "Saul referred to Christianity as the Way, a term used only in Acts (19:9, 23; 22:4; 24:14, 22)." Similarly, strategic planning involves planning through reflection on a past mission statement, current context and forward projection amalgamated with the future and making preparations to meet it (Anthony & Estep, 2005).

Jesus not only shows people the way, he is the way (Morris, 1995). Strategic planning may be defined as a flexible process, which presents goals and objectives in context of the local organization for the purpose of fulfilling the Great Commission (Malphurs, 2005). Strategic planning can improve organizational performance, which remains more important with greater the threats and opportunities (Yukl, 2013). Gangel (1997) proposed six principles of planning: (a) planning invests time; it does not spend it, (b) planning requires careful attention to immediate choices, (c) planning is cyclically based on evaluation, (d) planning requires acting objectively toward goal realization, (e) planning should allow for maximal participation, and (f) planning increases the specificity as the event draws nearer (Gangel, 1997, pp. 290–292). Strategic planning provides the way forward following the organizational mission. Saffold (1994) provided nine principles of strategic planning: (a) the plan for planning, (b) mission clarification, (c) strategic vision development, (d) environmental scanning, (e) status analysis, (f) major issues, (g) strategic initiatives, (h) operational planning, and (i) results management (Saffold 1994, pp. 92–95). "A master plan [strategic planning] is a written statement of a group's assumptions about its direction, organization and cash" (Biehl, 2005, p. 8). Carson (1991) posited the entirety of verse 6 provides an answer to Thomas's question: "How can we know the way?" (John: 14:5). Carson further explains: "if Thomas' question and v. 6a demonstrate that [way] is the principal theme, it follows that truth and life enjoy a supporting role: Jesus is the way to God, precisely

because he is the truth of God and the life of God. Jesus is the truth, because he embodies the supreme revelation of God” (Carson, 1991, p. 491). The way an organization leads largely occurs through its credo and mission. Organizations involving Christian leadership have the benefit of a prescribed mission (Matt. 28:19–20; Mark 16:15; Luke 24:45–49; Acts 1:8).

The claim to truth Jesus puts forth not only speaks of “utter dependability and complete relatability, but the saving truth of the gospel” (Morris, 1995, pp. 569–570). Leadership pioneers’ organizational endeavors through moral fortitude and biblical values. Leadership blazes the organizational trail through constant diligence in maintaining intuitions values.

Only because he is the truth and the life can Jesus be the way for others to come to God, the way for his disciples to attain the many dwelling-places in the Father’s house (vv. 2–3), and therefore the answer to Thomas’ question (v. 5). In this context Jesus does not simply blaze a trail, commanding others to take the way that he himself takes; rather, he is the way (Carson, 1991, p. 491).

The early church upheld values: bible doctrine (Acts 2:42–43), fellowship (Acts 2:42, 44–46) praise, worship (Acts 2:42, 47), and evangelism (Acts 2:40–41, 47). Organizations which do not maintain ethical values tend toward immorality.

Barna (2011) highlighted trends such as family life foundations, attitudes and values (or lack of), immoral media explosion, religious beliefs (orthodox or not), the behavior of the religious society and a waning belief in the truthfulness and accuracy of the Bible. The trends of America, according to Barna, tend toward the anti-religious movement (also immoral) sweeping across America, threatening the very foundations of family life and values so many Americans purport as foundational to living well. Leadership decisions and values remain connected, and ought to correspond to Scripture. “Values are guidelines and beliefs that a person uses when confronted with a situation in which a choice must be made” (Ivancevich & Konopaske, 2010, p. 418). Yukl (2013) stated values concern internalized attitudes, which direct between right and wrong, moral and immoral. Yukl underscored the importance of values stating that values guide the person’s preferences, perception of problems, and choice of behavior. Saffold (1994) provided ideas for developing an adaptive culture: (a) encourage departures from tradition, (b) scan the

events that signal the need for change, (c) practiced strategic decision-making, (d) empower champions for change, and (e) establish action vehicles to solidify change (Saffold 1994, pp. 81–84). Values remain a guiding light to an organization just as truth provides light to the disciple (John 8:31).

Just after Jesus claims to be the light of the world (John 8:12) he proves this by granting vision to a man born blind (John 9:5–7). Leaders who walk in the life and light of Jesus (1 John 1:5–7) maintain vision (Gen. 15:1; Num. 12:6; Isa. 6:1–13; Amos 3:7; Hab. 2:2–3; Dan. 7:13–14). The vision God provides may only be accomplished if He empowers it. Effective leadership provides organizational vision so magnificent only God may accomplish it. Organizationally, “environmental scanning provides information needed for strategic planning and crisis management” (Yukl, 2013, p. 297). This vision and foresight allow companies to maximize and exploit opportunity. Strategically, vision is maintained through (a) staying focused, (b) doing a few things well, and (c) adding things slowly (Stevens & Morgan, 2004, p. 33) Jesus provides light, life and vision (Prov. 29:18).

Jesus provides abundant life (John 10:10). Jesus is not only the life, but “the source of life to believers” (Morris, 1995, p. 569). “Jesus is the life (1:4), the one who has ‘life in himself’ (5:26), ‘the resurrection and the life’ (11:25), ‘the true God and eternal life’ (1 Jn. 5:20)” (Carson, 1991, p. 491). There remain at least seven reasons a vision statement is important: (a) provides energy, (b) creates cause, (c) fosters risk taking, (d) legitimizes leadership, (e) energizes leadership, (f) sustains ministry, and (g) motivates giving (Malphurs, 2005, p. 149). Saffold (1994) listed seven biblical principles for strategic planning: (a) focus on the future, (b) capture of vision, (c) manage opportunities and threats, (d) devise effective strategies, (e) emphasize action, (f) anticipate and respond to change, and (g) remain flexible (Saffold, 1994, pp. 7–16). Jesus remains the way, the truth, and the life (v.6) and provides mission, values, and vision for the betterment of organizational leaders.

*Principle Two: Leading like Jesus provides examples of threefold direction through strategic planning—maintaining biblical and organizational mission, vision, and values.*

## REVEALING JESUS

Jesus continued exhorting the disciples concerning their intimate knowledge of God (7), stating knowing him, means knowing God (John 1:18).

To be sure, a finite human knowing the infinite God remains impossible—but not with God (Matt. 19:26). This paradox provides more investigation and explanation of which books have been written (Boyer & Hall, 2012; Tozer, 1961), and remain beyond the scope here. In fact, knowledge of God is not normally claimed in the Old Testament (Morris, 1995), except in rare instances (Ps. 36:10; Jer. 9:24). God revealed himself to Moses, even speaking to him face to face, likely an anthropomorphic term as explained in the statement “as a man speaks to his friend” (Exo. 33:11 ESV). This seems only to have inspired Moses to know God with greater intimacy (Exo. 33:12–23), asking him to reveal the glory of God—which seem to be connected with seeing his face (Exo. 33:20). Speaking face to face provides authentication of friendship including intimacy and emotion. One common aspect of verbal communication is looking eye to eye with someone.

Some of the latest smart phones have retina authentication. This provides access to a wealth of items, through various details in a person’s retina. In John 14, Jesus provides a threefold authentication (the Father, words, works) of identity with the Father. We only know God in as much as he has revealed himself to us (Tozer, 1961). In John 5:19–26, Jesus provides 7 proofs of Messiahship: (a) works (v.19), (b) knowledge (v.20), (c) power of resurrection (v.21), (d) judgment (v.22), (e) honor (v.23), (f) regeneration (vv.24–25), and (g) self-existence. Continuing in John 5, Jesus provides 4 witnesses testifying he is the savior: (a) John the Baptist (v.33), (b) the works (v.36), (c) the Father (v.37–38), and (d) the scriptures (v. 39). Perhaps as a reminder of the former chapter, “Jesus insists, you do know him and have seen him” (Carson, 1991, p. 493). Or perhaps, “the text is a rebuke to the disciples, who should have realized that ‘really knowing’ Jesus would mean ‘really knowing’ God” (Borchert, 2002, p. 111). If this is a rebuke, it may have centered on the failure to understand Jesus and his mission (Blum, 1985). Either way, the noble venture of knowing God exists for millennium (Ex. 33:18). The gentle rebuke provides insight to limitations of Phillips knowledge (Morris, 1995). Jesus states that knowing him means knowing the Father (12:45, 13:20), and then provides a threefold authentication (the Father, words, works). In ancient time, a seal was a form of authentication. Freeman and Chadwick (1998) list the use of a seal.

Herodotus gives an account of the ceremonies among the ancient Egyptians accompanying the selection of an animal for sacrifice. If, after careful search, the animal was found without blemish, the priest bound

a label to his horns, applied wax to the label, and sealed it with his ring. This set it apart for sacrifice, and no animal could be offered unless it bore this seal. References to the sealing or setting a part of the people of God are made in 2 Corinthians 1:22; Ephesians 1:13; 4:30; Revelation 7:2 (Freeman & Chadwick, 1998, p. 514).

Today people look for the Consumer Reports seal or the Good House-keeping seal on items before purchasing. It is wise to look for a seal of approval. Jesus has God the Fathers approval seal upon Him at His birth (Luke 2:9–11), and at his baptism (Matt. 3:17) and during his ministry (John 6:27).

People also look for a seal or authentication with organizations and leaders. Authentic Leadership (AL) is aptly termed, for the main focus of AL concerns leadership, which remains, real, genuine, and authentic (Northouse, 2013). The need for a fresh leadership theory arose out of the leadership troubles within the past decade (Avolio et al., 2004; Northouse, 2013). The AL contemporary model developed due to moral leadership failures, such as Enron, Worldcom, and Global Crossing (Avolio et al., 2004; Northouse, 2013).

President, preacher, senator, or saint, all types of leadership influence people no matter what. British Broadcasting Corporation news (1998) recorded President Bill Clinton left office with the Monica Lewinsky despicable disgrace. WTVM News (2012) revealed itinerant preacher Sammy Nuckolls remains accused of secretly videotaping women. Hilzenrath (2011) reported Former Senator Jon Corzine leads MF Global into monetary degradation. Reece (2013) declared Pastor Charles Gilford remains accused of using over \$400,000 of church funds for personal gambling. Dougherty (2005) reported that Hitler, Stalin, and Mao led with self-reliant principles, and the destruction and death counts are horrendous. Significant differences exist between leadership motivated and controlled through a devotion to self and spiritual leadership, or leadership empowered by the Holy Spirit. Sanders (1994) declared spiritual leadership should be conducted with transparent character, open and innocent of guile (p. 62). Blackaby and Blackaby (2001) stated leaders without integrity can promote worthy causes, while they lose followers because inconsistent and morally corrupt lives discredit the validity of their own proposals. Perhaps the difference remains with the lack of mission, vision and values or standards of practice for ethical, moral, and behavioral decision making which reflects biblical principles.

*Principle Three: Leading like Jesus provides an example of authentic leadership—maintaining personal and organizational modality which attune with biblical principles.*

## KEEPING YOUR CHRISTIAN LEADERSHIP CHRISTIAN

Patrons may exhibit strong thoughts, emotions, and perceptions concerning a credo and organizational culture. Nordstrom's, Disney and McDonald's all maintain a branding or organizational culture that resonates within both employees and customers. Jesus recalls in the mind of his disciples his leadership climate which derives the organizational culture (values, beliefs, and norms). His link with the Father stresses their trust in the person of Jesus as well as the Father's abiding presence (Morris, 1995). "Furthermore, if a personality must be employed to represent God, that personality cannot be less than God and do him justice, nor can it be so far above humanity that it cannot communicate God perfectly to men" (Tenney, 1981, p. 145). Here, Jesus provides another recall of his words and works, which connect with the Father (cf. 5:36; 10:37–38). Reconnecting with the central mission provides constant assessment and helps prevent mission drift. "The way Jesus made known the character and reality of the Father was by his words and works. The truth of God filled Jesus' words; the power of God produced his works" (Tenney, 1981, p. 145). Jesus continually refers to his life and mission in complete connection with the Father's mission (John 3:35; 4:23; 5:17, 18–23, 26, 36, 37; 6:44–46, 57, 65; 8:38; 10:30; 12:49; 13:3; 14:10; 15: 8; 16:27; 17:1; 18:11; 20:17). Jesus and the Fathers will remain so completely connected, Christian leaders are now to pray and ask in Jesus' name (14:13,14). "Prayers in his name are prayers that are offered in thorough accord with all that his name stands for" (Carson, 1991, p. 497). This is not meant to be a formula (Morris, 1995), nor is this "phrase 'in my name,' ...a talisman for the command of supernatural energy" (Tenney, 1981, p. 146). Effective leaders' model and maintain a personal and organizational mission in line with the biblical mandate (Matt. 28:19–20; Mark 16:15; Luke 24:45–49; Acts 1:8). Jesus did greater works than any human in history; the blind receive sight, the lame walk, the deaf hear, lepers are cleansed, and the dead are raised (Matt. 11:4–5). Christian leaders may do greater works as our credo aligns with Jesus (John 20:21). Greater works remain through the life of Christian leaders, who remain in obedience to Jesus (John 14:15).

This does not resemble Autocratic leadership, rather, loving guidance and empowerment. “The uncompromising connection between love for Christ and obedience to Christ repeatedly recurs in John’s writings (*cf.* vv. 21, 23; 15:14). The linkage approaches the level of definition: ‘This is love for God: to obey his commands’ (1 Jn. 5:3)” (Carson, 1991, p. 498). Greater works are not accomplished through the leaders own strength and power, but through the intimate relationship with Jesus—through grace (Jer. 31:31–34). “Grace is not opposed to effort. Grace is opposed to earning” (Willard, 2006, p. 61). The term Helper is “the Greek term *paraklētos*...primarily means ‘legal assistant, advocate’ (LSJ, s.v.) i.e. someone who helps another in court, whether as an advocate, a witness, or a representative” (Carson, 1991, p. 499). The Holy Spirit or Paraclete is known by many names, at least 15.

Importantly, Christian leadership depends upon the Spirit, Advocate, and his empowerment remaining presently (with you) but also (in you) toward future certainty (Morris, 1995). Fry (2003) defined Spiritual Leadership (SL) “as comprising the values, attitudes, and behaviors that are necessary to intrinsically motivate one’s self and others so that they have a sense of spiritual survival through calling and membership” (p. 694). Fry declared this entails a sense of calling, which then produces efforts toward empowerment, as well as love, care, and concern. Sanders (2007) comments SL concerns power from on high—divine power—SL remains effective only due to the Holy Spirits work within. “Areas of overlap between the authentic and spiritual leadership theories include their focus on integrity, trust, courage, hope, and perseverance (resilience)” (Avolio & Gardner, 2005, p. 331). Given this, the Spirit empowers the Christian leader who maintains obedience to the credo and mission of Jesus.

*Principle Four: Leading like Jesus empowers greater works, which remains the pattern of Christian leaders and organizations whom maintain obedience to the credo and mission of Jesus.*

## PEACE CORRESPONDING AN IMPREGNABLE CASTLE

Jesus affirms his initial promise for the future (14:1,2, 18). He then provides added encouragement through repetition (14:19–25), which remains helpful since “repetition is an acceptable principle of learning” (Ivancevich & Konopaske, 2010, p. 393). “Repetition or redundancy into communication (especially that of a technical nature) ensures that if one

part of the message is not understood, other parts will carry the same message” (Ivancevich & Konopaske, 2010, p. 393). This pericope might also resemble positive reinforcement “a positive reinforcer is a stimulant that, when added to the situation, strengthens the probability of a behavioral response” (Ivancevich & Konopaske, 2010, p. 187). Jesus provides greater clarity and focuses on the Spirit, who will be sent from the Father in Jesus’ name. “If he is sent in Jesus’ name, he is *Jesus*’ emissary. Just as Jesus came in his Father’s name (5:43; 10:25), *i.e.* as his Father’s emissary, so the Spirit comes in Jesus’ name” (Carson, 1991, p. 505). In essence, the Spirit provides repetition or positive reinforcement so that the disciples remember Jesus’ teachings (Carson, 1991; Morris, 1995; Tenney, 1981). The ministry of the Spirit or “role of prompter/teacher is crucial for John because the task of the Holy Spirit could be said to be one of confirming and interpreting the message proclaimed and demonstrated by Jesus” (Borchert, 2002, p. 132). With the comfort of Jesus and the ministry of the Holy Spirit ahead of them, Jesus now declares his peace “(*eirēnē*) reflects Hebrew *šālōm*” (Carson, 1991, p. 505) upon them. The statement of peace often refers to the Jewish greeting and farewell (*shalom*), tied to the “Aaronic benediction (Num 6:26) and Israel’s messianic expectations (e.g., Isa 9:6–7; 52:7; 57:19; Ezek 37:26)” (Borchert, 2002, p. 133), but much more is intended.

The Roman Empire achieved its *pax Romana* of Augustus and his successors by the sword, but here Jesus proclaims a peace far different from the way of the world. As Hoskyns and Davey have succinctly stated, Jesus was proclaiming “the new order,” which “is simply the peace of God in the world.” It was not like the cries of “peace, peace” by Israel when Jeremiah reminded them “there is no peace” (Jer 6:14). This peace was the gift of Jesus which would calm their troubled hearts and ease their fears of his departure. It is the peace that Christians would come to experience in the postresurrection era of the Spirit, when Paul could proclaim a peace of Christ Jesus that goes beyond all human understanding and guards believers “hearts and minds” (Phil 4:7) (Borchert, 2002, p. 133).

The peace Jesus supplies provides the unshakable fortitude when the leader remains against all odds. This statement conveys messianic and eschatological implications (Carson, 1991). This peace remains a fundamental aspect of the apostle Paul’s letter to the Philippians. “God’s peace transcends our intellectual powers precisely because believers experience it when it is unexpected, in circumstances that make it appear impossible: Paul suffering in prison, the Philippians threatened by quarrels within



and by enemies without” (Silva, 2005, p. 196). The nature of its origin (divine) places it far against and above peace the world offers, which remains at best material and temporal and moreover truly nonexistent. “At the individual level, this peace secures composure in the midst of trouble, and dissolves fear, as the final injunction of this verse demonstrates” (Carson, 1991, p. 506). This does not mean that at no time will the Christian leader experience fear or trepidation (1 Cor. 18:9–10), but rather the peace empowered by the Spirit will provide an ability to overcome and remain courageous (Deut. 31:6, 7, 23; Josh. 1:7,9; 1 Chron. 28:20; 32:7). “This is the peace which garrisons our hearts and minds against the invasion of anxiety (Phil. 4:7) and rules or arbitrates in the hearts of God’s people to maintain harmony amongst them (Col. 3:15)” (Carson, 1991, p. 506). This essential element remains a major contributor toward perseverance (14:29). Authentic leaders (AL) remain hopeful. The transparent interacting with followers, along with optimism, confidence, hope, and decision making, help encourage trusting relationships with followers (Gardner et al., 2005). These ideologies are well articulated through Gardner et al. (2005).

By being true to one’s core beliefs and values and exhibiting authentic behavior, the leader positively fosters the development of associates until they become leaders themselves. Authentic leaders are also posited to draw from the positive psychological states that accompany optimal self-esteem and psychological well-being, such as confidence, optimism, hope, and resilience, to model and promote the development of these states in others. Moreover, they apply a positive moral perspective to lead by example as they communicate through their words and deeds high moral standards and values (p. 345).

AL values include altruism, optimism, trust, honesty, kindness, fairness, and accountability (Yukl, 2013, p. 351). “We expect authentic leaders to demonstrate through their words and deeds the importance of integrity, trust, transparency, openness, respect for others, and fairness—end values that are more closely aligned with self-transcendence than self-enhancement” (Gardner et al., 2005, p. 361). Given this, Christian leaders enjoy the comfort, encouragement, and empowerment of the Spirit and divine peace which provide perseverance and victory (John 16:33).

*Principle Five: Christian leaders and organizations enjoy the peace of Christ deposited by the Spirit providing comfort, empowerment, perseverance, and victory.*

## SUMMARY

John 14 remains rife with practical leadership principles, which background of events managed to even trouble both heart and spirit of Jesus himself (John 12:27; 13:21). The main point surely not left unnoticed—crisis and trouble may provide a ripe opportunity for internal and or external change. Cooperation with God during this troubled time provides for God positioned spirituality. Leaders ought to remain constantly vigilant that our lives remain an example even when it seems others are not watching. Given this, we may choose to see conflict as a way to reveal peace that passes understanding. Thus, crisis becomes functional conflict. Likewise, in as much as we remain cognizant of the example we maintain, leadership also continually strive toward maintaining the credo, mission, vision, and values both personally and organizationally. While maintaining and providing for organizational culture (and as much as our mission, vision, and values remain biblical) we revealed Jesus. In this way Christian leaders continue in the highest priority keeping the Christian in Christian leadership. As the Christian leader continues in the biblical patterns provided for in scripture confidence and peace of the victory is assured.

## DISCUSSION QUESTIONS

1. With an honest, humble, and authentic consideration of your attitude and behaviors, do those around you say you lead like Jesus and provide an effective and optimistic example through communicating perceived difficulties, providing hope, presence, power, and rewards even through times of trouble and anxiety?
2. Consider an example of effective leadership involving redirecting self, and others toward trusting God with the best path forward; how might you improve this in the future?
3. Leading like Jesus provides examples of threefold direction through strategic planning—maintaining biblical and organizational mission, vision, and values; how might the antithesis of this derail organizational goals?
4. If, leading like Jesus provides an example of authentic leadership—maintaining personal and organizational modality which attune with biblical principles; what model or style of leadership would others say best fits your practice?

5. What did it look like or what would it look like if your leadership was not empowered by Jesus toward greater works, and did not maintain obedience to the credo and mission of Jesus?
6. How much different is, or would your leadership be, if you did not enjoy the peace of Christ deposited by the Spirit providing comfort, empowerment, perseverance, and victory?

## REFERENCES

- Ambrose, S. (2001). *Band of Brothers*. New York: Touchstone.
- Anthony, M. J., & Estep, James Jr. (2005). *Management essentials for Christian ministries*. Nashville, TN: B&H Publishing.
- Avolio, G., Walumbwa, L., & May. (2004). Unlocking the mask: Unlocking the mask: A look at the process by which authentic leaders impact follower attitudes and behaviors. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 15(6), 801–823.
- Barna, G. (2011). *Futurecast: What today's trends mean for tomorrow's world*. Austin: BarnaBooks.
- BBC News. (1998). TimeLine: *The Clinton investigation*. [http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/events/clinton\\_under\\_fire/timeline/168540.stm](http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/events/clinton_under_fire/timeline/168540.stm). Retrieved on 03-23-13.
- Beck, J. (2019). The Atlantic. How 14 friends from the Vietnam war lost and found one another again. <https://www.theatlantic.com/family/archive/2019/03/friendship-files-how-14-friends-vietnam-war-lost-and-found-one-another/583714/>.
- Biehl, B. (2005). *Masterplanning: The complete guide for building a strategic plan for your business, church, or organization*. Mt. Dora, FL: Aylen Publishing.
- Blackaby, H., & Blackaby, R. (2001). *Spiritual leadership: Moving people on to God's agenda*. Nashville, Broadman & Holman Publishers.
- Blum, E. A. (1985). John. In J. F. Walvoord & R. B. Zuck (Eds.), *The Bible knowledge commentary: An exposition of the scriptures* (Vol. 2, p. 322). Wheaton, IL: Victor Books.
- Borchert, G. L. (2002). *John 12–21* (Vol. 25B). Nashville: Broadman & Holman Publishers.
- Boyer, S. D., & Hall, C. A. (2012). *The mystery of God: Theology for knowing the unknowable*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic.
- Boyer, S. W. (2019). *Biblical leadership development: Principles for developing organizational leaders at every level*. Switzerland Palgrave Macmillan: Cham.
- Büchsel, F. (1964–). ἐλέγχω, ἔλεξις, ἔλεγχος, ἐλεγμός. G. Kittel, G. W. Bromiley, & G. Friedrich (Eds.), *Theological dictionary of the New Testament* (electronic ed., Vol. 2, p. 474). Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

- Cairns, E. E. (1996). *Christianity through the centuries: The history of the Christian Church*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing.
- Carson, D. A. (1991). *The Gospel according to John* (p. 487). Leicester, England; Grand Rapids, MI: Inter-Varsity Press; W.B. Eerdmans.
- Coleman, R. E., & Graham, B. (2006). *The master plan of evangelism*. Grand Rapids, MI: Revell.
- Comiskey, J. (2015). *2000 years of small groups: A history of cell ministry in the church*. Moreno Valley, CA: CSC Publishing.
- Dockery, D. S. (Ed.). (1992). *Holman Bible Handbook*. Nashville, TN: Holman Bible Publishers.
- Dougherty, J. (2005). WorldNet daily. *Much about History: Mao more Lethal than Hitler and Stalin*. <http://www.wnd.com/2005/11/33619/>. Retrieved on 02-02-13.
- Eims, L. (1978). *The lost art of disciple making*. Colorado Springs Co: Navpress.
- Freeman, J. M., & Chadwick, H. J. (1998). *Manners & customs of the Bible*. North Brunswick, NJ: Bridge-Logos Publishers.
- Fry, L. W. (2003). Toward a theory of spiritual leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 14(6), 693–727.
- Gangel, K. O. (1997). *Team leadership in Christian ministry: Using multiple gifts to build a unified vision*. Chicago, Ill: Moody Press.
- Gardner, W. L., Avolio, B. J., Luthans, F., May, D. R., & Walumbwa, F. (2005, June). “Can you see the real me?” A self-based model of authentic leader and follower development. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 16(3), 343–372, ISSN 1048-9843. <http://0-dx.doi.org.library.regent.edu/10.1016/j.leaqua.2005.03.003>.
- Hilzenrath, D. (2011). *The Washington Post*. <http://www.wnd.com/2011/12/375501>.
- Ivancevich, J., & Konopaske, R. (2010). *Organizational behavior* (9th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Jeffress, R. (2016). *Not all roads lead to heaven: Sharing an exclusive Jesus in an inclusive world*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books.
- Larkin, C. (1920). *Rightly dividing the word*. Glenside, PA: Rev. Clarence Larkin Est. Publishing.
- Malphurs, A. (2005). *Advanced strategic planning: A new model for church and ministry leaders*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books.
- Mayer, H. T. (1976). Pastoral roles and mission goals. *Currents in Theology and Mission*, 3(5), 292–302.
- Morris, L. (1995). *The new international commentary on the New Testament: The Gospel according to John*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans Publishing Co.
- Nobuo, T. (2015). Where is bounded rationality from? *Annals of Business Administrative Science*, 14(2), 67–82. <https://doi.org/10.7880/abas.14.67>.

- Northouse, P. G. (2013). *Leadership: Theory and practice* (6th ed.). Los Angeles: Sage.
- Ogden, G. (2003). *Transforming discipleship: Making disciples a few at a time*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.
- Reece, K. (2013). KHOU News. <http://www.khou.com/home/DA-Pastor-wife-gambled-away-430000-from-Houston-church---160073565.html>. Retrieved on 03-23-13.
- Robertson, A. T. (1933). *Word pictures in the New Testament* (Jn 14:1). Nashville, TN: Broadman Press.
- Saffold, G. (1994). *Strategic planning for Christian organizations: Turning the power of vision into effective ministry*. Orlando, FL: ABHE.
- Sande, K. (2004). *The peace maker: A Biblical guide to resolving personal conflict*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Books.
- Sanders, O. J. ([1994] 2007). *Spiritual leadership: Principles of excellence for every believer*. Chicago: Moody Publishers.
- Silva, M. (2005). *Philippians* (2nd ed., p. 196). Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic.
- Stevens, T., & Morgan, T. (2004). *Simply strategic stuff: Help for leaders drowning in the details of running a church*. Loveland, CO: Group Publishing.
- Tenney, M. C. (1981). John. In F. E. Gaebelin (Ed.), *The expositor's Bible commentary: John and acts* (Vol. 9). Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House.
- Toussaint, S. D. (1985). Acts. In J. F. Walvoord & R. B. Zuck (Eds.), *The Bible knowledge commentary: An exposition of the scriptures* (Vol. 2, p. 375). Wheaton, IL: Victor Books.
- Tozer, A. W. (1961). *The knowledge of the holy: The attributes of God: Their meaning in the Christian life*. Harrisburg, PA: Christian Publications.
- Willard, D. (2006). *The great omission: Reclaiming Jesus's essential teachings on discipleship*. San Francisco: Harper Collins Publisher.
- Wright, N. H. (2003). *Crisis and trauma counseling*. Regal.
- WTVM News. (2012). Sammy Nuckolls is accused of secretly videotaping women while working as a traveling preacher. Retrieved from <http://www.wtvm.com/story/19543780/preacher-accused-of-peeping-will-face-a-judge-today>.
- Yukl, G. (2013). *Leadership in organizations* (8th ed.). New Jersey: Pearson Education Inc.
- Zodhiates, S. (2000). *The complete word study dictionary: New Testament* (electronic ed.). Chattanooga, TN: AMG Publishers.



## Jesus and Succession Planning

*Suzana Dobric Veiss and Elizabeth K. Hunt*

Navigating succession from leader to leader within an organization requires current leadership to spend time and energy planning how the torch of leadership will be passed and to do so in a way that leads to the least amount of disruption and the greatest amount of success for followers and the organization. The literature related to succession planning articulates several needs and goals of succession planning including developing talent pools, consideration of the past, present, and future, leadership development planning, competency models, consideration of competency and experience, and utilizing excellent communication (Daley, 2020; Hollinger, 2013; McCall, 1992; Rothwell, 2005).

While much has been written on the importance and methods for successful succession planning (Daley, 2020; McCall, 1992), limited

---

S. D. Veiss  
Fresno Pacific University, Fresno, CA, USA  
e-mail: [Suzana.Veiss@fresno.edu](mailto:Suzana.Veiss@fresno.edu)

E. K. Hunt (✉)  
University of Jamestown, Jamestown, ND, USA  
e-mail: [lhunt@uj.edu](mailto:lhunt@uj.edu)

research exists on succession planning models derived from the Scripture (Pugh, 2016; Tuppurainen, 2016). As noted, research on succession planning identifies communication as an essential factor in succession (McCall, 1992). However, limited research exists on the relationship between farewell speech and succession in the Scripture (Uytanlet, 2014), and very little research exists on the relationship between Jesus's farewell prayer and succession (Pugh, 2016; Tuppurainen, 2016). Since John 17 serves as a climax of Jesus's farewell discourse in John 13–17 (Brown, 1970; Kostenberger, 2004; Keener, 2014), and since a characteristic of farewell speeches was a concern with the succession of leadership (Holmas, 2011), this analysis examined Jesus's prayer in John 17 and the possible implications for succession planning.

### JOHN 17: GENRE AND PERICOPE

Genre analysis provides the principles by which the readers can understand a particular pericope (Wittgenstein, 1953). The Fourth Gospel, together with the other Gospels, falls into the general category of ancient biography (Keener, 2014). While historians and biographers typically wrote with a particular agenda and expected readers to recognize themes and draw lessons from their written work, they also desired to be as accurate as possible (Keener, 2014). According to Blomberg (2007), since the Gospels are historical accounts, they are trustworthy accounts, and historical investigation can be used to study them.

Chapters 13–17 are identified as the genre of farewell discourse where the chosen pericope, John 17, serves as a capstone (Brown, 1970; Kostenberger, 2004; Keener, 2014). In Jesus's "farewell discourse," "the new messianic community" is prepared for Jesus's departure through the washing of the feet in John 13, Judas's parting in John 13, instructions regarding the Holy Spirit in John 14–16, and Jesus's prayer in John 17 (Kostenberger, 2004). Kostenberger (2004) argued Jesus's farewell could be compared to Moses's farewell in Deuteronomy 31–33 and other Second Temple period works on farewells. The genre of such works from the Old Testament and the Second Temple period featured: "predictions of death and departure, predictions of future challenges for the followers/sons of the dying man after his death, arrangements regarding succession or continuation of the family line, exhortations to moral behavior, a final commission, an affirmation and renewal of God's covenant promises, and a closing doxology" (Kostenberger, 2004,

p. 396). Jesus's farewell included an exhortation to moral behavior in appeal to "love one another" (John 13:34, John 15:17); Jesus's warning about his "departure" (John 14:5–6); and comforting words (John 14:5–6) (Kostenberger, 2004). Furthermore, "in keeping with the genre's concern for proper succession," Jesus announced the coming of "another advocate" (John 13:16) (Kostenberger, 2004, p. 397). According to Kostenberger (2004), this farewell ensured Jesus's ministry is continued in the ministry of the disciples.

While the discussion on the Second Temple period literary genre and comparison to Moses's speech in Deuteronomy is important, for the purposes of this analysis, the central part is that "the function of such speeches is the preservation and handing on of wisdom and lessons from one's life to the next generation shortly before death or departure" (Witherington, 1995, p. 245). What is important for the purposes of this historical-grammatical exegetical analysis of John 17 is the focus on the text itself. Jesus's prayer in John 17 began with the opening words "when Jesus had spoken these words" (John 17:1), suggesting a connection to the previous text. Kostenberger (2004) suggested Jesus's prayer is "sandwiched," between the final dinner and the cross (p. 397). John 17 is traditionally divided into three divisions (Hera, 2012): John 17:1–5 focusing on Jesus, John: 17:6–19 focusing on immediate disciples, and John 17: 20–26 focusing on future disciples. Therefore, this linguistic analysis followed the same divisions.

## JOHN 17: HISTORICAL AND CULTURAL BACKGROUND

Historical and cultural background information on the pericope can indicate how the first readers would have understood its message (Keener, 2014). Knowing the information about the ancient culture is critical to understanding the sorts of circumstances to which the chosen pericope most directly applies (Keener, 2014). Critical components of the historical and cultural background are discussions on authorship, date, the audience to whom it was addressed, and purpose and themes (Osborne, 2006).

### AUTHORSHIP, DATE, AND AUDIENCE

The Fourth Gospel lacks a direct claim to authorship. Although the authorship of the Fourth Gospel has been debated, early tradition attributes the authorship of the Fourth Gospel to John, son of Zebedee



(Blomberg, 2007; Keener, 2014). For the purposes of the current analysis of John 17, the authorship is attributed to John. Keener (2014) argued that while the authorship of the Gospel of John is a meaningful discussion, the more critical discussion centers on the eyewitness account confirming the historical accuracy of the Fourth Gospel. In John 19:35, the “beloved disciple” provided evidence that the Fourth Gospel comes from an eyewitness. According to Keener (2014), only John son of Zebedee could fill the role of the “beloved disciple” following Jesus closely. This claim to eyewitness authorship is especially vital in the analysis of John 17. DeSilva (2004) argued in comparison with the Synoptic Gospels, the Fourth Gospel might provide a better historical study of Jesus due to the “correct remembrance of the story of Jesus” (p. 416). Early tradition dates the Fourth Gospel to the mid-90s of the first century (Witherington, 1995; Keener, 2014). Keener (2014) argued the Gospel’s audience was the Johannine community, most likely in Ephesus or Smyrna in Roman Asia, and others like Witherington (1995) argued the Fourth Gospel was written for nonbelievers. Since the Fourth Gospel does not specify a particular audience and there is little consensus among scholars, for the purposes of this historical-grammatical analysis of John 17, the date and the audience of the Fourth Gospel was not discussed in further detail.

## PURPOSE AND THEMES

John’s primary purpose in writing the Fourth Gospel is to demonstrate that Jesus is the Son of God (Carson, 1991). John portrays Jesus as God’s sent one, his agent (Witherington, 1995). Some of the major themes in the Fourth Gospel address the law and word (Keener, 2014). John emphasized in John 1:1–18 that Jesus is the Word, which is in direct opposition to the Pharisees’ claim that God’s law favors their position (Keener, 2014). Furthermore, John emphasized that the believers possessed the Spirit, which is in direct opposition to the Pharisees’ claim to know the law through their own interpretation (Keener, 2014).

Jesus’s prayer in John 17 resembles the themes found in Jesus’s talk with the disciples in John 13–16 (Harley, 2014; Keener, 2014). According to Tenney (1984) “the vocabulary, which contains such Johannine terms as ‘glory,’ ‘glorify,’ ‘sent,’ ‘believe,’ ‘world,’ ‘love,’ connects its content with the same topics in preceding sections of the Gospel” (p. 398). Similarly, Witherington (1995) highlighted the themes of Jesus’s departure, the truth, and Christ’s indwelling in the believers.

While Jesus prayed often and was in constant communication with the Father, the Gospels do not record very many words. However, John 17 records a lengthy prayer that serves as a final communication to the disciples. The prayer revealed a communion between Jesus and the Father and the union of disciples with Jesus and the Father (Nygaard, 2012). Jesus prayed to the Father that the Father would bring to fulfillment all the work Jesus did.

### LINGUISTIC STUDY: GRAMMAR, SEMANTICS, AND SYNTAX

This part of the historical-grammatical exegetical analysis of John 17 followed Osborne's (2006) method for lexical study. The goal was to examine grammar, semantics, and syntax as interdependent and necessary in determining the author's original meaning. The focus was on determining the meaning of the original context of the chosen pericope prior to uniting the hearer with the message of the text (Osborne, 2006). Here, the emphasis was "on the meaning of the text to show how it can be understood within the context of the overall Johannine narrative" (Hera, 2012). Specific terms in the pericope serve as keywords in the context and should be identified as needing additional study (Osborne, 2006). Osborne (2006) suggested a methodology for lexical study: "determines the semantic range," "allows the context to determine the meaning that best fits the other intended message of the whole," and "studies the theology behind the word" (p. 108). The first step in the lexical study is isolating keywords in the context by identifying those that are: theologically loaded, crucial to the meaning, repeated in the context or became themes, critical to the context (Osborne, 2006). This analysis of John 17 followed Osborne's (2006) methodology and suggestions for the lexical study. Identification and analysis of key repeated words and phrases developed specific themes in John 17.

## ANALYSIS OF JOHN 17

### *John 17:1-5*

John referred and summarized the four previous chapters, 13, 14, 15, and 16, by the phrase "after Jesus said this" (John 17:1). Jesus here "looked toward heaven" (John 17:1). According to Keener (2014), looking toward heaven was a common posture during prayer. In John

11:41 Jesus assumed the same position in prayer for Lazarus. Jesus refers to the “Father” or *pater*, meaning “generator or male ancestor,” six times in John 17. Jesus’s words “the hour has come” stand out as a reminder that Jesus’s earthly ministry was coming to an end. John referred to Jesus’s “time has not yet come” in John 2:4, 7:6, 7:8, 7:30, and 8:20. The Greek word for “time” is translated as “hour” (John 17:2). This term identified a specific time of Jesus’s death, and then Jesus’s exaltation (Carson, 1991).

Dyck et al. (2002) argued that timing the various components of succession and, indeed, the actual passing of the torch were critical in determining the outcome of a successful succession. The pericope indicated a distinct sensitivity to time, as Jesus began the prayer in John 17:1 with a proclamation that the “hour has come.” Before this start of the high priestly prayer, Jesus has engaged his disciples in John 13–16 that reviewed and highlighted what had already occurred, what was happening, and what was to come. In addition, he reviewed what the disciples knew and how they had been prepared for his departure. Hence, the time had come for him to leave and allow his successor, the Holy Spirit, to begin leading.

*Principle One: As a complex process, the various components of succession must be executed and communicated clearly at the appropriate time to ensure the readiness of both the successor and followers.*

In John 17:2 Jesus’s word “glorify” might be best explained by Balz’ (1990) definition of glorification: “Jesus’s entry into the divine glory ‘with the Father’ is distinguished from this glorification as the revealer of salvation; it is the restoration of the preexistence glory through the generous love of the Father; to see it and to participate in it is the destiny promised to the disciple” (p. 149). In Greek *doxazo*, the word “glory” or “glorify” means “show honor” or “reveal the wonderful character of something or someone” (Strong, 1890). In John 17 glory appears as a significant theme as displaying/acknowledging perfected character (John 17:5, 17:22); open approval of God (John 17:1); lifted to a position of authority (John 17:1, 17:22, 17:24); honoring another by words, actions, and thoughts (John 17:1, 17:4, 17:10); and heaven (implied), a place, Jesus’s dwelling (John 17:24).

Since in the Old Testament “flesh” was often used in the sense of humanity, in John 17:2 “flesh” (NASB) refers to the “people” (NIV) and “mankind” (NASB). Jesus has authority over all people. Furthermore, Jesus has authority to give eternal life (John 17:2). In John 17:3

John equated eternal life with knowing God. Similarly, in Ezekiel 37:14, knowing God is identified with eternal life. The focus in John 17:3 is on having a personal relationship with Jesus (Keener, 2014). In John 17:3 Jesus refers to himself as “the ‘sent one,’ a concept stemming from the Jewish idea of the *shaliach*, the ‘representative’ who reveals and embodies the will of the sender” and acts as a counselor or an advocate (Osborne, 2006, p. 437). The Hebrew word *shaliach* refers to an ambassador, a person’s representative with the same authority as the person who sent the ambassador (Hack Polaski, 1999). The authority of the sender is given to the one who is sent (Hack Polaski, 1999).

In John 17:4, Jesus says he completed the work assigned to him by the Father. The word *teleioó* is translated as “having accomplished” (Strong, 1890). Hera (2012) argued the “complexive aorist,” “an aorist that views the action as a whole,” summed up Jesus’s ministry (p. 202). Jesus here used the singular “work” instead of “works” to refer to the work He came to accomplish, death on the cross (Beasley-Murray, 1999). From the context, the work of the cross was still before Jesus, yet Jesus anticipated the completion of that mission. Jesus had a plan to accomplish his Father’s will.

In John 17:4–5, Jesus’s claim to the Father’s glory is a claim to being divine (Keener, 2014). According to Keener (2014) “Judaism did have an analogy with which to compare Jesus’s divine claim here: God’s Wisdom reflects his glory (Wisdom of Solomon 7:25-29)” (p. 297). Jesus had the same glory he is asking for now (John 17:5) when he was in God’s presence where Jesus shared nature and intimate familiarity in a relationship with God. Keener (2014) connects glory in John 17 to Moses, reflecting God’s glory in Exodus 33–34. When God revealed his glory to Moses in Exodus 33:19 he also revealed his character full of grace, truth, and love (Keener, 2014). In the Fourth Gospel, Jesus revealed his glory through signs and the sacrifice on the cross (Keener, 2014). According to Keener (2014) early Christians would have connected the suffering servant in Isaiah 53 to Jesus. In John 12:23 and again here in John 17:2 John connected the crucifixion to Jesus’s glory (Keener, 2014). Carson (1991) argued as Jesus does not seek “the praise of men but the glory that comes from the only God, so Jesus seeks by His own glorification nothing less than the glory of His Father” (p. 554). Jesus had glory before the world began, and He gained additional glory when He returned to heaven. In John 17:1–5, Jesus reviewed his mission and the work He has done.

Throughout the text, Jesus communicated the variety of ways that he has met his leadership mission in the completion of his works. More specifically, in John 17:2–5, the text supports that he was sent to glorify God, to represent to and bring knowledge of God to the people, and to equip the disciples to spread the Gospel. An important note related to this reiteration is that it is not done from a place of ego or self-glorification, but rather to glorify God and remind the disciples that the centrality of Jesus’s mission and, subsequently, their mission is to tell others of God and bring glory to the Father.

*Principle Two: The successful execution of succession requires that current leadership affirm the mission and vision of the organization and to guide followers to remain focused on the organizational mission and vision.*

### JOHN 17:6–19

In John 17:6–19, Jesus prayed for his disciples. In verses 6 and 9, Jesus said those God gave Him came out of the world. While the word for “world” (*kósmos*) refers to a “physical place,” “earth” and “universe” (John 17:5, 17:11, 17:13, 17:15, 17:18, 17:24); here (John 17:6, 17:9, 17:14, 17:16, 17:18, 17:21, 17:23) John assigned the word to mean “people” who don’t know or obey God (Strong, 1890). Jesus used endearing terms to refer to his followers: “those you gave me” in John 17:6 and “those who are mine” in John 17:10 (Kostenberger, 2004). Jesus claimed that God’s word was accepted by the disciples (John 17:8).

In John 17:11, “name” (*onoma*) is defined as “name” and “character” (Strong, 1890). “Your name” in John 17:11 relates to Moses’ announcement of God’s name in Exodus 3:15 (Keener, 2014). God’s name revealed character, attributes, honor, and reputation (Strong, 1890; Keener, 2014). Therefore, “to manifest the name of God is to reveal the essential nature of God to men” (Morris, 1995, p. 723). Glory came to Jesus through his disciples’ future ministry after his departure.

In John 17:17–19, *hagiazó* is translated as “sanctify,” but it could also be translated as “set apart for sacred use” or “make holy” (Strong, 1890). Witherington (1995) postulated the word should be translated as “set apart” since the disciples are to be set apart in the truth. In John 17:17, *alétheia* is translated as “truth” (Strong, 1890). In John 17:18, Jesus referred to the disciples as the “sent” ones. In John 17:11–19, Jesus varied the exact wording, but repeatedly said He shares what God gave Him with those who belong to Him. Jesus gave the disciples: God’s revelation

(17:6); His words (John 17:8, John 17:14); His joy (John 17:13), His separation from the world (John 17:16), His commission (John 17:18), His sanctification (John 17:17–19); and His glory (John 17:22, 17:24). Jesus prayed for those His Father had given him. Here, Jesus asked that the disciples would be kept in Father’s name (Kostenberger, 2004) as he petitioned for their protection by asking for unity (John 17:11), joy (John 17:13), and consecration (John 17:17). Jesus values those who belong to Him.

In the text, Jesus gave significant attention to the knowledge and skills the disciples had acquired in order to fulfill the mission and vision. More specifically, in John 17:8, Jesus claimed that the disciples had heard God’s Word and accepted it as truth. From this knowledge, the disciples would fulfill the mission and vision by bringing glory to God through knowing his name and character and spreading this knowledge to others. Jesus reiterated that the disciples possessed both the knowledge and skills needed to navigate and succeed in their roles and tasks following Jesus’s departure.

*Principle Three: Leaders must communicate what knowledge and skills followers possess to navigate their roles and tasks under new leadership.*

### JOHN 17:20–26

Jesus prayed for all believers and future disciples in John 17:20–26. According to Osborne (2006), in John 17:20–23, Jesus gave a Biblical command regarding unity. The mandate was given in the plural to a believing community and was intended to be lived out in a community (Osborne, 2006). In John 21:21, Jesus said, “that they also may be in us.” The unity is modeled by the relationship between the Father and the Son. Keener (2014) argued that Israel emphasized the importance that the God they serve is “one” (Deuteronomy 6:4). While John 17:20–26 supported that God is “one,” the focus was on God’s personal indwelling among those who believe and love Jesus (John 14:23–24). According to Osborne (2006), love and unity are central to the relationship between Christ and God and serve as a model to the family of God. Jesus’s prayer identified three types of unity: Jesus’s unity with His Father (John 17:1–7, 17:21); the believer’s unity with Jesus and the Father (John 17:10, 17:21, 17:23); and the believer’s unity with other believers (17:11, 17:21–23). The relationship between the Father and the Son serves as a model for unity of all believers. Keener (2014) argued “followers of Jesus constitute

a small minority in a hostile world and need each other to survive as much as other minorities normally do” (Keener, 2014, p. 298). The Father gives glory to Jesus and Jesus gives his glory to the believers (Hera, 2012). According to Hera (2012), both *‘ivα* clauses in John 17:21 and John 17:23 are interrelated. The disciples’ unity demonstrates to the world that God sent Jesus as His Son and that the disciples are loved by God (Hera, 2012). In John 17:25, Jesus refers to the Father with an adjective “righteous” in order to contrast the world with those who know the Father through Him (Hera, 2012).

In John 17:20–26, Jesus prays not only for the disciples but for all believers. In essence, Jesus calls for unity between Jesus and the Father, the disciples, Jesus, and the Father, and, finally, between all believers. Unity may be viewed as centered around the mission and vision of the organization. As mentioned previously, the central mission and vision highlighted in this text is spreading the Gospel. Jesus’s prayer emphasized the centrality not of him as the disciples’ leader, but rather the centrality of the Gospel mission. The knowledge of God and his glorification remained the unifying mission and vision of the disciples following Jesus’s departure.

*Principle Four: Leadership during succession communicates the need for current and future unity within the organization centered around the mission and vision.*

## SUMMARY

The historical-grammatical exegesis of John 17 revealed four distinct principles of succession communication. More specifically, to ensure satisfactory succession from one leader to another, the leader must communicate at the appropriate times, emphasize the mission and vision of the organization, reiterate what followers know, and the skills they possess and establish and encourage both present and future unity. To review, succession planning is critical for leadership development and the long-term success of an organization (Ishak & Kamil, 2016; Yukl, 2013). Yukl (2013) argued that consideration of succession planning using a systems perspective of leadership development would lead to success. More specifically, succession planning must be viewed as a complex phenomenon occurring within complex systems. McCall (1992) argued that best practices in organizations include utilizing a specialized position

or a committee to coordinate leadership development. Often, the specialized position equates to the individual holding the current leadership position. In addition, satisfactory succession planning involves developing talent pools, both internal and sometimes external (Hollinger, 2013) and the consideration of present situation, future situation, performance, future performance, development plans, competency models, succession planning program, and statement of values for governance (Rothwell, 2005).

Succession planning criteria highlight formal guidelines and considering capability and experience (Rothwell, 2005). While research highlights the benefits of succession leadership, most organizations have minimal integration of leadership development with succession planning (Tao & Zhao, 2019; Yukl, 2013). Organizations without a succession plan might experience obstacles such as: lack of support, politics, and quick-fix mentality (Rothwell, 2005). Brady and Helmich (1984) postulated executive succession is rooted in Max Weber's study of bureaucracies. For Brady and Helmich (1984), Weber's research on succession required adaptation on behalf of the followers.

The current analysis of John 17 explored how Jesus's teachings were understood in first-century Palestine and what Jesus meant in his final prayer. Jesus's sayings in John 17 were recorded to apply not only to the ancient hearers but also to the generations to come (Keener, 2014). Here, "Jesus ensured the continuation of his mission by preparing his new messianic community for its mission" (Kostenberger, 2004, p. 9). John portrays Jesus as a "sage who has left his legacy with his disciples" (Witherington, 1995, p. 268). Jesus's instructions to his followers were a part of the succession process. John 17 served as an "address, admonition, consolation, revelation, and prayer" for the disciples (Hera, 2012, p. 12). Jesus began "the process of succession planning for the Christian church by selecting and developing the apostles, who later selected and developed others" (Hollinger, 2013, p. 158). In the Fourth Gospel, first Jesus is the sent one, then Jesus claims Holy Spirit is the sent one, and then finally the disciples and believers are referred to as the sent ones. The authority is passed on from Jesus to the disciples and believers. Hollinger (2013) argued that although the early church significantly differs from the modern organizations, the modern leaders "can learn important lessons from the approach to succession" as presented in the Scripture (p. 158).

One way the material in this historical-grammatical study can be used is for discussion regarding succession development and the role of the



exiting leader in the communication with the followers. Jesus's leadership development of the disciples informs today's succession planning programs, and Jesus's prayer in John 17 informs succession farewell speeches. Farewell speeches in Greco-Roman culture and Paul's and Jesus's speeches prepared later generations for what was to come (Kurtz, 1985). Often, biblical farewell speeches addressed transitions in authority and necessary changes in practices due to the changes in circumstances (Kurtz, 1985). After Jesus fulfilled his assignment, He addressed and encouraged those who are staying behind to be united. Analysis of John 17 resulted in the identification of certain themes: unity, glory, and specific gifts Jesus gave to the disciples. John emphasized throughout the Fourth Gospel, the time for transition is not right until, in John 17, Jesus said it was time.

Leadership succession should occur at a specially designated time. The timing of the transition of authority from Jesus to disciples was specific. Jesus envisioned unity for the believers and repeatedly said he shares what he had with the believers. Departing leaders might pattern their farewell address on Jesus's prayer in John 17, reminding the followers of the right timing for the succession, all they have learned from the leader, the mission and vision for the organization, and the need for unity. In John 17, the disciples heard Jesus's comforting words of being one with God. Jesus purposely allowed disciples to hear His prayer. By utilizing the historical-grammatical exegetical process, the analysis of John 17 offered an alternative vision of succession planning and specifically communication of the exiting leader regarding the changes in the circumstances.

Some limitations of this research include its limited scope. As mentioned previously, succession planning is a complex phenomenon taking place in complex organizations. The analysis provided here focuses on a small slice of the full complexity of Jesus's life, leadership, and departure. Besides, there exist a number of ways in which research related to both this text and topic could be approached. This analysis provided just one.

Further research might examine the possible application of John 17 to the leadership succession efforts in various settings. In addition, it may be beneficial to the understanding of succession planning from this perspective to review and analyze additional section chapters within the

last discourse found in John 14–17. Doing so may provide additional insight into the character and specific influence of John 17 in the overall succession communication strategy of Jesus in the Gospel.

## DISCUSSION QUESTIONS

1. Why are timing and communication important to consider during succession planning?
2. How can organizations assure a successful process of transferring knowledge exists?
3. How can exiting leaders use the vision and mission of the organization to create opportunities for unity?
4. What does a culture conducive for knowledge sharing and succession planning look like?

## REFERENCES

- Balz, H. (1990). *Exegetical dictionary of the New Testament*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.
- Beasley-Murray, G. R. (1999). *Word Biblical commentary*. Downers Grove, IL: Thomas Nelson.
- Blomberg, C. L. (2007). *Historical reliability of the Gospels*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity.
- Brady, G. F., & Helmich, D. L. (1984). *Executive succession: Toward excellence in corporate leadership*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Brown, R. E. (1970). *The Gospel according to John*. New York, NY: Doubleday.
- Carson, D. A. (1991). *The Gospel according to John*. Leicester, England: Eerdmans.
- Daley, A. E. Jr. (2020). *Succession planning in organizations: Understanding organizational survival patterns in nonprofit organizations*. ProQuest Dissertation Publishing: Regent University, 27955854.
- deSilva, D. A. (2004). *An introduction to the New Testament contexts, methods & ministry formation*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity.
- Dyck, B., Mauws, M., Starke, F. A., & Mischke, G. A. (2002). Passing the baton: The importance of sequence, timing, technique and communication in executive succession. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 17(2), 143–162. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0883-9026\(00\)00056-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0883-9026(00)00056-2).
- Hack Polaski, S. (1999). *Paul and the discourse of power*. Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press.

- Harley, P. E. (2014). Between text and sermon: John 17. *A Journal of Bible and Theology*, 68(1), 72–74.
- Hera, M. P. (2012). *Christology and discipleship in John 17*. Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck.
- Hollinger, T. D. (2013). Leadership development and succession planning: A Biblical perspective for an ethical response. *Journal of Biblical Perspectives in Leadership*, 5(1), 157–164.
- Holmas, G. O. (2011). *Prayer and vindication in Luke-Acts: The theme of prayer within the context of legitimating and edifying objective of the Lukan narrative*. New York, NY: T & T.
- Ishak, A. K., & Kamil, B. A. M. (2016). Succession planning at Heis: Leadership style, career development, and knowledge management practices as its predictors. *International Review of Management and Marketing*, 6(7S), 214–220.
- Keener, C. S. (2014). *The IVP Bible background commentary: New Testament*. Downers Grove, IL: Intervarsity Press.
- Kostenberger, A. J. (2004). *John: Baker exegetical commentary of the New Testament*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic.
- Kurtz, W. S. (1985). Luke 22:14–38 and Greco-Roman and Biblical farewell address. *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 104(2), 251–268.
- McCall, M. W., Jr. (1992). Executive development as a business strategy. *The Journal of Business Strategy*, 3(1), 25–31.
- Morris, L. (1995). *The Gospel according to John: New international commentary on the New Testament*. Downers Grove, IL: Eerdmans.
- Nygaard, M. (2012). *Biblical interpretation ser: Prayer in the Gospels: A theological exegesis of the ideal prayer-er*. Leiden, NL: Brill.
- Osborne, G. R. (2006). *The hermeneutical spiral*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity.
- Pugh, B. (2016). Succession plans: Is there a Biblical template? *Journal of the European Pentecostal Theological Association*, 36(2), 117–130.
- Rothwell, W. J. (2005). *Effective succession planning: Ensuring leadership continuity and building talent from within*. New York, NY: Amacom.
- Strong, J. (1890). *A concise dictionary of the words in the Greek New Testament*. Nashville, TN: Abingdon.
- Tao, R., & Zhao, H. (2019). Passing the baton: The effects of CEO succession planning on firm performance and volatility. *Corporate Governance: An International Review*, 27(1), 61–78.
- Tenney, M. C. (1984). *The expositor's Bible commentary: Hebrews through Revelation* (Vol. 9), edited by F. E. Gaebelein. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.
- Tuppurainen, R. P. (2016). Jesus, the spirit, and the church: Succession in the fourth Gospel. *Journal of the European Pentecostal Theological Association*, 36(1), 42–56.

- Uytanlet, S. (2014). *Luke-Acts and Jewish historiography: A study on the theology, literature, and ideology of Luke-Acts*. Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck.
- Witherington, B., III. (1995). *John's wisdom*. Louisville, KY.
- Wittgenstein, L. (1953). *Philosophical investigations*. New York: Macmillan.
- Yukl, G. (2013). *Leadership in organizations* (8th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.



## Jesus as a Restoring Leader

*W. David Winner*

Managing conflict is an important part of a leader's ability. Bennis (1997) declared, "Conflict is inevitable, and it can be destructive or useful, depending on how the leader handles it" (p. 208). Northouse (2016) added to the discussion by stating, "The question is not 'How can people avoid conflict and eliminate change?' but rather 'How can people manage conflict and produce positive change?'" (p. 268). Conflict management is part of leadership. The conflict may be between two people or groups or it may be internal conflict based on failed expectations. Either way, leaders need to know how to manage conflict.

This chapter used Robbins' (1996) inner textual analysis to determine Jesus leadership style in John 21:1–15 in dealing with conflict and restoring the relationships with his disciples after each of them deserted Jesus at the arrest (John 18:15) and Peter denied Jesus three times (John 18:27). The inner textual analysis focuses on the words as tools of communication. This is a stage of analysis prior to the analysis of "meanings," that is, prior to the "real interpretation" of the text. Sometimes

---

W. David Winner (✉)  
Regent University, Virginia Beach, VA, USA  
e-mail: [willwin@regent.edu](mailto:willwin@regent.edu)

it helps the interpreter to “remove all meanings” from the words and simply look at and listen to “the words themselves” (p. 7) to perform the analysis. Like a jeweler turning a diamond to see the different reflections and angles, inner textual analysis allows a researcher to discover the angles and reflections in the text. Based on the inner textual analysis of John 21:1–25, this chapter identifies four leadership actions that Jesus used in restoring Peter and the disciples to the ministry which are (a) remembering the past, (b) acknowledging the hurt, (c) leading with love, and (d) refocusing on the mission. These four actions align well with radical candor (Scott, 2017) and flexible and adaptive leadership (Yukl & Mahsud, 2010).

### BACKGROUND OF JOHN 21:1–25

The NRSV biblical text divides John 21:1–25 into the three narrative units 1–14, 15–19, 20–25. Words of action mark the beginning of the units indicating a new narrative starting point as shown below. Robbins (1996) described narrational texture as a focus on the voices in the text whether spoken or unspoken. A careful study of these voices may reveal a pattern that helps to move the text forward or end the section. Like a play, each narration section of the text tends to have an opening, middle, and closing aspect to it. This pattern helps the reader to follow the thought process of the writer. “Opening-middle-closing texture resides in the nature of the beginning, body, and conclusion of a section of discourse. Repetition, progression, and narration regularly work together to create the opening, middle and closing unit of text” (Robbins, 1996, p. 19). The opening-middle-closing pattern of John 21:1–25 can be dissected into three units:

- Scene One John 21:1–14: Jesus and the seven disciples.
- Scene Two John 21:15–19: Jesus and Peter.
- Scene Three John 21:20–25: Jesus, Peter, and the unnamed disciple.

The result of the narrational texture pattern shows a strong interplay between the narrator, Jesus, and Peter. The unnamed disciple reveals his identity at the end by *testifying* to be the narrator, John.

This is supported by a repetitive texture analysis (Robbins, 1996). Bekker (2004) succinctly stated, “Repetitive texture resides in the occurrence of words and phrases more than once in the unit” (p. 18). There is value in identifying the words that are repeated more than once in each verse. It is important to notice the pattern of the words by their occurrence and place in the text. The repetitive texture of John 21:1–25 identifies the key people in the text by showing the repetition of their names include these four groupings, Jesus/Lord, disciples, Simon Peter/Simon son of John, and the disciple. Other key phrases identified include fish, bread, love, feed/tend, sheep/lambs, and death/die.

Other key phrases identified with a repetitive analysis in the pericope are phrases that connect past events with current actions between Jesus and the disciples. Jesus used fish and bread reminds the disciples of the feeding of the five thousand. Jesus used the words love, feed/tend and sheep/lambs three times in his dialogue with Peter refers to the three-time denial of Jesus that Peter committed at his trial. Jesus then mentioned death/die in reference to Peter and the unnamed disciple foreshadowing future actions. The following three sections explore these themes in more detail.

### JOHN 21:1–14

The first unit is a discourse between Jesus and the seven disciples. Jesus used the disciples fishing as an opportunity to reveal who he is by repeating an earlier miracle (Luke 5:4–7) when Jesus helped the disciples have a miraculous catch of fish. Jesus repeats the miracle and then invited the disciples to a breakfast of bread and fish. Both actions would have reminded the disciples of the feeding of the five thousand (John 6:9).

Using Robbins’ (1996) progression texture analysis revealed the progression of the conversation in John 21:1–14 between Jesus and the disciples with Simon Peter taking a lead role within the context of a meal with fish and bread. The narrative goes back and forth between Jesus with the disciples and Jesus with Simon Peter. The real focus of the section is on Jesus and Peter. Peter is separating himself from what is happening with the disciples and Jesus. Jesus speaks to all the disciples, yet Peter responds individually, almost as if the other disciples are not there. The section ends with the eating of bread and fish, again a reminder of the feeding of the five thousand (Burge, 2000) which demonstrated Jesus’ miraculous power over physical reality.

Sensory-aesthetic texture focused on the five senses identified in the text. Robbins (1996) summarized “the range of senses the text evokes or embodies (thought, emotion, sight, sound, touch, smell) and the manner in which the text evokes or embodies them (reason, intuition, imagination, humor, etc.)” (p. 30). Robbins identified three body zones, emotion-fused thought, self-expression speech, and purposeful action to help organize the sensory-aesthetic patterns.

The self-expression speech in John 21:1–14 includes mostly questions and statements by Jesus. Jesus is guiding the conversation and the whole experience. He initiated the conversation with the disciples in the boat, he invites them to breakfast, he offers them a communion meal, he questions Peter and corrects Peter, he predicts Peter’s death and keeps Peter focused on the task of following him. Jesus is the lead character displaying command of the situation with an agenda to teach with the disciples.

### JOHN 21:15–19

The second unit of discourse turns to a discussion between Jesus and Peter. Jesus repeats the same question three times reminding Peter of his thrice denial of Jesus (Matt. 26:34). The repeating of the question hurts Peter but is an important part of Peter’s restoration to ministry. Jesus restores Peter and gives a brief prediction about his death. The unit closes with Jesus again calling Peter to follow him, just as he did the first time they met (Matt. 4:18–19).

The progression of John 21:15–19 centers on Jesus and Peter with the dialogue going back and forth with the word *love*. The progression ends with an emphasis on belt and death, predicting Peter’s death. The progression helps to show the intensity of interaction between Jesus and Peter with the repeat of the word *love* three times.

There is an argumentative nature to this interchange between Jesus and Peter. Robbins (1996) noted how ancient writers often used arguments to communicate points, “Yet, ancient rhetoricians observed that stories, as well as speeches, used argumentative devices to persuade the reader to think and act in one way rather than another” (p. 21). The role of the argumentative sections is to give reasons for what comes next, often guiding the reader to logically expect them. The second (John 21:15–19) and third (John 21:20–25) units of John 21:1–25 show a more obvious argumentative pattern. The purpose of the argument nature in this unit



is to prepare the reader to anticipate the reconciliation of the tension that has been building since Peter first jumps out of the boat to swim to Jesus (v. 7).

### JOHN 21:20–25

The third unit focuses on Peter's inquiry about the unnamed disciple and the fate of this unnamed disciple. The progression texture analysis in the last narrative unit shows an expansion from Jesus and Peter to now include an unnamed disciple who is following along after them on the walk. Peter invites the disciple to join the discussion. However, Jesus changes the word pattern focus from *love* to a focus on mission with the keywords *follow me* and *die*. Jesus does not disclose any information, instead draws the focus back on Peter's and the mission Jesus has for Peter. The unit closes with the disciple identifying himself as John and proclaiming that more could be written about Jesus.

In conclusion, John, the narrator presents the narrative as a conversation with Jesus with the seven disciples, Jesus with Peter, and Jesus with the unnamed disciple (we know by content to be John). Why does the narrator focus so much on Peter and Jesus? It seems the narrator is summarizing the gospel and wanted to bring some closure to Peter and Jesus, while at the same time clarifying what Jesus said about him, the unnamed disciple. Jesus did not say John would live forever, just that it is of no concern to Peter.

John is building a story of remembering, remembering Jesus' miracle with the fish and bread, remembering Peter's three denials of Jesus, remembering the rumors about the unnamed disciple. The remembering stories come through in the form of questions allowing the reader to ponder and answer the question. The narrator is using John 21:1–25 as closing arguments convincing the reader of the trustworthiness of the whole book, by referencing back to earlier events that parallel the events taking place in these verses.

### REMEMBERING THE PAST

Some might think it is best to overlook the conflict or avoid it. Lencioni (2012) addressed this directly, "Avoiding conflict creates problems even beyond boring meetings and poorly vetted decisions" but the anxiety and tension can "transfer it in far greater quantities to larger groups of people

throughout the organization they're supposed to be serving" (p. 40). This is consistent with the work of Sande and Johnson (2015) who wrote, "Encouragement to speak up to others about their sins appears frequently in Scripture. Jesus says, for example, 'if your brother sins against you, go and show him his fault' (Matthew 18:15)" (p. 73). Conflicts should be worked through so they can be resolved and not avoided. Avoiding only creates more problems down the road.

When dealing with a conflict it is important to start with remembering the past because trust has been broken. Lewicki and Tomlinson (2014) proposed, "Trust is often the first casualty in conflict. If trust makes conflict resolution easier and more effective, eruption of conflict usually injures trust and builds distrust" (p. 126). If team members or leaders and followers do not trust each other, how can the work of the organization be accomplished? If can't and the organization will suffer if trust is not restored.

Burge (2000) identified in John 21 two subjects within the passage, the apostolic mission of the church and restoration of Peter. The apostolic mission refers to the first calling of Peter to follow Jesus to be "fishers of humans" when he first met him and the disciples in John 1:35–43. In John 21, the apostolic mission of the church is "symbolized not only by the great catch of fish but by Peter's private conversation with Jesus" (p. 581). The second subject identified by Burge in this text is "Peter's restoration. Jesus sees in this fallen disciple genuine interest in him but predicts Peter will follow Jesus even in a death that will glorify God (21:19)" (p. 582). So, the restoration of Peter and the other disciples involves remembering the past as Burge writes, "Jesus must get their attention by evoking an old memory" (p. 596). Jesus knew he had to deal with Peter's and the other disciple's actions while offering forgiveness to Peter and to allow Peter to forgive himself. Burge imagines, "The last time Peter stood over a charcoal fire, he denied Jesus (18:18). Now Jesus makes him stand over another charcoal fire (21:9) and with it, review old memories and remove them" (p. 596). Yukl and Mahsud (2010) listed the first guideline for flexible and adaptive leaders when facing a crisis is to "Learn to recognize early warning signs of an impending crisis that can affect your organization; avoid the common tendency to ignore or discount these warning signs" (p. 86).

*Principle One: In restoring relationships the leader needs to initiate the conversation by focusing on the common past before the conflict to start the process of reestablishing trust with the other person but most not be afraid to address the conflict.*

## ACKNOWLEDGING THE HURT

The three narrative units of John 21 show how Peter was withdrawing from his friends and Jesus. He had returned to his prior occupation of fishing. His friends, the disciples, joined him in the fishing boat. Jesus takes the initiative to seek out Peter and the disciples and guides the restoration through conversation. But seeking him out and remembering the past is not enough. Leaders need to acknowledge the hurt caused by the conflict. Lewicki and Tomlinson (2014) offered this advice in rebuilding trust, “If possible, each person responsible for a trust violation or act of distrust should apologize and give a full account of the reasons for the trust violation” (p. 128).

Jesus is asking Peter to acknowledge the hurt caused by his actions when he asks, “Do you love me?” three times in John 15–19. Jesus is not condemning Peter nor is he overlooking the denials, he is acknowledging the event while showing love. Jesus is still in control of the conversation with Peter, confronting Peter, and acknowledging Peter’s failure. Shepherd (2010) proposed that through interplay with the Greek words, Jesus is calling Peter to realize a deeper, self-sacrificial type of love:

Thus, while Jesus’ three questions may well signal his intention to rehabilitate Peter following the latter’s three denials, Peter’s own continuing failure to grasp the kind of love that Jesus demands results in Jesus’ final and most pointed attempt, “Feed my sheep” (*βόσκει τὰ πρόβατά μου*), to evoke in Peter a consciousness of the self-sacrificial love (imagined in Ch. 10, eucharistically illustrated in Ch. 13, and exemplified in the crucifixion) to which Peter is being called (p. 791).

Shepherd’s summary of the conversation between Jesus and Peter is also a reminder of how John describes Jesus coming in *grace* and *truth* (John 1). John 21 gives a clear example of Jesus using *grace* and *truth* with Peter on the beach. Jesus is engaging Peter and presenting a model of interaction with others based on acknowledging the hurt of past actions (truth) while offering forgiveness (grace) for those actions. John 21 reminds every reader that forgiveness is available even to deniers of Jesus. As Burge (2000) stated, “The work of the church can only go forward when we are unburdened of our destructive memories through the gracious forgiveness of God” (p. 596).

Scott (2017) developed a framework to balance two concepts of caring personally (grace) and challenge directly (trust). In creating her four-box concept, she names the concept of in the upper right box, Radical

Candor. She writes, “‘Radical Candor’ is what happens when you put ‘Care Personally’ and ‘Challenge Directly’ together” (p. 9). It is the balance of grace and truth that Jesus demonstrated in John 21. Jesus cares personally for each disciple and especially Peter and John. Then Jesus challenges directly Peter, acknowledging his betrayal but restoring him through love. Scott stated, “Radical Candor works only if the other person understands that your efforts at caring personally and challenging directly are delivered in good faith” (p. 16). Jesus having built and trust and relationship with the disciples over three years could then be honest in his restoration of the disciples while also loving them deeply.

*Principle Two: Leaders lead with grace and truth when confronting a broken relationship. Truth acknowledges the hurt caused and grace assumes the best in the other person.*

### LEADING WITH LOVE

Leading with love implies a level of forgiveness by the one offended. If the one offended has not worked through their own emotions and hurt of the conflict it will be hard for reconciliation to take place. Sande and Johnson (2015) state, “Forgiveness is how you move from merely solving a problem to repairing a relationship. It’s the means of finding lasting solutions and enduring peace” (p. 87). Jesus’ actions in John 21 shows he has forgiven Peter and the disciples because He seeks them out. This event is the third post-resurrection sighting in the book of John (Burge, 2000). Jesus then draws Peter aside and begins asking him three times if Peter loves Jesus. Beasley-Murray (1987) emphasize the key point:

The one issue Jesus must clarify with Peter is his relationship to him after the debacle in the High Priest’ court; the sole element of that relationship concerns Jesus’ love, for without it all else is vain (cf. 1 Cor. 13:1–3) (p. 405).

Lee (2017) added an interesting element to his exchange by proposing there is a tonal difference in the Greek words for love that Jesus uses verse Peter’s word:

In the conversation in John 21, Simon Peter is being formal and polite. He draws back from using Jesus’s plain word, which might imply a certain familiarity. This does not mean that he loves any less, only that he feels unable to express it so directly (p. 29).

According to Lee, Jesus uses a less formal, more familiar word for love, expressing a deeper relationship, while Peter kept a more formal attitude. As Lee concludes, “More likely the compiler of this Gospel, John, introduced the subtle detail of Peter’s choice of word to portray Peter’s respectful attitude to Jesus” (p. 30). Either way, Jesus is pursuing Peter in love and wants to reestablish Peter’s love for him. When we see to restore a relationship or resolve a conflict, do we lead with love? Do we lead with a love that does not overlook the offense, but offers forgiveness for the offense?

*Principle Three: Leaders must forgive the offense in their heart first before they can seek to restore the broken relationship in a loving way. But once the relationship is restored, leaders do not keep bringing it up but allow the relationship to start fresh from that point. It takes time to rebuild the trust, but the subject is not held over another person’s head.*

## REFOCUSING ON THE MISSION

After Jesus has restored Peter, he reminds him of the bigger mission. Northouse (2016) stated the adaptive leader need to provide direction, “by providing direction, the leader helps people feel a sense of clarity, order, certainty, reducing the stress people feel in uncertain situations” (p. 267). Jesus is not just interested in restoring Peter and the disciples, but He wants to recommission them to the mission He called them to. As Burge (2000) commended, “Peter—and each of us—is called to embrace the body of Christ, to love it, to tend it, and to protect it” (p. 598). Peter is being restored to live a life glorifying God even in death. Death is not the focus of the passage, but Jesus is reminding Peter and the disciples they are part of a bigger mission of the church. Referring to the catch of fish at the beginning of the chapter, Burge writes:

The miraculous catch of fish is no doubt a symbol as well as a surprise. Jesus is still the disciples’ champion, aiding them in the struggle of their labors. But more, he wants to direct their work, and with this help, they will find catches beyond their wildest belief (p. 594). The mission is the reason for the restoration of a broken relationship. Jesus still had a plan and purpose for Peter, and we need to see restoration as also having a plan and purpose for the greater mission of our organization.

*Principle Four: The leader must keep the vision of the mission of the organization as the focus so once the broken relationship is restored there is a renewal toward the common goal.*

## SUMMARY

From this brief interaction with the inner textual analysis of John 21:1–25, we see Jesus dealing with the disciples who fled during his arrest and specifically with Peter who denied Jesus three times. The inner textual analysis shows that Jesus is the center of John 21; he is directing the disciples and calling them to experience him anew. However, Jesus is doing more than interacting with the disciples, he is walking Peter and the disciples through a process of restoring a broken relationship after a conflict with the themes of remembering the past, acknowledging the hurt, leading with love, and refocusing on the mission. From these four principles of leadership developed:

- **Principle 1:** In restoring relationships the leader needs to initiate the conversation by focusing on the common past before the conflict to start the process of reestablishing trust with the other person but most not be afraid to address the conflict.
- **Principle 2:** Leaders lead with grace and truth when confronting a broken relationship. Truth acknowledges the hurt caused and grace assumes the best in the other person.
- **Principle 3:** Leaders must forgive the offense in their heart first before they can seek to restore the broken relationship in a loving way. But once the relationship is restored, leaders do not keep bringing it up but allow the relationship to start fresh from that point. It takes time to rebuild the trust, but the subject is not held over another person's head.
- **Principle 4:** The leader must keep the vision of the mission of the organization as the focus so once the broken relationship is restored there is a renewal toward the common goal.

Flexible and adaptive leaders need follow these principles as Yukl and Mahsud (2010) state “Finally, to be flexible and adaptive in a world full of change and uncertainty is difficult and stressful and leaders need to have a high level of commitment to do what is necessary and ethical” (p. 91) especially when dealing with conflict.

## DISCUSSION QUESTIONS

1. How have you handled conflict in the past? Was the relationship restored?
2. How have you seen unresolved conflict create anxiety that has affected your team?
3. Why is it important to restore trust by remembering the past at the start of the process of reconciliation?
4. How hard is it for you to forgive someone who has offended you? Why is forgiveness the key to leading with love in the reconciliation process?
5. How can you as a leader ensure you do not dwell on past mistakes when you have a conflict with a team member?
6. How can you practice grace and truth in dealing with your team members?
7. Why is ending with a call to refocusing on the mission so important for moving forward after a conflict?

## REFERENCES

- Beasley-Murray, G. R. (1987). *John*. World biblical commentary. Waco: Word Books.
- Bekker, C. (2004). *Exploring leadership through exegesis*. Unpublished manuscript. Virginia Beach, VA: Regent University.
- Bennis, W. (1997). *Managing people is like herding cats*. Provo: Executive Excellence.
- Burge, G. M. (2000). *John: The NIV application commentary*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.
- Lee, J. A. L. (2017). The puzzle of John 21:15-17. *Novum Testamentum*, 59(1), 27–30. <https://doi-org.ezproxy.regent.edu/10.1163/15685365-12341549>.
- Lencioni, P. (2012). *The advantage: Why organizational health trumps everything else in business*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Lewicki, R. J., & Tomlinson, E. (2014). Trust, trust development, and trust repair. In P. T. Coleman, M. Deutsch, & E. C. Marcus (Eds.), *The handbook of conflict resolution: Theory and practice* (3rd ed., pp. 104–136). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Northouse, P. G. (2016). *Leadership: Theory and practice* (7th ed.). Los Angeles: Sage.

- Robbins, V. K. (1996). *Exploring the texture of texts: A guide to socio-rhetorical interpretation*. Harrisburg: Trinity Press.
- Sande, K., & Johnson, K. (2015). *Resolving everyday conflict*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, a division of Baker Publishing Group.
- Scott, K. M. (2017). *Radical candor: Be a kick-ass boss without losing your humanity*. St Martin's Press.
- Shepherd, D. (2010). "Do you love me?" A narrative-critical reappraisal of ... and ... in john 21:15-17. *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 129(4), 777-792. <http://eres.regent.edu:2048/login?url=https://search-proquest-com.ezproxy.regent.edu/docview/911786880?accountid=13479>.
- Yukl, G., & Mahsud, R. (2010). Why flexible and adaptive leadership is essential. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 62(2), 81-93. <https://doi-org.ezproxy.regent.edu/10.1037/a0019835>.





## Jesus as a Loving Leader

*Christa M. Bonnet*

In order to empower people, leadership has to be more than titles and positions, and it has to reflect Jesus in every way (Sanderson, 2017). Those who seek to lead others unto Christ should strive to emulate the Savior's example of a loving and empowering leader. The life and teachings of Jesus Christ constitute an unsurpassed example of such leadership. Furthermore, to be motivated by love is foundational to the Christian life. So, we must honestly ask ourselves as Christian leaders, what motivates our faith and leadership approach? Is it our love for Christ? Do we serve because we love? Do we lead because we love our followers or is it the bottom line only?

This chapter shares seven leadership principles based on Jesus' empowerment approach from John 21. Jesus as an empowering and loving leader is an exemplar who illustrated the ties between himself as leader and his love for his mentees and devoted followers. Jesus was flock-focused and a role model to his team whom he loved with unconditional and compassionate love. Jesus had a forgiving heart and empowered his team through

---

C. M. Bonnet (✉)  
The Difference Makers, Johannesburg, South Africa

© The Author(s), under exclusive license to Springer Nature  
Switzerland AG 2021

J. D. Henson (ed.), *Biblical Organizational Leadership*,  
Christian Faith Perspectives in Leadership and Business,  
[https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-69929-1\\_11](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-69929-1_11)

his leadership approach, which is still appropriate for Christian leaders in contemporary organizational settings.

Love does not thrive as theory on its own. Paramount to effectiveness in leadership is love as a critical value in leadership that is firmly centered in a complex combination of other virtues (Caldwell & Dixon, 2009). Love is identified as the primary motivation for the incarnation of Jesus Christ (John 3:16). Jesus used it to characterize the way in which all of God's laws and commandments can be fulfilled (Matt. 20:37–40). Hackman and Johnson (2013) posited that an exemplar or role model plays a critical role in the development of high moral character of followers. In the study of how Jesus developed the Apostle Peter from Simon Peter to Peter *the rock*, it was evident that, to develop leaders, Jesus needed the right raw materials, the right experiences, and the right lessons learned for his followers to work with.

## LEADERSHIP AND EMPOWERMENT THEORY

Empowerment has been an important and popular topic in organizations since the 1980s in a variety of circumstances under a variety of conditions. There are ample evidence to suggest that, if honestly applied, it is an organizational force multiplier (Bass, 2012; Chang et al., 2010; Emuwa, 2013; Purvis, 2010; Vecchio et al., 2010; Wright, 2018). Empowerment plays an explicit role in several modern leadership theories (Autry, 2012; Yukl, 2013).

In recent years, several theories and definitions of empowerment have been formulated; however, researchers have not arrived at a collective understanding of its definition (Bayes, 2018; Christens, 2011; Purvis, 2010; Wright, 2018). Some theories in which empowerment plays a substantial role include Bass' (2012) transformational leadership theory, McGregor's X&Y theory, transactional leadership theory, Vroom's expectancy theory, Greenleaf's servant leader theory, leader-member exchange (LMX) theory, Hersey's situational leadership theory, and Northouse's participative leadership theory (Purvis, 2010).

Empowerment plays a significant, but not necessarily a vital role in the workings of theory, and it does not address the issue of potential connectivity between secular empowerment theory and Christian theory (Purvis, 2010). Despite the tremendous popularity of the ideal of empowerment in leadership studies and the business world, there appears to be some disconnect between definition and application (Hoehl, 2008; Bonnet,

2020). Much discussion and debate about empowerment as a concept exist (Bayes, 2018). There is also a gap in the literature regarding the religious aspects of empowerment despite this construct being observed in various religious faith traditions (Purvis, 2010). Despite all the talk, change programs, and research, empowerment is still mostly an illusion and nothing more than lip service (Bayes, 2018; Christens, 2011). This may be a result of some misunderstandings regarding the nature of the empowerment and the implementation of an empowerment strategy (Hoehl, 2008; Purvis, 2010). Also, faith must be proven (1 Pet. 1:6–7) and the *litmus* test for faith is obedience (1 Pet. 1:22–23; 2:7–8), which is challenging to reach agreement on in research.

A general definition by Christens (2011) stated that empowerment consists of “various processes by which people gain greater control over their lives, participate in democratic decision-making, and develop critical awareness” (p. 114). Reza et al. (2010) defined empowerment as “the process coming from relational and psychological foundations...which enables others to gain power, authority, and influence over others, institutions, or society” (p. 65). Empowerment involves the perception by members of an organization that they have the opportunity to determine their work roles, accomplish meaningful work, and influence important events (Yukl, 2013). Empowerment also refers to the way leaders prepare followers to carry out necessary tasks and responsibilities (Wright, 2018; Yukl, 2013).

Concepts having similar meanings as empowerment referred to in literature include words such as delegation of authority, motivation, self-efficacy, job enrichment, employee ownership, autonomy, self-determination, self-control, self-influence, high-involvement, and participative leadership (Lee & Koh, 2001). In the empowerment process it is the leader’s responsibility to initiate the decision to start this transfer of power between leader and follower (Petrucci, 2011). In this chapter, empowerment as a theory refers to the transfer of knowledge and skills from the leader (in this case Jesus) to the follower (in this case Peter).

## JOHN 21 AND JESUS’ EMPOWERMENT APPROACH

John 21:1–25 described a post-resurrection encounter between Jesus and seven of the disciples, including Peter and John. The plot of the story revolved around a three-part-question conversation between Jesus and Peter. It served to highlight Jesus’ empowerment approach of Jesus and

the missions of Peter, John, and the other disciples. Jesus' approach in the context of empowerment theory forms the basis of the exegesis of John 21. Christian leaders can learn a lot from Jesus' example as teacher and apply it in their succession planning, mentoring, and skills development to empower followers (Bonnet, 2020). From John 21 it is evident that despite Peter's biggest failures it could not separate him from Jesus' love and Christ' perfect plan for his life, which involved redemption from his biggest failures of betrayal, and despite his moral blunders Peter was still the leader Jesus wanted to lead for his church.

MacArthur (2018) observed that "John 21 is for every one of us. This part of the story needed to be told" (p. 308). It is the duty of every Christian leader to guard what Jesus has entrusted to us (1 Tim. 6:20; 2 Tim. 1:14), and to pass it on to the next generation (2 Tim. 2:2). Each Christian leader has a responsibility to carry God's message forward, even when they feel weak and frail at times. Part of the purpose of John 21 was that Jesus came to shepherd his wayward sheep by leading them back to sanctification through obedience. This is done by empowering them to recover their usefulness after their public failures so that they can be used for God's kingdom (Klink, 2016). The shepherd and the sheep relationship is used to illustrate Jesus' relationship to his followers who referred to him as "our Lord Jesus, the great shepherd of the sheep" (Heb. 13:20).

According to Wilkins (2017), Jesus' empowerment as a leader was that of a master with disciples as an expression of the relationship that he developed with his followers. John 21:1–25 serves as an example of Jesus' actions empowering his followers. It is important to note that the major actions in John 21 include: (1) direction (i.e., coming, going, and following); (2) discourse; (3) loving; (4) knowing; and (5) feeding (Hoehl, 2008). Through the interaction between Jesus and Simon Peter in verses 15–22 the reader gets a clearer picture of Jesus' empowerment strategies and its applicability for leaders of today.

## JESUS HAD A SHEPHERD'S HEART

Leadership with a steward attitude and shepherd's heart can only come from a heart transformed by God, and followed by a deeper understanding of the gospel, so that the transformed Christian leader can live a life of humility, faith, service, prayer, and focusing on emptying of the self (Leahy, 2010; Mathew, 2017). Jesus served the needs of his disciples

and never had an attitude of entitlement. He was known for his humility while serving his followers. Christian leaders must realize that they are servants of God and be humble while serving those around them like Jesus did. Christian leaders as shepherds must feed their sheep, allow the Holy Spirit to transform their hearts, and guide them on the path toward divine truth (Ellsworth, 2007). Such leaders have the wisdom to know that it is all about God's flock, taking care of the sheep, watching over the flock, and laying down their life for His flock (Osborne, 2018).

According to Bonnet (2020), in terms of the updated Petrine Four-Vector Model of Empowerment, one aspect of Jesus' empowerment approach to empower Peter to develop a shepherd's heart included the development of Peter's own competency, ability, agency, and performance as the key elements in this process. This principle of an empowering leader developing a shepherd's heart centers around Jesus' first command to Peter to "Feed my lambs" (John 21:15). Jesus said to Peter that if he (Peter) loved him (Jesus), then Peter should dedicate his life to Christ and tend to, and feed his lambs, with the truth of God's Word. It is vital for Christian leaders to remember that the followers they shepherd are not their flock, but Christ's flock, and that they are placed in their care as leaders to be nurtured and empowered—like Jesus did with Peter (MacArthur, 2018).

The Bible urged that Christian leaders should be accountable for their actions and decisions to God. Jesus gave Peter the accountability to care for Christ' lambs, their well-being, and spiritual formation process. In contemporary organizational settings leaders fail to care for the metaphorical lambs from their positional leadership platforms entrusted to them at the best of times. It is important that they look into their own hearts and examine themselves; then humbly look to Jesus to find the answers for any untransformed parts in their hearts, and then pray for guidance on how to change direction to transform their minds and hearts to be in full service of Christ. The Apostle Peter's understanding of Jesus' application of empowering leadership included the unique gifting of his personhood coupled with humility in imitating Christ as the ultimate leader who empowered his flock through a shepherding approach (Crowther, 2012, 2013).

*Principle One: Christian leaders have shepherd hearts so that they follow the Good Shepherd's example and feed His lambs and sheep, care for them, and allow the Holy Spirit to transform their hearts.*

## JESUS WAS AN AGENT OF CHANGE

Jesus was an agent of change (Wilson, 2010), and as a patient and loving leader (John 21:15–17), Jesus gave his disciples important and specific tasks to do as part of his empowerment approach (John 21:4–6). At its most basic level, empowerment happens when leaders take action to increase the belief of followers that they can succeed at assigned tasks (Kark et al., 2003). This was evident on the case between Jesus and Peter in John 21 where Jesus modeled intimacy with God in his empowerment approach while delegating tasks to Peter as his follower and chosen disciple (Odgen & Meyer, 2007).

By asking good questions Jesus involved his followers to do self-reflection to discover the truth for themselves under his guidance. Jesus knew that there is great power in self-discovery to experience a new level of understanding. This was the case also with Peter in John 21:14–23. As agent of change Jesus had the courage to challenge his mentees and was not afraid to take exception to issues raised (Resane, 2014). Jesus also used the art of asking the right questions to teach his followers to be proactive to change and to draw out the truth as part of his empowerment approach. Jesus encouraged his disciples to ask questions as part of his role of change agent to ensure clarity, growth, and personal development (Belsterling, 2006).

As agent of change, throughout John 21 specifically, Jesus asked his disciples questions that challenged their current mode of thinking. In verse 14, Jesus challenged the disciples' current method of fishing. He challenged them to try a new method, throwing the net on the right side of the boat and promised that they would be successful. He then worked a miracle, and the disciples caught more fish than they were able to haul into the boat. Jesus also prepared the disciples for a vocational shift, from fishing for a living to winning souls through the Gospel message. In verses 15–22, Jesus challenged the current paradigm of his expectations for his followers, Peter in particular. Jesus questioned this paradigm and asked Peter about the degree of his love for him. Once Peter responded affirmatively, Jesus challenged Peter to step up to the next level of operation by ministering to the people on earth. Jesus also commanded Peter to follow him out of love as Christ's commands are instructional to a loving heart. Bailey (2018) wrote that this is important as love is foundational to obedience, and obedience is the outcome of love as loving leaders are motivated to love by obeying Christ's commands.

It is evident that Jesus challenged the disciples' values and beliefs in John 21:1–25 with the intent of empowering them for service in God's kingdom. In today's organizations, challenging followers' values, beliefs, and work practices can help overcome the obstacle of complacency and lead to increased innovation, creativity, and productivity (Hoehl, 2008). The spiritual inner battle to be transformed in the image of Christ is not an overnight process and will not be quickly won. This was evident in Peter's spiritual formation journey under Jesus' guidance. It is important to note that, when a leader provides too much assistance in the empowerment process, it ceases to be empowerment; instead, it becomes a handicap for the follower (Wright, 2018). Jesus mastered this practice well, which is evident in John 21.

*Principle Two: Christian leaders are agents of change so that, coupled with the foundation of love, they can have a restorative impact on the lives they touch.*

## JESUS AS MENTOR WAS FLOCK-FOCUSED

Jesus saw the love of a leader as inseparable from caring for his flock (Minear, 1983). According to Huffman (2016), in the development of his character, Jesus as Peter's mentor mirrored Peter's language in John 21 to highlight that true love meant being like the Good Shepherd (John 10:11,15) who loved his sheep by laying down his life for them. As a caring shepherd leader Jesus knew that caring for his flock meant restoring them through a love that heals. Such a love for the flock also entailed searching, finding, and bringing them home (John 10:11; 21:15–17).

This also required that the shepherd leader protects the flock from danger by using God's rod and staff appropriately when needed from time-to-time. Jesus used this for disciplining his team and protecting his flock by alerting them to the pitfalls of the world and teaching them to be vigilant to deceiving leadership and falseness of the world (Resane, 2014). Wright (2006) referred to this provision as "the necessary work of justice and protection of the weak that needed to go on" (p. 277). This leadership task depends on the power and provision of the shepherd leader to direct the flock out of danger and teach them to stay together in unity. Jesus mentored his disciples to follow him by listening to his voice as mentor and the Good Shepherd (Tenney, 1975).

Jesus modeled to his disciples that shepherd leaders are watchmen who have learned and mastered the art of using both their rod and

staff in a balanced way as overseers based on the contextual environments and needs of the situation in protecting their flock (Resane, 2014). In Peter's spiritual formation journey, to develop his full potential as the founder of the first-century church, Jesus' empowerment approach was that of a caring mentor who called, disciplined, rebuked, affirmed, forgave, restored, and developed Peter's mindset and heart in his pursuit for knowledge (Howell, 2003). Peter had an important choice to make when Jesus invited him back home. However, at that point of calling him back, Peter was ready to accept the personal and steep cost of discipleship when Jesus' invited him to "*Follow Me!*"

In doing so, in alignment with Bayes (2018) empowering components, Jesus had an integrated perspective between the following: (a) social empowerment (i.e., participation, fair treatment, equality, significance); (b) structural empowerment (i.e., opportunity, information, support, resources); (c) psychological empowerment (i.e., meaning, competence, self-determination, impact); and (d) spiritual or divine empowerment (i.e., calling, participation, membership, authority, mediation role). As the Good Shepherd and mentor, Jesus' directed, empowered, restored, and guided his flock on paths of righteousness, and in this sense, Jesus demonstrated mentorship to Peter as he charged him to be a mentor going forward (Wilson, 2010).

In terms of the updated Petrine Four-Vector Model of Empowerment, the second element of this model referred to *encouraging followers* (Bonnet, 2020). In this regard, Jesus' empowerment approach encouraged Peter to become more Christlike as his follower with a well-developed ability to inspire him with hope, courage, and confidence. This was evident from the interaction between Jesus and Peter in John 21. Jesus knew that the morale of a follower was an important positive organizational or team characteristic that is closely associated with encouragement and that it would form an essential element of an empowerment leader's style (Purvis, 2010). This was the case between the interaction between Jesus and Peter in John 21.

As mentor, Jesus' empowerment and development approach taught Peter to submit to Jesus' authority as mentor, that he (Peter) should imitate Christ as role model, trust God to take care of all his needs and be loyal and respectful to Jesus as his leader and mentor. Coupled with the foundation of love, Jesus' mentoring example as leader had a restorative impact on his followers (Nouwens, 1974). This principle links to Jesus' second command to Peter to "Take care of my sheep" (John 21:16). In



Christian ministry this might include actions such as watching over the flock, talking to them, gathering them together, visiting them, protecting them from spiritual warfare, preparing them how to deal with it, guarding them from physical danger, and praying with them and supporting them in difficult times (Osborne, 2018).

*Principle Three: Christian leaders as Shepherd leaders direct, empower, restore, and guide the flock on paths of righteousness.*

## JESUS WAS A ROLE MODEL TO HIS TEAM

As role model to his team Jesus had a strong moral focus based on a godly love as a foundation for his empowerment approach (Poon, 2006). Jesus used influence rather than authority or positional power to urge his disciples toward achieving the common goals set by Christ (Henson, 2020). While love is a power-base from which a leader exert such influence (Miller, 2006), godly love involves caring for people and not manipulating them (Caldwell & Dixon, 2009). Jesus' empowering approach as leader centered on an unconditional love that flowed from heaven and extended God's love to those Christ served and lead (Poon, 2006). Jesus' persistence in questioning Peter in John 21:15–17 focused on the one main point, namely: “*Do you love me?*” By asking this question, Jesus wanted to know from Peter whether love was at the core of who he was (Poon, 2006). This love command was linked with Jesus' instructions to Peter to follow his example as role model to tend/feed his lambs/sheep as an inseparable requirement of care for his flock (Miner, 1983).

Contemporary research efforts have described the empowerment process as focusing on three areas of follower development: (a) confidence and self-efficacy, (b) values and beliefs, and (c) work-related skills. Contemporary leaders can benefit from Jesus' example of developing and empowering his disciples' sense of confidence and self-efficacy. Careful observation and interaction with followers not only highlights areas where followers feel less confident but also offers insights into how to increase their levels of self-efficacy. Jesus as a role model to his team did this masterfully. He empowered his disciples in John 21:1–25 by building their confidence and enhancing their senses of self-efficacy. Jesus' ability to empower his disciples is evident by their response to his presence throughout John 21, particularly with respect to Peter.

*Principle Four: Christian leaders as role models are driven by a strong moral love, and they use influence rather than authority to urge followers toward achieving common goals.*

## JESUS LOVED HIS TEAM UNCONDITIONALLY

According to Bailey (2018), the source of love that motive loving leadership is God's unending, unconditional love for His children. The foundation of Christian leadership in John 21 is about love and devotion to Jesus Christ. Oord (2005) wrote that "To love is to act intentionally, in sympathetic response to others (including God), to promote well-being" (p. 924). Fung (1988) posited that love is the virtue from which all other virtues come and that the freedom to place oneself in loving service of others is characterized by the mutual service of one another, and given this, the implications of this fruit of the Spirit for leadership begin and end with love.

*Agapaó* is the Greek word translated as love in John 21:15–16. A simple definition of *agapé* as a term for love is an unmerited, self-giving love (Hoehner, 2001, p. 709). Winston (2008) offered the concept of *agapaó* as establishing the beliefs and principles of behavior that support good leadership. Winston (2008) maintains that *agapaó* behavior produces higher respect for leaders and higher performance for followers toward achieving organizational goals. The leadership of Jesus in John 21:1–25 aligns with Winston's notion of *agapaó* leadership. Jesus demonstrated genuine concern for his followers, particularly in his restoration of Peter. The disciples as followers demonstrated an undying loyalty to Jesus as leader and to his mission. Jesus demonstrated how good and effective leadership behavior was expressed as he engenders in his followers an ever growing sense of respect, commitment, and service. Therefore, leadership that is based on such unconditional love establishes a foundation for an altruistic relationship in which both leader and follower are benefited through a morally right process of interaction.

Love is a prominent word in John 21. In Jesus' first challenge, he asked Peter of his love in a relative sense when he said: "Simon, son of John, do you love me more than these?" (John 21:15). In the second and third questions, the questions were more empathetic and used the phrase: "Simon son of John, do you love me?" (John 21:16–17). Peter's response, however, progressed in the opposite way with his first response being: "Yes, Lord; you know that I love you" (John 21:15–16), and his

third response, however, being: “Lord, you know everything, you know that I love you” (John 21:17). In verses 15 and 16 Jesus used the word *agape/agapaó* when Jesus asked Peter: “Do you love me?” However, in verse 17 he used *phileó* when he asked the same question.

Regardless of which word Peter used for love in this three-question interview with Jesus (John 21:15–17), Jesus moved Peter every time back toward the true meaning of love, which was more than the personal relationship Peter was thinking of at that moment (Huffman, 2016). Jesus did not ask Peter the question “*Do you love me?*” because he did not know the answer; rather, he wanted Peter to examine his heart after he has sinned. Just like he did with Peter, Jesus asks of Christian leaders daily to examine their hearts to answer the question truthfully: “*My child, do you love me?*”

Love itself is an empowering agent of change, growth, and transformation in the human heart, and like a seed, it could grow from a germ of potential into a life-giving vine. Jesus saw that germ of love in Peter’s heart and he was willing to work with Peter’s imperfect raw materials as he knew his potential and the intentions of Peter’s heart. When Jesus commanded Peter to “Feed my sheep...tend to my sheep” he called Peter to love God’s flock as best as he could. This was the basis of Jesus’ example as role model. Jesus also invites Christian leaders today to love their followers as best as they could in their commitment as empowering leaders.

According to the structural theory of empowerment, followers are empowered when they are equipped with resources, information, and support necessary to accomplish an organizational goal (Kanter, 1979). Jesus’ leadership approach was not empowered by a sense of duty nor obligation nor by a desire to build an image, but by an inner source of unconditional and compassionate love. Sanderson (2017) wrote that Jesus teaches his disciples how love can radically change three areas of a leader’s life—i.e., purpose, perspective, and priorities—and how a leader view these areas can either make or break their potential to lead others. What makes these three areas so important is that if they are not funneled through godly love, it will impact adversely three of the most foundational areas in any leadership approach, namely self-leadership, self-awareness, and self-management (Sanderson, 2017).

According to the updated Petrine Model and its nine characteristics in the Fortosis Spiritual Formation Stage Model (SFSM) compiled by Bonnet (2020), great leaders like Jesus build a deep redemptive love for

people and move them to do far more than obligation, power and conditional love could ever do. Jesus' love for Peter in his restoration in John 21 was an example of such a deep redemptive and unconditional love for Peter as his mentee.

*Principle Five: Christian leaders see the seed of potential in others, nurture that seed, and transform their minds and hearts to grow from a germ of potential into a life-giving vine.*

## JESUS HAD A FORGIVING HEART

Jesus was love and he modeled love. He extended compassionate love to sinners who were aware of their sin but unaware of God's forgiveness. Jesus healed the broken hearted—in this case Peter—by forgiving their sin and teaching them how to follow Christ as a loving leader. All Christian leaders are clay pots with visible flaws and imperfections, and when measured on their love for God, in His omniscience, God knows whether their love is real or not (MacArthur, 2018).

Hamilton (2018) posited that the meal that Jesus had with his disciples in John 21 was more than just a meal for connection and remembrance between Jesus and his disciples, but a meal of reconciliation and forgiveness. This was definitely the case for Simon Peter where Jesus had taken on the role of a servant at the meal once again. John 21:15–17 was a lesson in forgiveness, and a reminder that, Christian leaders should restrain from condemning others as unconverted just because they see the path of duty differently (Ryle, 2015). In this passage Jesus had a private meeting with Peter after his resurrection during which Jesus showed Peter a pure and transformed heart filled with godly grace, forgiveness, and unconditional love from his shepherd heart despite Peter's mistakes and betrayal.

Peter was transformed in John 21 from an ambitious, self-motivated, and inconsistent follower of Jesus, to a fully committed, charismatic leader of Christ's church (Leahy, 2010). The question may be asked: "*What has love and forgiveness got to do with empowerment?*" Peter's redemption, conversion, and restoration was a glimpse into the possibility that the human heart of Christian leaders can be transformed as there are many Peter's among us. Many of us are Peter's ourselves. The short exchange between Jesus and Peter in John 21:15–17 was a glimpse in the heart of Jesus as the Son of a faithful God, even when Christian leaders turn away from or disappoint Him—like Peter did when he denied Jesus three times.

God continued to love Peter despite Peter messing up. Jesus knew Peter's heart well enough and he believed that Peter was capable of immense spiritual growth and transformation of his heart; to such an extent, that Peter would become the rock on which Christ's church would be build.

Failure as a Christian leader did not disqualify Peter from serving Jesus or from being forgiven or empowered by Jesus to become one of the most well-known exemplars and Christian leaders of all times. Jesus predicted Peter's failures, then later instructed him how to empower others when he said: "...but I prayed for you that your faith may not fail. And when you have returned again, strengthen your brothers" (Luke 22:32). After each of his failures, Peter made a comeback with a desire to continue to follow Christ. Jesus had the foresight that Peter was not perfect and that he had an untransformed heart, however, he knew Peter's heart. Jesus also knew that, with the right mentoring and experiences, Peter could become *the rock* on which the church could be build. It takes a deep and unconditional love to walk someone through the messy process of understanding their purpose, perspectives, and priorities (Sanderson, 2017). Jesus did not give up on Peter despite his many mistakes.

Just as Jesus forgave and reinstated Peter for usefulness as Christian leader, he is ready to do the same for all God's children. That include all of us. Peter's fall as Christian leader is a reminder that no believer could stand in his or her own strength. John 15:5 reminds that "Apart from me you can do nothing." Through Peter's redemption and restoration in John 21 unrestrained forgiveness is demonstrated by Jesus as his mentor, role model, and empowerment leader. Bailey (2018) wrote that loving leaders grow the capacity to love when they experience forgiveness often.

This is a direct contrast with contemporary empowerment theory, which generally values justice, retribution, revenge, or even disciplinary action for poor performance. Murray and Karl (1999) wrote that: "Unlike revenge, the concept of forgiveness has been almost totally ignored in the organizational literature" (p. 610). Jesus demonstrated a godly forgiving heart by loving Peter to such an extent that he restored him fully into ministry and ordained him as founder of the first-century church. Such an act of love is a feature of reconciliation offered from a forgiving and loving heart despite the human mind not being able to fully comprehend the depths of their offense or the depths of Jesus' love (Wells, 2007).

*Principle Six: Christian leaders practice unrestrained forgiveness as an act of love as part of reconciliation, restoration, and empowerment.*

## JESUS EMPOWERED HIS TEAM

According to Sanderson (2017), like Jesus, real leaders seek to empower others and not themselves. Christian leaders' mission must be fueled by a desire to see people's lives improve and to empower them. Their mission—whether it is in business, churches, organizations, or personally—must in some way be ignited by their godly love for people. Jesus understood the human reality that leaders cannot be everything to everyone, therefore, he empowered the chosen people around him to use and develop their God-given talents to the best fulfillment of their higher purpose and in the service of God's mission.

According to Hoehl (2018), Jesus' actions offer insights into his empowerment strategies such as developing his disciples' confidence and self-efficacy, challenging their values and beliefs, and equipping them with the skills needed for their ministries and leadership path. In alignment with the principles of empowerment theory, Jesus taught Peter that empowering leaders support followers to develop the necessary skills and capability that might be under-developed or in need of strengthening (Choi, 2001). This supports principle six in this chapter and the notion where Jesus instructed Peter in Luke 22:32 to “strengthen your brothers.”

Christian leaders will not accomplish their highest potential until they learn to empower others. It was this deposit of God's grace in the life of Peter that caused him to become *the rock* on which Christ's church ultimately was built as foreseen by Jesus. When Peter's heart was ready and eager, the Holy Spirit's work became fruitful in his heart and the germ of potential that Jesus saw when he met Peter next to the sea of Galilee was ready to grow into a life-giving vine. Jesus invites Christian leaders every day to open their hearts to allow the Holy Spirit to work in their lives as the Spirit of God's love wants to awake this same divine love in their minds and hearts to make it real—like it did with Peter (see Rom. 5:5).

Receiving Jesus Christ was not an ending, but a beginning for Peter as a leader (Donnelly, 2012). Peter was a mentee who became a mentor later himself when he was adequately empowered to teach and to continue to empower others like Jesus did with him (see John 21:17). Jesus' final command to Peter in John 21:19 was to “Follow me!” At that moment Peter was at a crossroad and he had to decide whether he was willing to accept the new relationship with Jesus after his restoration as this new

calling came with a steep cost to the next level of discipleship (Wells, 2005).

According to Sanderson (2017), the answer to the question “*How do I lead with love?*” comes down to perspectives. Jesus taught his disciples that being in a position of leadership has very little to do with a title, and it has everything to do with their ability to be content in the purpose that God has set for them. As part of Jesus empowerment approach he taught Peter that following Christ had a deeper meaning than just forming an intimate relationship as it represented a deep commitment to do the “work of shepherding” and the work of Jesus Christ (Leahy, 2010, p. 2). In John 21 Peter came understood empowerment, not as a theory, but as a practical process that bring God’s children closer to Him and transform them into His image (Bonnet, 2020).

In today’s world with all its challenges, being a disciple of Christ does not mean that all Christian leaders would end up with the same faith statement as the Apostle Peter. It means that we all should try to walk on the same path that both Jesus and Peter did, namely, the path of love and service, and to accept that such a path would involve risk, challenges, commitment, and sacrifices. Peter’s spiritual formation journey is a reminder that discipleship and Christian leadership begin with a specific calling, choices, and changed behavior. Just like with Peter, Christian leaders are invited to reflect whether they are living the commands that Jesus taught and lived, and whether they are applying the leadership principles that Jesus left as an empowering and loving leader to follow.

*Principle Seven: Christian leaders know that they will not accomplish their highest potential until they learn to empower their followers.*

## SUMMARY

Peter learned the answer to an important question during his journey with Jesus, namely: “*Why should I lead with love?*” The answer he learned from his Master and mentor was “*Because we are all called to love one another.*” Peter had to learn the lesson from Jesus that to love people is to lead them. Such loving leadership can simply mean to help others understand their gifts and talents or purpose or it may mean to lead them to the one who can help—Jesus.

God wanted Peter’s heart to empower him to become the Christian leader he was destined to be. It was the motif of love for Jesus and shepherding His sheep as imaged in the narrative of John 21 that

defined leadership as an approach for Peter. Jesus lead the disciples toward an inner transformation in themselves and toward ultimately becoming leaders who empower and transform others as well. Jesus' engagement with Simon Peter in John 21 was an encouragement for Christians today as it illustrated that, no matter how his people fail, and how many times they failed, Christ is willing to forgive and restore (Ellsworth, 2007).

This chapter illustrated that the function of Jesus as shepherd leader was that of loving and empowering leader that was caring, protecting, guiding, and directing his flock. This required courage, the need to act firmly and decisively. Jesus knew when to be gentle and when to use the staff as shepherd leader or when more discipline in the form of the rod was needed. He knew that kindness was key to effectively leading his team to achieve God's mission and empower them to become who they were born to become.

## DISCUSSION QUESTIONS

1. How will being a loving leader shape your leadership approach going forward?
2. What will it take for you to lead with love? Are you fully equipped to do this?
3. Can you lead people with love when there is nothing for you?
4. Are you serving those you love with your presence sufficiently?
5. Do you know those your serve (whether it is your business, your industry, your job, your customers, your employees, your suppliers, your peers, your supervisors, your community members) well enough? If not, talk to them, get to know, so that you can serve them in radical, loving ways.

## REFERENCES

- Autry, J. A. (2012). *The servant leader: How to build a creative team, develop great morale, and improve bottom-line performance*. Prima.
- Bailey, B. (2018). *Learning to lead like Jesus: 11 Principles to help you serve, inspire & equip others*. Harvest House Publishers.
- Bass, D. B. (2012). *Christianity after religion: The end of Church and the birth of a new spiritual awakening*. Harper One.



- Bayes, J. D. (2018). *A model of divine empowerment: A socio-rhetorical analysis of the relationship between the ascension of Christ and leadership empowerment in Ephesians 4:1-16*. Dunamis Publications,
- Belsterling, R. (2006). The mentoring approach of Jesus as demonstrated in John 13. *Journal of Youth Ministry*, 5(1), 77–92.
- Bonnet, C. M. (2020). *Leading from a transformed heart: A content analysis of biblical pivotal moments in the life of the Apostle Peter* (Publication No. 27836374). Published doctoral dissertation, ProQuest Dissertation Publishing.
- Caldwell, C., & Dixon, R. D. (2009). Love, forgiveness, and trust: Critical values of the modern leader. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 93(1), 91–101.
- Chang, L., Shih, C., & Lin, S. (2010). The mediating role of psychological empowerment on job satisfaction and organizational commitment for school health nurses: A cross-sectional questionnaire survey. *International Journal of Nursing Studies*, 47(4), 427–433. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2009.09.007>.
- Choi, S. J. (2001). *A new heart to know the Lord: Rhetorical analysis of Jeremiah 21-24*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Gloucestershire.
- Christens, B. D. (2011). Toward relational empowerment. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 50(1–2), 114–128. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10464-011-9483-5>.
- Crowther, S. S. (2012). *An examination of leadership principles in 1 Peter in comparison to authentic and kenotic models of leadership* (Publication No. 3515407). Published doctoral dissertation, ProQuest Dissertation Publishing.
- Crowther, S. S. (2013). *Peter on leadership: A contemporary exegetical analysis* (Kindle ed.). Ontos Zoe Publishing.
- Donnelly, E. (2012). *Peter: Eyewitness of his majesty—Eyewitness, preacher, pastor*. The Banner of Truth Trust.
- Ellsworth, R. (2007). *Simon Peter: Encountering the preacher at Pentecost*. Day One Publications.
- Emuwa, A. (2013). Authentic leadership: Commitment to supervisor, follower empowerment, and procedural climate. *Emerging Leadership Journeys*, 6(1), 45–65.
- Faber, S. (2019). *Love is just damn good business: Do what you love in the service of people who love what you do*. McGraw-Hill Education.
- Fung, R. Y. K. (1988). *The Epistle of the Galatians*. The New International Commentary of the New Testament. Wim. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.
- Hackman, M. Z., & Johnson, C. E. (2013). *Leadership: A communicative perspective* (6th ed). Long Grove, IL. Waveland Press.
- Hamilton, A. (2018). *Simon Peter: Flawed but faithful disciple*. Abington Press.

- Henson, J. D. (Ed.). (2020). *Modern metaphors of Christian leadership: Exploring Christian leadership in a contemporary organizational context*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hoehl, S. (2008). Empowered by Jesus: A research proposal for an exploration of Jesus' empowerment approach in John 21:1-25. *Journal of Applied Christian Leadership*, 2(2), 5-17.
- Hoehl, S. (2018). Empowered by Jesus: A research proposal for an exploration of Jesus' empowerment approach in John 21:1-25. *Journal of Applied Christian Leadership*, 2(2), 5-17.
- Hoehner, H. W. (2001). In W. A. Elwell (Ed.), *Evangelical dictionary of theology* (2nd ed.). Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House Company.
- Howell, D. N. (2003). *Servants of the servant: A biblical theology of leadership*. Wipf & Stock Publishers.
- Huffman, D. T. (2016). *Kenotic alterity: An exegetical study of the ontological essence of leadership as the "death" of the leader in Johannine, Pauline, and Petrine Scriptures* (Publication No. 10137840). Published doctoral dissertation, ProQuest Dissertation Publication.
- Kanter, R. M. (1979). Power failure in management circuits. *Harvard Business Review*, 57(4), 1-13. <http://ils.unc.edu/daniel/131/cc04/Kanter.pdf>.
- Kark, R., Shamir, B., & Chen, G. (2003). The two faces of transformational leadership: Empowerment and dependency. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(2), 246-255. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.88.2.246>.
- Klink, E. W. (2016). *Exegetical commentary on the New Testament: John*. Zondervan.
- Leahy, K. (2010). A study of Peter as model of servant leadership. *Inner Resources for Leaders*, 2(4), 1-10.
- Lee, M., & Koh, J. (2001). Is empowerment really a new concept? *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 12(4), 684-695. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09586190110037344>.
- MacArthur, J. F. (Ed.). (2018). *High king of heaven: Theological and practical perspectives on the person and works of Jesus*. Moody Press.
- Mathew, S. (2017). *Apostle Peter's cross-cultural leadership in Christian missions to the Gentiles: A socio-rhetorical analysis of Acts 10:1-11:18* (Publication No. 10747526). Published doctoral dissertation, ProQuest Dissertation Publishing.
- Miller, M. (2006). Transforming leadership: What does love have to do with it? *Transformation*, 23(2), 94-106.
- Minear, P. S. (1983). The original functions of John 21. *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 102(1), 94.
- Murray, B., & Karl, A. (1999). The effects of blame attributions of offender likableness on forgiveness and revenge in the workplace. *Journal of Management*, 25(5), 607-631.

- Nouwens, H. J. M. (1974). *Out of solitude* (p. 36). Ava Maria Press.
- Odgen, G., & Meyer, D. (2007). *Leadership essentials: Shaping vision, multiplying influence, defining character*. IVP Connect.
- Oord, T. J. (2005). The love racket: Defining love and agape for the love-and-science research program. *Zygon*, 40(4), 919–938.
- Osborne, L. (2018). *Lead like a shepherd: The secret to leading well*. Thomas Nelson.
- Petrucci, T. (2011). Divine empowerment of leaders in early Christianity. *Emerging Leadership Journeys*, 4(1), 58–69.
- Poon, R. (2006). John 21: A Johannine model of leadership. *Journal of Biblical Perspectives in Leadership*, 1(1), 49–70.
- Purvis, D. B. (2010). *Developing a four-vector model of empowerment by examining Pauline leadership attributes: Implications for secular leadership theory* (Publication No. 3447892). Published doctoral dissertation, ProQuest Dissertation Publishing.
- Resane, K. T. (2014). Leadership for the church: The shepherd model. *HTS Theological Studies*, 70(1), Art. #2045. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4102/hts.v70i1.2045>.
- Reza, B., Gholamreza, J., Hasan, Z., & Nasrin, D. (2010). An examination of the relationship between empowerment and organizational commitment. *International Journal of Human Sciences*, 7(2), 63–72.
- Ryle, J. C. (2015). *John (Vol. 2): Expository thoughts on the Gospels* (6th reprint). The Banner of Truth Trust: Versa Press.
- Sanderson, R. (2017). *Love to lead: How love empowers leadership*. Leadership Revolution LLC.
- Tenney, M. C. (1975). *John—The Gospel of belief: An analytical study of the text*. Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.
- Vecchio, R. P., Justin, J. E., & Peace, C. L. (2010). Empowering leadership: An examination of mediating mechanisms within a hierarchical structure. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 21(3), 530–542. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2010.03.014>.
- Wells, S. (2007). A Friend like Peter. *Christian Century*, 124(3), 24–30.
- Wilkins, M. J. (2017). Peter's theology of discipleship to the crucified Messiah (1 Peter 2: 2:18-25). *SBJT*, 21(3), 53–75.
- Wilson, J. H. (2010). Jesus as agent of change: Leadership in John 21. *Emerging Leadership Journeys*, 3(1), 10–21.
- Winston, B. (2008). Agapao leadership. *Inner Resources*, 1(1), 1–6.
- Wright, N. T. (2006). *Simply christian: Why christianity makes sense*. San Francisco: Harper San Francisco.
- Wright, A. G. (2018). *Trust and empowerment in Jesus' sending of the 72: A socio-rhetorical analysis of Luke 9:51-10:24*. Doctoral dissertation, Regent University, Virginia Beach, VA.
- Yukl, G. A. (2013). *Leadership in organizations* (8th ed.). Pearson.



## Jesus as an Introspective Leader

*Chad M. Minor*

In this information age where disconnecting proves difficult, I am reminded of a quote by James Mattis, “If I were to sum up the single greatest problem of senior leadership in the information age, it’s a lack of reflection.” This chapter will explore the importance of leadership solitude through the lens of Jesus in John 2:13–22, fighting for solitude; John 6:15, seeking solitude when others attempt to make you do something contrary to God’s calling on your life; John 10:39–42, retreating into solitude while waiting on God’s time; and John 21:15–19, finding solitude with trusted others about the forward mission. Leading as Jesus led within our community and organization is the goal, and maintaining a personal balance for self-reflection, prayer, and meditation is the method. Today’s Christian leadership can be identified through the lens of Jesus: how to serve, live in community, disciple, and maintain personal-development margins. Briner and Pritchard (1997) explain Jesus was utilizing his time, waking up early to pray, removing himself to a quiet place, and disciplining himself to maintain a posture of prayer and solitude. This should serve as an example for today’s Christians desiring to serve within any

---

C. M. Minor (✉)  
Regent University, Virginia Beach, VA, USA

© The Author(s), under exclusive license to Springer Nature  
Switzerland AG 2021

J. D. Henson (ed.), *Biblical Organizational Leadership*,  
Christian Faith Perspectives in Leadership and Business,  
[https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-69929-1\\_12](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-69929-1_12)

leadership position. The example of Jesus' solitude in the Gospel of John provides a guidepost for today's leaders as leaders balance organizational and communal workloads with personal development. This chapter will consider the importance of solitude for today's connected leaders using the four images of solitude that Jesus exemplifies in the Gospel of John.

## JESUS AND SOLITUDE

Okoroafor (2019) explains that Jesus' prioritization of solitude and silence flows throughout the Gospels. Solitude is how Jesus begins his ministry, makes decisions, handles emotion, deals with the challenges of ministry, maintains self-care, and teaches the disciples. According to Morton (2015), the successes of Jesus' earthly ministry do not come from traditional leadership skills or development but rather it emerges from His personal relationship with God the Father, who empowers Jesus through Scripture to navigate temptation. According to Nouwen (1995), solitude is the space where our spiritual discipline is established and where we can hear the Holy Spirit's whispers.

Morton (2015) states that in the information age, it is paramount that tomorrow's emerging leaders practice the discipline of solitude and understand the necessity of spending time alone in reflection, seeking God's voice. Jesus does not outline solitude as an obligation or significant religious exercise. Because He recognizes that faith is an outward life, Jesus mirrors the Old Testament prophets in His ability to navigate from solitude to the outward moments in His earthly ministry (Bowker & Coplan, 2014). Plummer (2009) states that for Christians, spaces of solitude serve to provide psychological or emotional encouragement and allow a person to focus solely on Christ's will for his or her life.

According to Akrivou et al. (2011), solitude allows a person to identify positive characteristics for the intention of an inward and outward benefit, not for the sake of isolating oneself or because of an inability to cope with external variables. Harris (2017) details the importance of leaders' understanding that solitude is under attack by the onslaught of digital information and our busy schedules. Our margins are skewed, which, in turn, creates inward loneliness that longs for unhealthy isolation. Akrivou et al. (2011) explain a model for leaders that details how expanded solitude utilization bolsters a person's capacity for moral leadership and reduces the likelihood of neutral leadership; solitude strengthens ethical leadership by substantially enhancing a leader's capacity to morally

reason. Deresiewicz (2010) details solitude as a space for contemplation, reflection, meditation, and, counterintuitively, friendship, as two people are engaging in a lengthy, uninterrupted conversation in which they strengthen each other.

### JOHN 2:13–22: FIGHTING FOR SOLITUDE

Pink (1923–1945) explains that during biblical times the cattle dealers and money changers were well known for price gouging and pocketing more than their fair share of the sales, and history validates Christ for calling the temple court a den of thieves. Within the marketplace, people were outrageously cheated, and the worship of God was crippled and obstructed rather than promoted and enriched (Pink, 1923–1945). Kruse (2003) explains that Jesus' opposition was not directly to the money changers; instead, He was agitated by the thought that this was happening within the temple court, a space that was supposed to be reserved for prayer and solitude. According to Milne (1993), Jesus' anger seems to be focused on the presence of merchants bringing all of the confusion into a quiet space of meditation on God, a space of solitude to seek God prayerfully. Jesus, knowing the importance of a space of solitude, removes the noise and clamor of the world, and fights for the Gentiles' solitude in the temple courts.

The scene at the temple court admonishes present-day Christians for allowing the surrounding culture to remove these spaces of quiet reflection from our busy lives; areas that were once reserved for meditation have become boisterous and bustling slots on a calendar that we fill, spaces that are devoid of solitude (Pink, 1923–1945). Kruse (2003) states that the only space of solitude where the Gentiles could go to pray within the temple was the court of the Gentiles, and it had been turned into a clamorous location by the cattle dealers and money changers. Carson (1991) explains that Jesus was not merely objecting to the unethical commerce that was taking place; He was emphatically stating that such practices should not take place within the temple courts, a space where one could find refuge, quiet, and solitude to commune with God. Jesus' frustration was with the fact that these people had turned the temple courts, which were meant for quiet reflection, into a clamorous location.

Milne (1993) details that rather than the temple court being a space for a person to reflect and seek God quietly, there is the clamoring of merchants; instead of solitude, there is boisterous commerce. According

to Pink (1923–1945), a person seeking to find a place of solitude for worship had to force their way through the annoying solicitation of the market dealers, having their quiet time with the Lord interrupted by the yelling within the cattle market. Christ did not idly stand by and allow this space of solitude to be abused. His devotion and passion for an intimate relationship with God the Father overwhelmed Him, and He fought for this space to return to a space of solace, reflection, and solitude for the people (Pink, 1923–1945). Jamieson et al. (1997) explain that it was not that the merchandise was unacceptable, but the fact that it was being sold in the temple court, a place of solitude—a blasphemy that Jesus would not stand for. In today’s world, we are bombarded with information, schedules, and social media, and Jesus calls on us to fight for our solitude, to remove ourselves from the commotion that has become our normal daily life.

Erwin and Kethledge (2017) explain that leadership solitude is under attack in today’s information age, with most people feeling connected continuously in the workplace through personal connective technologies that are introduced daily. Buchholz (1998) states that solitude in today’s information age is being challenged. Merton (1958) says that, when a society is comprised of leaders who devalue solitude, the culture is no longer able to be bound together by love. Hence, they allow themselves to be held together by abusive behavior that is counter to the Gospel. Storr (1988) explains that, in our Western culture, solitude is a difficult space to find and maintain, and that leaders, for their own personal health, must continue to seek out these spaces of personal self-reflection. Bowker and Coplan (2014) explain that solitude is a commitment to process beneficial attitudes and beliefs in a space void of distraction.

We see the importance of solitude by understanding that Jesus drove out the merchants and cattle dealers not because they were selling goods but, instead, because they were obstructing one’s ability to seek God earnestly within a space of quiet reflection. Averill et al. (2003) detail the importance of finding periods of solitude away from communal pressure, whereby we provide ourselves with the opportunity to meditate and process personal, spiritual, and professional development. Solitude was not only under attack within John 2:13–22; our solitude is also under attack because we, today’s leaders, are always connected, overloaded with information, and awaiting the next pings on our phones.

As Christian leaders within a connected world, we fight to have spaces of solitude not only within our own lives but also within the lives of our

followers and to challenge a connected society to remove the noise and clutter and seek Jesus. Nouwen (1995) explains that God encourages us to be connected to Him first. Bratman et al. (2015) describe how a short amount of time spent disconnecting in a natural environment improves mental alertness and proposes that usable natural spaces within urban areas are a critical resource for a person's psychological health within the connected world. Today's Christian leaders mirror Jesus by helping themselves and their followers maintain a space for balance within their lives by combating a constant connected lifestyle. Christian leadership is about a relationship and lifestyle that embodies the teachings of Jesus. One of those essential teachings is to embrace a space of solitude, personal reflection, and prayer, which in turn provides leaders a healthy balance with the outward connected focus of the world.

Morton (2015) found that a leader's ability to continue to lead productively was directly linked to his or her ability to find spaces for spiritual fulfillment, highlighting the importance of Jesus' fighting for solitude in John 2:13–22. The spiritual practices implemented by leaders were identified as significant contributors to staving off burnout and increasing productivity (Morton, 2015). Briner and Pritchard (1997) encourage leaders to find solitude throughout the day and get creative finding it, knowing that leadership encompasses both a requirement to live within a community and pursuing solitary spaces of reflection and prayer for personal edification.

Nouwen (1995) explains that the order through which God teaches us begins in a solitary, reflective space with God, which establishes a foundation for fellowship in which to live out God's mission. Subsequently, this community of believers moves together into the culture to proclaim the Gospel. Hetzel and Castillo (2014) explain that the objective of solitude is not to be alone, but for a person to be alone with God. Plummer (2009) states that spaces of solitude not only serve as a psychological or emotional encouragement for Christian leaders, they also provide space for a person to place their focus solely on Christ's will for their life. According to Hetzel and Castillo (2014), solitude intensifies a person's ability to hear God and effectively enter a space of communion with Him, healing areas of our lives that need attending to and softening our hearts toward those against whom we struggle. With the importance of solitude, shouldn't today's leaders be fighting against today's information age and the ever-connected culture in favor of spaces of solitude?



*Principle One: As leaders in today's information age, we have to fight, as Jesus did within John 2:13–22, to maintain spaces of solitude within our lives—to remove ourselves from the noise and clamor of the outside world to maintain a state of connection with God.*

## JOHN 6:15 SEEKING SOLITUDE FOR BALANCE AND DIRECTION

The story of Jesus' feeding the five thousand highlights for today's leaders the difficulty of balancing people and solitude. It highlights the need to understand the reality of a growing population's needing services, as well as the imperative to be both poor and poor in spirit (Milne, 1993). Milne (1993) details that Jesus' removing himself and rejecting their pursuit to make him king is a sudden and definitive action, and when placed within the context of the earlier temptation in Matthew 4:8, which pursues a political route to being king, it allows one to understand how such a decision would bypass the path to the cross for Jesus. Westcott and Westcott (1908) explain that the people intended to use Jesus, against his will, to accomplish their agenda, so Jesus removed himself. Today, Christian leaders are constantly pulled in different directions, overburdened by completing tasks that drain their energy away from God's calling on their lives. Understanding the path that God has called leaders to and remaining steadfast to that path, as Jesus does, is vital in today's world.

Chrysostom (1856) explains that Jesus went up to the mountain to demonstrate to the disciples and today's leaders how to avoid accolades and remove oneself from the midst of adoration, in order to seek, like Jesus, solitude for the pursuit of God's will for our lives. According to Barclay (2001), the people followed Jesus because He was providing them with what they desired, and they wanted to use Him for their gain. Jesus knew this. He knew they wanted gifts without the cross, and He responded by removing Himself to pray. Kruse (2003) explains that the occurrence of Jesus feeding these five thousand people started when He went up on the mountain with the disciples, and it ended when Jesus removed Himself to the mountain, doing so to withdraw from people who wanted to make Him king.

Aquinas (1845) states that when Jesus anticipated the people would demand He become king, He moved to a solitary place on a mountain. Barclay (2001) details that the people were enthusiastic when Jesus gave them what they wanted, healing them, feeding them, teaching them.

Because of this, they would, therefore, make Him their king, but Jesus knew that His ministry was about more than the giving of physical needs. Chrysostom (1856) states that Jesus would regularly remove Himself to a solitary place to demonstrate solitude as an essential practice when approaching God, striving to find a space that is void of the clamor of the world, seeking time free from disruption.

Just as Jesus seeks out solitude in John 6:15, leaders today must seek spaces of refuge from the onslaught of information and connectivity in today's world. Bergmann and Hippler (2018) state that the exploration of solitude is an undertaking that comes at an emotional price and allows a person to reflect on his or her positive and negative leadership capacities. Within today's connected world, it is difficult to maintain a posture of quiet reflection, but Jesus calls each of us through John 6:15 to seek out space to connect to Him. As people remove themselves too much from the community, their lives become void of opportunities to share God's love with others, and as leaders move too far into community, they diminish their ability to meditate on God's word and have a time of personal reflection and prayer. Maslach and Cooke (2000) explain that extended periods of stress, brought on by unbalanced personal margins, materialize into burnout, which is the feeling of being extremely tired by one's work, thus making a leader interpersonally distant, and indifferent to personal achievement. There is no shortage of good things that we can do as leaders, but we process these things within spaces of solitude in order to ask, "Are these things I'm being asked to do God's will or mine?"

Christian leaders constantly have outside forces attempting to push them off their path of seeking out God's calling for their lives, so continuing to seek God's will and direction becomes an essential component to living a life of faith. Living in the world but not being of the world, it is possible to fall into the pitfalls of over-scheduling, never having time to process God moving within our lives, the direction he is calling us. Embracing (2017) explains that a leader who maintains a schedule that is void of solitude, therefore, has no space for personal reflection, and without self-reflection, it proves difficult for leaders to maintain a healthy balance of personal and organizational needs.

Collins et al. (2017) detail that solitude plays an essential role as a leader seeks clarity, helping them to re-center and confidently navigate difficult decisions with clearer thoughts. Kethledge and Erwin (2017) explains that through the differing methods of solitude, leaders utilize the

ability to contemplate and reflect, with the same outcome in mind: time away from the world's distractions, which allows a leader's inner voice a space to guide and connect to something greater than ourselves. Byrd and Thomas (2019) explain that a person removes themselves from external distractions in solitude to increase communication with the inner self. According to Burton-Christie (2003), solitude allows a leader to maintain a posture of openness to the Holy Spirit, to process and understand both the renewing power of God and the deception of the devil.

To understand the benefits of solitude, a person must also know its pitfalls. Akrivou et al. (2011) explain the pivotal point at which the frequency of solitude becomes dangerous for a person, and that this threshold varies from person to person. Basil of Caesarea (329–379) was against solitude; he described the necessity for Christians to live in a community with other people because it protects them from the dangers of self-indulgence, pride, and self-delusion by pointing out one-anothers' errors. He explained that the Christian life demands communion with and service of people, where we have the opportunity to show God's love for others.

Long et al. (2003) state that a benefit of solitude is the ability to freely move through one's thoughts without the fear of judgment, non-objectively processing ideas, casting vision, and allowing space for self-reflection and spirituality. Foster (1988) explains that a person who understands the importance of solitude must be on guard against confusing doing specific religious deeds at a set time with successfully meditating. Averill and Long (2003) state that the person seeking solitude can circumvent isolation through their rapport with trusted individuals or preoccupy themselves with contentment or intrigue.

Bonhoeffer (1954) states that a person who struggles to maintain solitary spaces must be cautious of community, and a person who distances themselves from the community must be cautious of solitude, knowing that too much of either is hazardous. Littman-Ovadia (2019) details the importance of maintaining a healthy balance between finding spaces of solitude and living within a community. Bonhoeffer (1954) explains that a person who desires community without solitude finds contentment through interpersonal communication and emotions, while one who desires solitude without community can succumb to pride, arrogance, and sadness. According to Littman-Ovadia (2019), solitude is not to remove oneself from the world; solitude is a style of participating within it, promoted by temporary separation from interpersonal communication.

While the community is an essential component of a faithful life, too much social interaction can become stifling (Averill et al., 2003).

According to Littman-Ovadia (2019), maintaining margin within one's life, balancing solitude and interpersonal communication, allows a person to balance their development as a leader and fosters a complete and satisfying life. Akrivou et al. (2011) found through research that solitude has become part of a productive process for the growth of leaders, and spaces of silence and reflection are shown as an instrument for the enhancement of moral leadership. According to Foster (1988), the fruit of solitude is heightened self-awareness and an outward compassion for people, allowing oneself to meditate on the response to a person's needs thoughtfully. Long et al. (2003) explain solitude, in contrast to loneliness, as a space that a person seeks, benefiting from the opportunity to create and build oneself through reflection and introspection freely. Leary et al. (2003) detail that future research on solitude should surround definitive factors that influence the demographics of people who pursue and enjoy solitude.

*Principle Two: Healthy Christian leaders must maintain a balance between solitude and community, understanding that too much of either becomes detrimental to a person's spiritual health.*

## JOHN 10:39–42 SOLITUDE WHILE WAITING ON GOD'S TIME

During a time of struggle in His earthly ministry, when Jesus needed to connect to God, He went back to the location where the Lord had descended upon him, and we would do well also to make a pilgrimage back to a location where we encountered God (Barclay, 2001). Lincoln (2005) explains that the last three verses of John Chapter 10 establish a structural transition in Jesus' earthly ministry, and they demonstrate His response to the hostile treatment He endured at the hands of the religious leaders; in short, this section details how Jesus transitions by removing Himself once again to connect with God the Father. Barclay (2001) illustrates that Jesus knew the path God had laid out for Him and the hour in which it would happen; He did not carelessly seek out threats to his path, nor did He sidestep risk to preserve His life. He desired quiet alone time with God before the final struggle. Christian leaders are many times forced to make quick decisions, rapidly moving from one thing to the

next, allowing external stimuli to determine what's next. Seeking solitude, waiting on God, and allowing the Holy Spirit to guide becomes a vital component of living a life of faith in today's connected world.

The location that Jesus returns to is noteworthy; it is where He was baptized and where the voice of the Lord descended upon Him. For Christians today, this highlights the importance of periodically returning to the place where we experienced the presence of God, where God speaks to us—a space where we can be encouraged (Barclay, 2001). Govett (1881) explains that the crossing of the Jordan put a strong barrier between Jesus and His adversaries, which allowed Him a space of solitude to rest. Barclay (2001) explains that the location where Jesus retreated to is a pleasant place for Him; it is the spot where He heard the voice of the Lord assuring Him about His decision and letting Him know that He was on the right path. Kelly (1898) states that the religious leaders desired to apprehend Jesus by force, and He removed himself to across the Jordan not because the belief of the religious leaders was lacking but rather because His time had not yet come. Through God's grace, He converts many people who observe in Him the truth of John's testimony. Before Jesus was to exert himself, he armed himself with alone time with God; he removed himself to the other side of the Jordan to prepare for the final battle, not to run away from what was the current one (Barclay, 2001). A key component to leadership is providing direction and purpose for the organization and its people. In a connected world that asks for quick decisions, it is necessary for Christian leaders to maintain a space of solitude that eases their minds and provides them with a comfortable space to process direction.

As Jesus in John 10:39–42 calls on the reflective leader to balance decisions and wait on God's timing, we gain an understanding of the importance of reflection for leaders in an organization. Research completed by Doohan (2007) shows that a reflective and non-discriminatory leader is essential to an organization, highlighting the importance of a leader who seeks solitude while waiting on God's direction. Burger (1995) describes how short periods of solitude provide emotional renewal before engaging in interpersonal communication. Leaders who are thoughtfully processing decisions, contemplating their followers' opinions, and deliberately navigating differing outcomes in different situations are vital to the overall health and success of an organization (Doohan, 2007). As followers of Jesus and leaders within our respective callings, we thoughtfully and

reflectively make decisions for the betterment of our followers and organizations. Taking time away from life's distractions and finding a space of quiet solitude to process allows a leader to respond to external stimuli rather than simply react.

According to DeGrosky (2011), vision or forward-thinking is necessary to leadership, as is the ability to self-reflect, concentrate on one's work, read without interruption, and participate in extended conversation with another individual. McKinney (2017) explains that solitude helps eliminate or deemphasize distractions, helping a leader intuitively clarify their analytical thoughts. According to Byrd and Thomas (2019), solitude encourages leaders to self-reflect on the difficulties of leadership without the fear of judgment. Adelman (2014) explains that the benefits of solitude include freedom from social impulsion and interaction, providing a space to gain harmony with the self and tune one's moral compass.

Leary et al. (2003) provide research through the lens of healthy solitude—spending time alone for personal development—versus the desire to isolate from other people. Leary et al. (2003) detail in their research that the frequency with which a person immerses themselves in solitary spaces and whether they enjoy solitude is attributed to an individual's personal preference toward solitude rather than to any unwillingness to engage in social interactions. Long et al. (2003) state that not all people find solitude beneficial, understanding that a psychological metamorphosis toward engaging in activities that require solitude would intimidate some rather than encourage them. Akrivou et al. (2011) found that only a person who chooses to embrace solitude—not imposed or sanctioned but decided upon deliberately and voluntarily—benefits inwardly and outwardly from the space. Leary et al. (2003) also state that a person's willingness to engage in solitary activities came more from understanding solitude as a space for personal development rather than from a desire to teach interpersonal interactions.

For today's leaders, waiting is like torture. Today's information-age leader would rather do anything but wait. Decisions are made quickly, on the fly, and this is encouraged by a fast-paced society. Harris (2017) states that solitude is useful for cultivating new ideas, inwardly searching and identifying blind spots, and processing one's external relationships. As leaders process direction, casting vision for the future of organizations, a time of waiting is vital. God's calling, and God's timing, will always be God's calling on God's time, not ours. If the Lord has opened a door and provides a path, the door will stay open until He closes it. The world sells

successful leadership as the ability to make quick, microwavable decisions. At the same time, God calls on leaders to seek His direction, processing and praying over the vision for an organization, slowly allowing things to happen on God's timing, much like cooking in a crockpot.

Thapar and Rudman (2019) explain that the benefits of solitude are countless within professions that place a premium on systematic reasoning and on the importance of leaders' examining different styles and methods of personalized solitude. Jesus knew that this was not His path, nor was it God's timing for His death, so He removed himself to prepare for his impending death, the path that God had laid out for him. According to Averill and Long (2003), solitude provides a space that allows a person to partake in personal introspection, which is not provided by our cultural surroundings. Jones (2017) completed a qualitative study on a person's reentry into communal living and found that as each participant moved back into the community after a period of solitude, they did so with a better self-awareness, stating that the time in solitude allowed them to process their life, struggles, and goals within an environment free from external influence and opinions.

Teo et al. (2013) explain that solitude, in contrast to isolation, encourages individuals to attend to the spiritual, emotional, and behavioral needs of themselves and others. Leary et al. (2003) state that the regularity and gratification of spaces of solitude are significantly associated with a desire for solitude rather than a person's introverted personality. Ellerbeck et al. (2014) found that the untaught mind does not enjoy solitude and would instead rather complete a negative task than be alone with its thoughts. Ellerbeck et al. (2014) establish that participants had negative emotions when made to spend 6 to 15 minutes secluded with their thoughts. Ellerbeck et al. (2014) found that these individuals preferred doing routine external tasks, and many chose to administer electric shocks to themselves rather than being isolated with their thoughts.

Foster (1988) states one explanation for people's struggles with solitude is the feeling of helplessness they experience when they've been trained to depend on interpersonal communication to lead others; in essence, people never truly allow God to take control of a situation, and they fail to understand that silence and solitude are intertwined with a person's ability to trust. Long et al. (2003) explain that for a person to find solitude advantageous, they must maintain within themselves the ability to search for meaning in circumstances in which external reinforcements are inadequate. Bonhoeffer (1954) details the importance of a

person's ability to maintain personal margins and enter into both solitude and community in a healthy balance to receive God's unconditional love. With information and scheduling overload, today's leaders feel like they always have to be doing something; they always have to be connected, easily reached, and available. Christian leaders have to relearn how to embrace solitude.

*Principle Three: For Christian leaders in a connected world, solitude allows leaders the time and space they need to work through God's direction for their lives and the organizations they are leading.*

### JOHN 21:15–19 SOLITUDE WITH TRUSTED OTHERS ABOUT FORWARD MISSION

Kelly (1898) explains how within this secluded conversation, Jesus restores to Peter the freedom and authority to teach the Gospel, publicly announcing in front of six other disciples that the public denial of Jesus has been forgiven. Such a restoration was needed for both Peter and the disciples so they would know that the weight of sin is not a reason for abandoning the spread of the Gospel. Within this private interaction, Jesus entrusted Peter with authority over the ministry, and Peter does not defer to the other disciples to act as an intercessor for him, even going as far as to seek information from Jesus on behalf of the others, all while John remained silent (Chrysostom, 1856). Milne (1993) explains that Jesus addresses Peter in this private interaction as “Simon, son of John,” not “Peter, the rock of my church” because Jesus is showing him that on his own, Simon will always be Simon, but the Simon who trusts Jesus is Peter the rock, a pillar on whom the early church will rely for leadership and direction. The breakfast on the beach in John 21:15–19 leads to an interaction between Jesus and Peter where a select few are present, allowing Jesus to communally reestablish Peter after the public dishonor of his denials (Milne, 1993). Christian leaders exemplifying the character traits of Jesus identify with his ability to navigate the forward mission of the Gospel with Peter and the disciples. Bringing trusted others into private spaces of solitude to process organizational goals, struggles, and issues allows them the opportunity, much like Peter, to be forgiven for past mistakes while encouraged for the future mission.

Jesus publicly restores Peter and commissions him with His authority, knowing that the other disciples would have doubts about a man who had, despite a warning, fully denied the Lord (Chrysostom, 1856). Jesus'



closing words to Peter, “Follow me,” not only invite Peter to interact with him intimately, but they connect the process of discipleship to Jesus’ original call in John 1:43; they challenge Peter to continually seek a relationship with Jesus until his impending martyrdom, inviting each of us, during our times of doubt, to remain resilient in our pursuit of Jesus (Carson, 1991). During this private interaction, Jesus is encouraging Peter, entrusting him with the authority of the ministry, showing him that in the impending struggles, he must remain steadfast because his denial of Jesus had been completely forgiven (Chrysostom, 1856). Kruse (2003) explains that during this private interaction with the disciples, Jesus, in commissioning Peter, asks him whether he loved him more than these, and Peter’s response becomes a public declaration of his love for Jesus that supersedes his public denial. Jesus responds, “Feed my lambs.” Maintaining a posture of humility and treating others as we would like to be treated provides leaders with the insight to privately address public mistakes, much like Jesus does with Peter, before making public statements regarding the organization’s future.

When the time comes for leaders to build up and encourage employees in order to direct the organization, the leader seeks a space for solitude with trusted others to communicate the organizational vision, as Jesus did in John 21:15–29. Littman-Ovadia (2019) states that communal living must be balanced with solitude, understanding that healthy relationships cannot exist without solitude or space where one can reflect with themselves and trusted others. Leading (2017) emphasizes the importance of solitude, both professionally and personally, and how we, as leaders, are continuously required to make quick decisions while Jesus challenges us to stop, reflect, process, and discern with quiet time alone and with others.

According to Detrixhe (2011), a person’s willingness to live within the community works in harmony with their ability to seek solitude for personal development. 800 CEO (2017) states that solitude provides a leader with space for clarity, conviction, courage, and necessary self-reflection to understand the consequences of our actions. Greenleaf (1996) states that servant leaders require a space for solitude where they can self-reflect and understand themselves and others on a deeper level. Buchholz (1998) explains that solitude is boundless, encourages our circumstances, polishes our thoughts, provides a space for relaxation, and encourages the innovation of inventive ideas for ourselves and others.

Solitude provides an ability to enter a space of self-reflection, whether in nature, a monastery, another environment, or with God, through prayer (Averill & Long, 2003). Littman-Ovadia (2019) defines solitude as a return to one's inner self, allowing a person to experience sources of understanding and truth beyond themselves. Burger (1995) states that solitude provides leaders with space to contemplate the self, reflect on past events, and prepare for future endeavors. Rather than distancing from interpersonal communication and isolating oneself, solitude should be seen as a valued space for self-reflection that increases the personal development of leaders, allowing them to find an internal balance of introspection and community (Durà-Vilà & Leavey, 2017). According to Teo et al. (2013), a leader who strives to maintain periods of self-reflection interlaced with spaces of interpersonal communication with trusted others will gain the ability to maintain balance between solitude and community.

*Principle Four: As leaders in today's fast-paced culture, we have a responsibility to exemplify the spiritual discipline of Jesus by seeking solitude with trusted others. This happens by removing ourselves and others to a space of reflection.*

## SUMMARY

According to Coplan and Bowker (2014), solitude provides leaders with a space to contemplate and understand the underlying sources of value within their life and to examine the self without the distraction of outside influences. Harris (2017) states that solitude is useful for an individual cultivating new ideas, inwardly searching and identifying blind spots, and processing one's external relationships. Saint Anthony of Egypt explained that the person who abides in solitude and quiet is delivered from fighting three battles: hearing, speech, and sight. He believed that after that, there remains one thing for a person to battle: the heart.

Collins et al. (2017) state that solitude must be built into a leader's life by intentionally designating certain amounts of time when nothing will be scheduled in their calendar. Byrd and Thomas (2019) state that solitude encourages reflection, which is a conduit to effective interpersonal communication. Adelman (2014) states that solitude allows one's mind to experience revelations, garden creative observations, and maintain space for forward-thinking, inventive ideas. Teo et al. (2013) state that momentary periods of self-reflection are highly therapeutic and help a person fix his or her attention on a present situation and reduce anxiety. According

to Durà-Vilà and Leavey (2017), solitude is an essential element for an intimate relationship with Christ and does not lead to isolation. Rather, it serves as a medium for a person to commune with the Holy Spirit.

The world will always force us to act in ways contrary to God's calling. The devil constantly tried to remove Jesus from His path through deception, promising glory here on Earth. For today's Christian leaders, when the world attempts to force us to act in a manner contrary to God's calling for our life, we must process and respond rather than haphazardly react on emotion. According to Harris (2017), solitude is not the attempt to remove oneself from society but a discipline that provides a person with the ability to inwardly contemplate ideas, the self, and external stimuli in an effort to respond to dealings in a healthy manner. As Christian leaders, we do not serve for accolades, or strive to achieve power on this earth. We mirror Jesus, maintaining a posture of humility, serving others, and remaining steadfast to the calling God laid on our hearts. Doing so is not easy, knowing that the world will attempt to make you something you are not. By processing our calling and the direction of God's path for our lives and by being intentional about removing ourselves from the distractions of the world, finding a quiet space to reconnect with God becomes a vital component to today's decision-making leaders.

## DISCUSSION QUESTIONS

1. When is the last time you sought solitude, and what was the motivation behind it?
2. Can you identify some spaces of solitude within your life?
3. What threatens or competes for your attention? What are some things that you would have to eliminate from your schedule to practice solitude?
4. What practices have you learned to employ to record your spiritual journey to access a greater understanding of yourself and those you lead?
5. Are you drawn more to solitude or community, knowing that too much of either is unhealthy for a leader?
6. What would it look like to practice solitude together in a community of believers?

## REFERENCES

- Adelman, M. (2014). Kindred spirits in teaching contemplative practice: Distraction, solitude, and simplicity. In *Contemplative learning and inquiry across disciplines* (pp. 51–67). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Akrivou, K., Bourantas, D., Mo, S., & Papalois, E. (2011). The sound of silence—A space for morality? The role of solitude for ethical decision making. *Journal of Business Ethics, 102*(1), 119–133.
- Aquinas, T. (1845). *Catena Aurea: Commentary on the four Gospels, collected out of the works of the Fathers: St. John* (Vol. 4, p. 217). Oxford: John Henry Parker.
- Averill, J. R., & Long, C. R. (2003). Solitude: An exploration of benefits of being alone. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behavior, 33*(1), 21–44.
- Averill, J. R., Long, C. R., More, T. A., & Seburn, M. (2003). Solitude experiences: Varieties, settings, and individual differences. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 29*, 578–583.
- Barclay, W. (2001). *The Gospel of John* (Vol. 1). Edinburgh: Saint Andrew Press.
- Bergmann, I., & Hippler, S. (Eds.). (2018). *Cultures of solitude*. Switzerland: Bern.
- Bonhoeffer, D. (1954). *Life together*. San Francisco: Harper and Row.
- Bowker, J. C., & Coplan, R. J. (2014). *The handbook of solitude: Psychological perspectives on social isolation, social withdrawal, and being alone*. Somerset: Wiley.
- Bratman, G. N., Daily, G. C., Gross, J. J., Hahn, K. S., & Hamilton, J. P. (2015). Nature experience reduces rumination and subgenual prefrontal cortex activation. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 112*(28), 8567–8572.
- Briner, B., & Pritchard, R. (1997). *The leadership lessons of Jesus*. B&H Publishing Group.
- Buchholz, E. (1998). The call of solitude. *Psychology Today, 31*(1), 50–54, 80–82.
- Burger, J. M. (1995). Individual differences in preference for solitude. *Journal of Research in Personality, 29*(1), 85–108.
- Burton-Christie, D. (2003). The work of loneliness: Solitude, emptiness, and compassion. *Anglican Theological Review, 88*(1), 25–45.
- Byrd, H. J., & Thomas, A. R. (2019). Overcoming the “Distraction dilemma”: The effects of solitude on leadership capacity Scholarly Commons. *Atlantic Journal of Communication, 28*(1), 68–83.
- Carson, D. A. (1991). *The Gospel according to John*. Leicester, England; Grand Rapids, MI: Inter-Varsity Press; W.B. Eerdmans.
- Chrysostom, J. S. (1856). *The homilies of St. John chrysostom, archbishop of Constantinople, on the statues; or, to the people of Antioch, translated with notes and indices*. J. H. Parker, 1856.

- Collins, J., Erwin, M. S., & Kethledge, R. M. (2017). *Lead yourself first: Inspiring leadership through solitude*. New York: Bloomsbury Publishing, USA.
- Coplan, R. J., & Bowker, J. C. (2014). *The handbook of solitude: Psychological perspectives on social isolation, social withdrawal, and being alone*. Somerset: Wiley, Incorporated.
- DeGrosky, M. (2011). Solitude, focus and relationships. *Wildfire*, 20(5), 10.
- Deresiewicz, W. (2010). Solitude and leadership. *American Scholar*, 79(2), 20–31.
- Detrixhe, J. J. (2011). *Solitude's paradox: The role of object relations and attachment in the capacity to be alone* (Doctoral dissertation, Long Island University, The Brooklyn Center).
- Doohan, L. (2007). Spiritual leadership and reflection. *The International Journal of Servant-Leadership*, 3(1), 281–301.
- Durà-Vilà, G., & Leavey, G. (2017). Solitude among contemplative cloistered nuns and monks: Conceptualisation, coping and benefits of spiritually motivated solitude. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture*, 20(1), 45–60.
- Ellerbeck, N., Gilbert, D. T., Hahn, C., Wilson, T. D., Reinhard, D. A., Shaked, A., & Westgate, E. C. (2014). Just think: The challenges of the disengaged mind. *Science*, 345(6192), 75–77.
- Embracing solitude. (2017). *Marin Independent Journal*. Retrieved from <http://eres.regent.edu/2048/login?url=https://www-proquest-com.ezproxy.regent.edu/docview/2112752194?accountid=13479>.
- Erwin, M. S., & Kethledge, R. M. (2017). *Lead yourself first: Inspiring leadership through solitude*. USA: Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Foster, R. J. (1988). *Celebration of discipline: The path to spiritual growth*. San Francisco: Harper & Row.
- Govett, R. (1881). *Exposition of the Gospel of St. John* (Vol. 1). London: Bemrose & Sons.
- Greenleaf, R. K. (1996). *On becoming a servant leader*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc.
- Harris, M. (2017). *Solitude: In pursuit of a singular life in a crowded world*. NY: Saint Martin's Press.
- Hetzel, J., & Castillo, D. P. (2014). *Why rest, retreat, Sabbath, and solitude*. *CSE*, 18(2). Retrieved from <http://www.omagdigital.com/article/Why-Rest%2C-Retreat%2C-Sabbath%2C-and-Solitude-Are-Essential-Disciplines-for-the-Christian-Educator/1892991/240357/article.html>.
- Jamieson, R., Fausset, A. R., & Brown, D. (1997). *Commentary critical and explanatory on the whole Bible* (Vol. 2). Oak Harbor, WA: Logos Research Systems, Inc.
- Jones, S. E. (2017). *An exploration of individuals' transition from prolonged solitude to society: A generic qualitative inquiry* (Doctoral dissertation, Capella University). ProQuest Dissertations Publishing. 10283673.

- Kelly, W. (1898). *An exposition of the Gospel of John*. London: T. Weston.
- Kethledge, R. M., & Erwin, M. S. (2017). *Lead yourself first: Inspiring leadership through solitude*. USA: Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Kruse, C. G. (2003). *John: An introduction and commentary*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.
- Leary, M. R., Herbst, K. C., & McCrary, F. (2003). Finding pleasure in solitary activities: Desire for aloneness or disinterest in social contact? *Personality and Individual Differences*, 35(1), 59–68.
- Lincoln, A. T. (2005). *The Gospel according to Saint John*. London: Continuum.
- Littman-Ovadia, H. (2019). Doing-being and relationship–Solitude: A proposed model for a balanced life. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 20(6), 1953–1971.
- Long, C. R., Seburn, M., Averill, J. R., & More, T. A. (2003). Solitude experiences: Varieties, settings, and individual differences. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 29, 578–583.
- Maslach, C., & Cooke, R. A. (2000). *Manual: Maslach burnout inventory*. Consulting Psychologist Press.
- McKinney, M. (2017). *Leading blog: 4 things solitude will do for you*. Chatham: Newstex. Retrieved from [https://www.leadershipnow.com/leadingblog/2017/08/4\\_things\\_solitude\\_will\\_do\\_for.html](https://www.leadershipnow.com/leadingblog/2017/08/4_things_solitude_will_do_for.html).
- Merton, T. (1958). *Thoughts on solitude*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Milne, B. (1993). *The message of John: Here is your king!: With study guide*. Leicester, England; Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.
- Morton, J. (2015). *Spiritual practices and effective Christian leadership*. Retrieved from <https://place.asburyseminary.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1883&context=ecommonsatsdissertations>.
- Nouwen, H. (1995). Moving from solitude to community to ministry. *Leadership*, 16(2), 81–87.
- Okoroafor, C. (2019). Hearing the voice of God. *The Guardian*. Retrieved from <https://guardian.ng/sunday-magazine/ibru-ecumenical-centre/hearing-the-voice-of-god/>.
- Pink, A. W. (1923–1945). *Exposition of the Gospel of John* Swengel, PA: Bible Truth Depot.
- Plummer, R. L. (2009). Are the spiritual disciplines of “Silence and solitude” really biblical? *Journal of Spiritual Formation and Soul Care*, 2(1), 101–112.
- Storr, A. (1988). *Solitude: A return to the self*. New York: Free Press.
- Teo, A. R., Stufflebam, K. W., & Kato, T. A. (2013). *The intersection of culture and solitude*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Thapar, A. R., & Rudman, S. (2019). *Solitude, leadership, and lawyers*. Ann Arbor: Michigan Law Review Association.
- Westcott, B. F., & Westcott, A. (Eds.). (1908). *The Gospel according to St. John Introduction and notes on the Authorized version*. London: J. Murray.



## Jesus as a Transformational Leader

*Kenneth S. Dixon*

In today's contexts that require leadership, different leadership styles are in use by leaders. These contexts in which leaders practice their leadership can be a myriad of places and situations. These places and situations can be on a continuum from the military, police departments, secondary school systems to universities, a city's sanitation workforce, and many organizations producing goods and services in a global environment. All of these organizations, regardless of what type they are, require leadership to get things done. Leaders cannot do all of the work; they must have people who work with them to get things done. This chapter will refer to these people as followers. So, leaders need followers, and followers need leaders (Northouse, 2019). Leaders and followers must come together at some juncture to get things done. Northouse (2019) gives the following definition for leadership, "Leadership is a process whereby an individual influences a group of individuals to achieve a common goal (p. 5)." While meeting the previous definition requirements and getting the best results while maintaining a wholesome relationship between leaders and

---

K. S. Dixon (✉)  
Regent University, Virginia Beach, VA, USA  
e-mail: [kdixon@kdixonleadership.com](mailto:kdixon@kdixonleadership.com)

© The Author(s), under exclusive license to Springer Nature  
Switzerland AG 2021

J. D. Henson (ed.), *Biblical Organizational Leadership*,  
Christian Faith Perspectives in Leadership and Business,  
[https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-69929-1\\_13](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-69929-1_13)

followers, leaders need a leadership style to do just that. To fill that need, this is where transformational leadership comes in.

Transformational leaders focus on motivating their followers to excel in doing more than what the followers initially intended to do or even thought that was possible to do, and it is one of the most encompassing leadership styles available (Allen et al., 2017; Bass & Bass, 2008; Bonsu & Twum-Danso, 2018; Matzler et al., 2015; Tabassi & Bakar, 2010). Transformational leaders inspire their followers to accomplish remarkable things by understanding and adapting to their followers' motives and needs (Northouse, 2019). Transformational leaders' characteristics receive recognition as change agents, role models, creating and communicating a clear vision for organizations, empowering followers to meet higher criteria, and being trustworthy (Allen et al., 2017; Northouse, 2019). In the article entitled *The Power of Transformational Leadership* (2013), the author lists the following five things that one must do to become a transformational leader: listen, communicate, care, be collegial, and engage. Transformational leadership is more than and is different from transactional leadership. Transactional leadership rewards followers with something for meeting certain conditions, standards, or criteria, i.e., this for that (Bass & Bass, 2008). But outstanding leadership must be focused on more than just getting things done or using people without focusing on followers' needs. Frankly, followers are such an essential part of the equation, which is why transformational leadership is so great. Transformational leaders can accomplish an array of goals in so many areas, such as in urban development, politics, and in the context of many types of organizations (Brouer et al., 2016; Rada, 1999). Transformational leadership can virtually exist in every work scenario (Hamad, 2015). Four factors of transformational leadership make this leadership so unique. The four factors are idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration (Jung et al., 1995; Morkevičiūtė et al., 2019).

There are some advantages and disadvantages to transformational leadership. The advantages of this leadership style makes it quite popular for leaders to implement. Because transformational leadership emphasizes followers and their relationship to leaders, it is regarded as a process (Northouse, 2019). This process is much like the definition of leadership in the paragraph above. Because of transformational leadership between leaders and followers, the theory emphasizes followers' needs and interests



(Burns, 1978). Transformational leadership is what is needed in organizations today as a leadership paradigm. Transformational leadership sets the standard for the leadership style called for by organizations and followers for leaders to implement (Dartey-Baah, 2015). Transformational leadership is also one of the most effective leadership styles (Louw et al., 2017; Northouse, 2019). There are some shortcomings of transformational leadership that calls for the reader to remain cognizant. Transformational leadership can be used in the wrong way by leaders (Northouse, 2019). Stein (2013) asserts that transformational leadership can be used adversely for cultic motives, i.e., the dynamics of groups claiming a status of independence and differences in power between the organizations' leadership and their followers are opposing to the characteristics of transformational leadership. Transformational leadership can be abused (Northouse, 2019). The characteristics of transformational leadership closely mirror that of charismatic leadership. Transformational leadership's charismatic nature, beliefs, values, and vision must continually and adequately be assessed and monitored (Northouse, 2019).

### JOHN 3:1–10, 7:50–52, 19:39–42

#### *Genre and Pericope*

A particular Scripture genre is its category or type and it determines how readers will interpret it (Keener, 2003a). From the standpoint of a genre, John's book is one of the four Gospels, a subset of a narrative (Klein et al., 2017). The genre of the Gospel of John has the classification of a biography (Keener, 2003a; Klein et al., 2017). Keener (2003a) explicitly asserts that this Gospel is a historical biography written by a writer in a Hellenistic context. These Hellenistic writers or biographers did not necessarily present a person's life chronologically (Klein et al., 2017). Hellenistic biographers intentionally selected which events of a person's life they included in the narrative to advocate certain ideologies or teach moral lessons (Klein et al., 2017). Genres identified give revelations of essential intentions the author(s) aimed at conveying to the original audience (Keener, 2003a). These writers also focused on a person's death because they closely believed that how a person died revealed a person's character (Klein et al., 2017).

The pericope of John 3:1–10 is Jesus' first expositional revelation in the Gospel of John (Brown, 1966a). It encapsulates the principal themes of

what is revealed by Jesus (Brown, 1966a). This discourse contains Jesus' conversation with Nicodemus regarding the born again experience and the kingdom of God (Brown, 1966a). This antecedent makes the transition from those who responded to Jesus' signs as recorded in the last few verses of John 2 to Nicodemus presented in John 3, whose incomplete faith responded to Jesus' signs performed in Jerusalem at the Passover feast (Keener, 2003a).

The pericope of John 7:50–52 establishes a different setting, as Jesus is not physically there. Here, the priests and Pharisees assembled and were annoyed by the people's developed division among themselves (Keener, 2003a). Keener (2003a) asserts this elite group comforted themselves in knowing that none of their own had placed trust in Jesus. Little did this group know, at this juncture of the gospel story, Nicodemus had believed. After this group of Jewish leaders questioned who among themselves had believed in Jesus, Nicodemus speaks up to his group, attempting to be fair on the part of Jesus (Keener, 2003a). The group dismisses Nicodemus' question, and the meeting adjourns with all departing to their own homes.

In John 19:39–42, by this time, Jesus is dead, and his burial is going on. If there was a question about Nicodemus' faith in Jesus, he now, at this time, shows more fidelity than the disciples who had been with Jesus for the last three or more years (Keener, 2003b). Critics who claim that Nicodemus was a secret ally or disciple would have to acknowledge Nicodemus' overt service to the burial of Jesus (Keener, 2003b). Joseph of Arimathea, who makes the cameo debut appearance at this juncture in this Gospel, and whose appearance contrasts to the 11 disciples who became secret disciples after the death of Jesus because of their fear of the Jews (Keener, 2003b). Ironically, Nicodemus' first appearance in John's Gospel was in the dark while it was yet night; now, he appears in the light during the day (Keener, 2003b).

The discussion of Nicodemus in the Gospel of John, first in discourse with Jesus, then defending Jesus, and finally helping bury the body of Jesus, are essential parts of Scripture. However, this analysis intends to spotlight the leader-follower relationship between Jesus and Nicodemus (Northouse, 2019). The salient point to derive from this historical-grammatical exegetical analysis of John 3:1–21, 7:45–52, and 19:38–42 is Nicodemus' ascending status as a believer and disciple of Jesus.

### *Historical and Cultural Background*

Ancient biographers aimed to present their work to be more historical rather than having similarities to novels (Keener, 2003a). Since modern critical scholarship began, the thought and linguistics of the Gospel of John have continually induced the pursuit of the cultural and religious context of the composition of the Gospel of John (Frey, 2012). According to Keener (2003a), the Gospel of John assumes that its audience possessed a certain level of competence of Jewish culture; however, not all of the audience had this competence. Below is a discourse of authorship, date, audience, purpose, and themes about historical and cultural background.

### *Authorship, Date, and Audience*

Within scholarly circles, the authorship of the Gospel of John remains unclear (Keener, 2003a). However, many scholars continue to purport that John wrote the Gospel (Keener, 2003a). Others claim the beloved disciple wrote the Gospel, which tradition points to the Apostle John by whom the Gospel is named (Keener, 2003a). Referencing John 19:35 and 1:14, tradition points to these scriptures as internal evidence that John wrote this Gospel (Keener, 2003a). Besides, no consensus has been reached on the beloved disciple being the author (Keener, 2003a). Keener (2003a) asserts that if John's recording of the Gospel can be compatible with the synoptic gospels, the author can be no one else except for Zebedee's Son, John (Keener, 2003a). Brown (1966a) posits, after considering the external evidence, internal evidence, and tests of John as the author with a modern compositional theory, none of these proposals give an absolute certainty that John was the actual author of the Gospel of John. The most plausible possibility is the combination of external and internal evidence that points to John (Brown, 1966a). Munn (1994) asserted unless incontestable evidence appears, John should not be ruled out as the absolute author. The Gospel historicity is questionable whenever the authorship of John is forsaken (Munn, 1994). Ellis (1988) asserts the time frame of the writing of the Gospel of John should date within the first two decades of the second century. Brown (1966a) posits a general opinion of the latest date range of A.D. 100–110 (100–110 C.E.) for writing the Gospel of John. A Greek-speaking audience is to whom this Gospel

was written to include the aristocrats in Jerusalem, indicated by the word-play throughout the book (Keener, 2003a). Pertaining to the audience, Brown (1966a) posits the possibility that the Gospel of John was originally written in Aramaic either in part or in its entirety; however, the text eventually was written in Greek. Keener (2003a) holds that approximately two-thirds of the Jewish writings and letters in Palestine were in Greek, but among the Hellenized aristocrats, it would be Greek.

### *Purpose and Themes*

The Gospel of John's purpose is expressed explicitly within its Scripture. John 20:30 indicates Jesus did a large number of other signs, but those signs are not recorded in the Gospel of John. This preceding verse introduces the next revelatory verse, which says, "but these are written so that you may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that by believing you may have life in his name" (John 20:31, ESV). In this verse lies the purpose of the Gospel of John (Keener, 2003a). Brown (1966a) proposes the following four possible reasons why the Gospel of John was written: (1) "Apologetic against the sectarians of John the Baptist"; (2) "Argument with the Jews"; (3) "Arguments against Christian heretics"; and (4) "Encouragement to believing Christians, Gentiles, and Jews" (pp. LXVII–LXXVIII).

Regarding the theme for the Gospel of John, Wu (2019) asserts the theme of new creation resounds throughout the Gospel of John. Yet Jojko (2019) posits that the Gospel of John has the two themes of life and faith, which shows linkage to John 20:31. Keener (2003a) lists five themes for the Gospel of John, which are: (1) Realized Eschatology, (2) Love, (3) Faith, (4) Life, and (5) the World.

### *Linguistic Study: Grammar, Semantics, and Syntax*

The historical-grammatical exegetical analysis of John 3:1–10, 7:50–52, and 19:39–42 follows Osborne's linguistic analysis method (2006). This study analyzes the grammar, semantics, and syntax as much as necessary to ascertain the author's intentional meaning. Before the hearer received the original message, the context's meaning from which the pericope was taken had to be determined (Osborne, 2006). There are specific terms within the pericope that should be highlighted to receive a more profound analysis (Osborne, 2006). A methodology will determine the semantics

allowing the meaning to derive from the context to be congruent with the intended contextual message and determines the theological meaning of the word (Osborne, 2006). This practical method first determines the pericope keywords that possess theological significance, connected to the purpose, is vital to the context, and is repeated or is thematic (Osborne, 2006). The analysis and identification of essential words and phrases have evolved into themes from John 3:1–10, 7:50–52, and 19:39–42.

### ANALYSIS OF JOHN 3:1–10, 7:50–52, 19:39–42

#### *The Leader Attempts to Take the Follower to a Higher Level—John 3:1–10*

John 3:1 states, “Now there was a man of the Pharisees named Nicodemus, a ruler of the Jews” (ESV). Brown (1966a) notes that the first word in the chapter, “Now,” links the beginning of this chapter with John 2:23–25. The use of the word “man” in that phrase could refer to the end of 2:25, indicating Jesus already knows what is in man’s heart (Brown, 1966a; Keener, 2003a). The author uses the phrase “a man of the Pharisees” to refer to Nicodemus being a Pharisee (Brown, 1966a; Keener, 2003a). Brown (1966a) asserts that Nicodemus represents a particular sect of the Jewish leaders who cautiously came to believe in Jesus, and “a ruler,” i.e., a member of the Sanhedrin, the ruling body of the Jews, is also ascribed to Nicodemus (pp. 533–534).

John 3:2 reads as, “This man came to Jesus by night and said to him, ‘Rabbi, we know that you are a teacher come from God, for no one can do these signs that you do unless God is with him’” (ESV). Nicodemus has come to Jesus during the night, addressing him as Rabbi, then using the pronoun of we and acknowledging that Jesus is a teacher come from God because of the signs that he performs. Brown (1966a) posits that Nicodemus coming to Jesus during the night symbolizes untruth and ignorance. It could be that the visit at night by Nicodemus may have been to evade the Jews because of fear or to associate Nicodemus to the custom of Rabbis staying up during the night to study the Law (Brown, 1966a). Keener (2003a) proposes Nicodemus sets the stage for the remainder of the conversation by his starting point of “Rabbi, we know . . .” thus identifying himself to a group that claims to know more than what they actually know. The phrase “we know” is described as the plural form and collective speech used by Nicodemus (Brown, 1966a, p. 130). By

Nicodemus suggesting that Jesus is “a teacher come from God,” Keener (2003a) posits this is a phrase that the audience would be familiar with the author’s style of writing and would equate this to claim that Jesus is “from above” (p. 534). The perspective of the Pharisees conceding that prophets being scarce or gone may have given Nicodemus this impression of the signs worked by Jesus (Keener, 2003a). The phrase “no one can” contains the verb (*dynasthai*), and it means merely “can,” which appears six times in verses 2–10 (Brown, 1966a, p. 130).

John 3:3 states, “Jesus answered him, ‘Truly, truly, I say to you, unless one is born again he cannot see the kingdom of God’” (ESV). In this verse, Jesus is speaking now, and this is his first response to Nicodemus. The verb “born” is the passive of the verb (*gennan*), which can mean either “to be born” of a feminine nature or the verb “to be begotten” of a masculine nature; thus, there are no feminine attributes to the Spirit located anywhere in the Gospels (Brown, 1966a, p. 130). Brown (1966a) asserts that in this Gospel, the born again experience is the idea of begotten rather than being born (p. 130). The verb “see” has the connotation of “to experience, encounter, participate in” (Brown, 1966a, p. 130). Keener (2003a) posits that “see” means to understand in this context (p. 537). The synonymous expression of this word in verse 5 “enter” however suggests that possibly the verb “see” reveals a better relationship between Jesus’ revelation and the kingdom; that must be “seen, accepted, believed” (Brown, 1966a, p. 130). Mounce (2007) asserts to see the kingdom of God means to experience the entrance into and participate in God’s final establishment of God’s sovereign rule on earth, i.e., to experience the resurrected life during the end of time.

Jesus provided and displayed such a powerful influence when people saw him. He was such a strong role model in people’s presence that many believed in his name when they saw the signs he did that they wanted to emulate him and inquire about him, which is why Nicodemus came to Jesus.

Transformational leaders possess the factor and quality of idealized influence. Sahibzada et al. (2016) assert that leaders who exhibit idealized influence are acknowledged and accepted as role models by followers, and they act as coaches to these followers. These leaders’ ethical and moral standards are highly superior and can be trusted to practice the right things (Northouse, 2019). Langat et al. (2019a) assert that idealized influence applies the emotional component of leadership, enabling these leaders to be role models, possess respect for their followers, and

demonstrate trustworthy ethical behavior. Followers' respect for these leaders is great, and they are willing to place their trust in these leaders (Northouse, 2019). Arunima et al. (2014) posit that charisma proceeds forth from these leaders. These leaders strengthen the confidence, affirm the loyalty, provide the shared vision, and inspire the purpose for these followers (Arunima et al., 2014). Otieno et al. (2019) assert that idealized influence instills confidence, emphasizes the most salient beliefs and values, determines when change is needed, provides vision, and motivates followers to exceed expectations above their initial expectation.

*Principle One: Transformational leaders provide the necessary influence to be strong role models for their followers.*

John 3:4 states, "Nicodemus said to him, 'How can a man be born when he is old? Can he enter a second time into his mother's womb and be born?'" (ESV)? By Nicodemus' question, he thought Jesus meant to be born again physically, but the meaning intended by Jesus in this verse was being born "from above" (Brown, 1966a, p. 130). That is, the Greek word (*anōthen*) that has a double meaning of "again" and "from above," which could attribute to Nicodemus' misunderstanding (Brown, 1966a, p. 130). Nicodemus thought Jesus meant being born "again," however, Jesus primarily meant being born from "above" (Brown, 1966a, p. 130). Keener (2003a) posits that the religious leaders of Jesus' earthly days understood him only partly, i.e., only in a natural or physical sense (Keener, 2003a). Keener (2003a) intimates that even Jesus' disciples who were around him regularly did not always understand him fully at times either.

John 3:5 states, "Jesus answered, 'Truly, truly, I say to you, unless one is born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter the kingdom of God'" (ESV). Here, Jesus responds to Nicodemus' question. Brown (1966a) asserts the phrase "of water and the Spirit" parallels to that of Matthew 1:20; which alludes to the angel of the Lord appearing to Joseph about Mary's pregnancy, pointing out that which is "conceived" in her is from the Holy Spirit (ESV). Keener (2003a) posits a way to read within this context is to reckon that it refers to the natural birth; thus, the following verse expounds more upon this concept that there must be two birth experiences, the natural and the spiritual. Pamment (1983) points out that John 3:5 is not referring directly or indirectly to water baptism but to a person experiencing being made a new creature by the direct work of the Spirit of God. This verse highlights again the phrase "kingdom of

God,” which harmoniously pairs with the “kingdom of God” in verse 3 (Brown, 1966a, p. 131).

John 3:6 states, “That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit” (ESV). Jesus continues to expound here to Nicodemus’ question. The writer of the Gospel of John highlights the morality and weakness of the creation, and the Spirit as the agent of divine power and life enclosed within frail human vessels (Brown, 1966a, p. 131). The surrounding and relative verses that refer to being born and born again, the part of the verse which refers to “the flesh is flesh,” would mean being born naturally (Keener, 2003a, p. 547). Thus, the part of the verse, which refers to “the Spirit is spirit,” would mean being born again (Keener, 2003a, p. 547). Grese (1988) highlights Jesus made it his purpose to explain the concept of being born again to Nicodemus.

The next verse of John 3:7 states, “Do not marvel that I said to you, ‘You must be born again’” (ESV). Jesus encourages Nicodemus not to be amazed (Keener, 2003a). Brown (1966a) posits that the “Do not marvel” phrase is a Rabbinical expression (p. 131). The first pronoun “you” is singular, but the second “You” in this verse as in “You must be born again” is plural, in which Jesus is addressing a wider audience than just that of Nicodemus (Brown, 1966a, p. 131). When Nicodemus first approached Jesus that night, he started with “Rabbi we know ...” so Jesus, through the person of Nicodemus, addresses this broader audience to address the “we” (Brown, 1966a, p. 131).

John 3:8 reads, “The wind blows where it wishes, and you hear its sound, but you do not know where it comes from or where it goes. So it is with everyone who is born of the Spirit” (ESV). Jesus expounds on the word wind, the Greek word being (*pneuma*), and the Hebrew word for wind is (*ruah*) both have the double meaning of “spirit and wind” (Brown, 1966a, p. 131). From this dual meaning, wind appears to have the more principled meaning of the two (Brown, 1966a, p. 131). The word “sound” literally means “voice” and is a portion of the play on the words; “sound of the wind” and “the voice of the Spirit” (Brown, 1966a, p. 131). The phrase “do not know” refers to the invisible wind’s movement, which owned a divine and mysterious property; thus, primitively, the wind possessed a description of being the breath of God (Brown, 1966a, p. 131).

In John 3:9, the verse reads, “Nicodemus said to him, ‘How can these things be?’” (ESV)? Nicodemus, in his last response in this discourse (Brown, 1966a, p. 131). He asks, “How can these things be” (Keener,



2003a, p. 558). After all that Jesus has explained to Nicodemus, he still does not understand (Keener, 2003a).

John 3:10 reads, “Jesus answered him, ‘Are you the teacher of Israel and yet you do not understand these things?’” (ESV)? Here, Jesus responds to Nicodemus’ inability to comprehend his words with a question, “Are you the teacher ...” (RSV). But Nicodemus’ lack of understanding as one of the “teachers of Israel” is shamefully demonstrated (Keener, 2003a, p. 559). The question-phrase, “yet you do not understand ...” Brown (1966a) asserts Nicodemus could have had a better understanding if he knew the Old Testament Scriptures better (Brown, 1966a, p. 131).

Jesus continued to remain with Nicodemus’ questioning even though Nicodemus could not grasp what Jesus was communicating. Even though Jesus remained patient with Nicodemus, Jesus did not dampen the criteria or standards of the need of being born again before Nicodemus could experience anything more of the kingdom of God. Jesus maintained the requirement of being born again as a prerequisite to participating in the kingdom of God. Jesus sustained his high standards.

Northouse (2019) describes leaders who possess inspirational motivation who convey high expectations to their followers by exciting the followers’ motivation through inspiration to commit to and embrace the organization’s shared vision. These leaders employ an emotional appeal element to synthesize group members’ efforts to achieve more than they would have by pursuing their self-interests for themselves (Northouse, 2019). These leaders exhibit motivation that increases followers’ expectations by the vision, enabling followers to develop their self-confidence in the leader’s vision and meticulously fulfill the vision (Dialoke & Edeh, 2018). Langat et al. (2019b) posit that this transformational leadership factor pertains to creating a vision, developing strategies for bringing the vision to pass, and preparing the vision’s commitment by clearly conveying the vision to followers. Salas-Valline and Fernandez (2017) support that inspirational motivation connotes creating a relationship between leader and followers that change today’s followers into tomorrow’s leaders and today’s leaders into moral representatives.

*Principle Two: Transformational leaders demonstrate the inspirational motivation that communicates high expectations to their followers to embrace and commit to the organization’s shared vision.*

*The Leader Causes the Follower to Think Independently—John 7:50–52*

John 7:50 states, “Nicodemus, who had gone to him before, and who was one of them, said to them” (ESV). Keener (2003a) reminds the reader that it was Nicodemus who had visited Jesus earlier, as indicated in Chapter 3. In the phrase “... who was one of them,” just as Nicodemus came to Jesus by night, the author of John was singling out characters who have been previously identified, i.e., Nicodemus being associated with the Sanhedrin (Brown, 1966a, p. 325).

John 7:51 declares, “Does our law judge a man without first giving him a hearing and learning what he does” (ESV)? Nicodemus asks the other Pharisees a question about the correct judicial proceedings (Keener, 2003a). Brown (1966a) references Exodus 21:3, indicating a judge cannot judge until he or she hears the pleas that a person brings to the court (p. 325). Brown (1966a) posits the phrase “without first giving him a hearing and learning what he does” could be referring to Deuteronomy 1:16, which require judges to hear both sides of a pending case (Brown, 1966a, p. 325).

John 7:52 declares, “They replied, ‘Are you from Galilee too? Search and see that no prophet arises from Galilee’” (ESV). Here, the Pharisees reply to Nicodemus’ question about fair judgment. The phrase “Search and see” represents the standard language for an invitation to search the Scriptures within the Torah (Keener, 2003a, p. 734). The phrase “no prophet” suggests from the most common reading that no prophet would never come from Galilee (Brown, 1966a, p. 325). This claim had not always been the case because Jonah had come from Gathhepher in Galilee’s region (Brown, 1966a, p. 325). Keener (2003a) comes back with a play on words regarding “arising,” wherein he asserts Jesus would not arise in Galilee but a place near Jerusalem, after which these Pharisees, the scribes, and others have lifted the Son of Man (p. 735).

By Nicodemus encountering Jesus and seeing the miracles he did, Nicodemus was stimulated to think on his own, be creative and innovative, and challenge his own values and beliefs to include those of leaders and the organizational context. Nicodemus rose to the challenge of being creative in his thinking and challenging the other members of the Sanhedrin’s status quo.

Regarding transformational leadership, Northouse (2019) asserts that intellectual stimulation is descriptive of leadership that provides the stimulation for followers to be creative and innovative and challenges their

personal beliefs and value systems to include those of the organization's leaders and the organization. This leadership supports followers in developing fresh ways and methods of handling issues with the organization (Northouse, 2019). This support encourages followers to think things independently and provide a deliberate thought to problem-solving (Northouse, 2019). Alexander et al. (2018) posit that intellectual stimulation happens when leaders stimulate followers' efforts to be creative and innovative by challenging suppositions, reworking difficulties, and rethinking old situations in fresh ways. Anjali and Anand (2015) hold that intellectual stimulation is when leaders persuade followers to be creative and innovative in approaching conventional or old problems in new ways. Smothers et al. (2016) hold that intellectual stimulation is when leaders encourage followers to display rational and logical thinking, intelligence, and problem-solving skills.

*Principle Three: Transformational leaders stimulate followers' creativity and innovative capacity to challenge their values and beliefs.*

### *The Follower Honors the Leader—John 19:39–42*

John 19:39 states, “Nicodemus also, who earlier had come to Jesus by night, came bringing a mixture of myrrh and aloes, about seventy-five pounds in weight” (ESV). Nicodemus appears here in John's Gospel for the third time (Brown, 1966b, p. 940). The phrase “Nicodemus also, who earlier had come to Jesus by night,” this being so typical of Johannine style and such are reminders of those who are peculiar to the Johannine tradition (Brown, 1966b, p. 940). The phrase “came bringing” literary means “came bringing” speaks of Nicodemus bringing the spices. The word “mixture,” of which its Greek equivalent is (*magma*), means a compound (Brown, 1966b, p. 940; Wigram, 2002, p. 500). The phrase “of myrrh and aloes” of which “myrrh” or “Smyrna” is a fragrant resin that Egyptians in the embalming; “aloe” is aromatic sandalwood that is powdery which is utilized, not for burial, but for clothing and beddings (Brown, 1966b, p. 940). None of the Synoptic gospels mentioned the spices used for embalming placed in Jesus' tomb on the Friday that Jesus died (Brown, 1966b, p. 940). There is something to be noted about the next phrase, “about seventy-five pounds in weight” (Brown, 1966b, p. 941; Keener, 2003b, p. 1163). Keener (2003b) asserts the Roman pound was about 12 ounces, so the figure in this Scripture was about 75

pounds (Brown, 1966b, p. 941; Keener, 2003b, p. 1163). Some translations of the Bible write it as 100 pounds; the reason being is that the Johannine preference and taste were extravagant at times (Brown, 1966b, p. 941).

The next verse of John 19:40 states, “So they took the body of Jesus and bound it in linen cloths with the spices, as is the burial custom of the Jews” (ESV). The phrase “So they took the body of Jesus” almost sounds like the ending of 19:38, but the verbs are different, which (*lambanein*) here is used (Brown, 1966b, p. 941). Nicodemus participated in taking the body of Jesus and wrapping it in linen with the spices. The next phrase that Brown (1966b) highlights is “as in the burial custom of the Jews,” and it literally means, “custom for burying” (Brown, 1966b, p. 941). However, the author was hardly insinuating that preparation was being made for a burial happening in three days from that time (Brown, 1966b, p. 941). When burying, the Jews did not embalm as the Egyptians did; instead, the Jews washed the body, anointed it with anointing oil, and then clothed the body (Brown, 1966b, p. 941). Spices were used not for the preservation of the body, but to get rid of the stench from decay and to render final respects to the ones who are deceased (Keener, 2003b, p. 1163). According to the Gospel of John, Nicodemus had previously left some aromatic spices while the body was lying in the tomb before the Sabbath had arrived (Keener, 2003b, p. 1163). Keener (2003b) states, “... Nicodemus honored Jesus lavishly ...” (p. 1163). The next phrase, “and bound it” as the author uses the verb (*dein*), which is different than what Mark 15:46 uses (*eneilein*) meaning “wrap or tie up” (Brown, 1966b, p. 941).

John 19:41 states, “Now in the place where he was crucified there was a garden, and in the garden a new tomb in which no one had yet been laid” (ESV). Out of convenience, it would have been very good to keep a burial place close to the area of execution (Brown, 1966b, p. 943). The phrase “there was a garden,” and the term for the olive garden where Jesus was arrested is (*kēpos*) (Brown, 1966b, p. 943). Only the author of the Gospel of John out of all four gospels is specific about the tomb that Jesus was buried in, indicating it was near Golgotha (Brown, 1966b, p. 943).

In the last Scripture given, which is John 19:42, states, “So because of the Jewish day of Preparation, since the tomb was close at hand, they laid Jesus there” (ESV). The first phrase of this verse is “Jewish day of Preparation” which it is not clear whether the terminology is referring

to the day before the Passover or the day before the Sabbath (Brown, 1966b, p. 943). Nicodemus helped to lay the body of Jesus in the tomb.

In this last pericope of Scripture, Jesus has been crucified, but Nicodemus is present at the burial. Not only is Nicodemus present, but he is assisting Joseph of Arimathea in taking Jesus' body off the cross and burying the Lord in the tomb. The one-on-one time Jesus spent with Nicodemus, as depicted in John 3, has made such an indelible impact upon Nicodemus that Nicodemus is there to aid in the proper burial of the Lord. The type of supportive climate that Jesus created of carefully listening to Nicodemus gave Nicodemus the needed attention. Jesus satisfied Nicodemus' individual needs; even though Nicodemus did not seem to acquire everything required at the time, it did help Nicodemus grow personally in his challenges.

Northouse (2019) asserts, this factor of transformational leadership, individualized consideration, describes leaders who establish a supportive climate in that they carefully listen to followers' individual needs. Here, leaders apply their advising and coaching skills while simultaneously assisting followers to become actualized (Northouse, 2019). Leaders of this type can delegate authority to their followers to help followers grow through challenges (Northouse, 2019). Anthony (2017) holds that individualized consideration is leaders' supportive alignment in favor of followers' concerns and needs. These leaders engage in constructive leadership behaviors such as less supervision and more delegation (Northouse, 2019). Asencio (2016) asserts individualized consideration pertains to leaders who exemplify coaching, support, mentorship, and encouragement to followers' concerns and needs. Hussain et al. (2016) hold that individualized consideration is leaders' behavior, which demonstrates respect and giving attention to followers' feelings and needs.

*Principle Four: Transformational leaders provide such a supportive climate of careful listening to their followers' individual needs.*

## SUMMARY

The historical-grammatical exegesis of John 3:1–10, 7:50–52, 19:39–42 have unveiled four principles linked to transformational leadership. Those principles are: (1) Transformational leaders must provide the idealized influence that projects the leaders' image as being strong role models for the followers so that the followers want to emulate them; (2) Transformational leaders must demonstrate inspirational motivation

who communicate high expectations to their followers by exciting the followers' motivation through inspiration to embrace and commit to the organization's shared vision; (3) Transformational leaders must stimulate followers' creativity and innovative capacity to challenge their values and beliefs and that of leaders and the organization; and (4) Transformational leaders must provide such a supportive climate of careful listening to their followers' individual needs. Organizations must have outstanding leadership to have great organizations. Also, organizations must have great leaders to have great followers. Transformational leadership is the leadership that organizations should embrace for the optimum performance for their organizations. Not only that, but transformational leadership should be the leadership that leaders specifically apply to lead their followers. The characteristics of transformational leadership ensure that the relationship between leaders and followers remains a process. Followers deserve the best, and they deserve to be treated right. With transformational leadership, the followers are the ones that receive leaders' attention (Northouse, 2019). Transformational leadership focuses on values, ethics, emotions, standards, and long-term goals (Northouse, 2019).

Transformational leadership has four factors. These four factors are idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration. Transformational leadership's four factors are presented in this chapter as the relationship between Jesus (transformational leader) and Nicodemus (followers) advances from John 3 to John 19. From each of these four transformational leadership factors, four principles are derived from them. Transformational leadership does what its name implies; it transforms people (Northouse, 2019). The analysis of John 3:1–10, 7:50–52, 19:39–42 explored how Jesus' leadership and teaching impacted Nicodemus during his earthly pilgrimage. By leaders adopting transformational leadership as their leadership, these leaders can transform followers and, in the process, transform themselves (Northouse, 2019).

There are different ways to use the information presented in this historical-grammatical study. One way is for leaders to rally with other leaders and compare, side-by-side, their leadership with the leadership presented in this chapter. Another way is to research and take the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ). The MLQ is a self-assessment questionnaire that assesses the transformational leadership of leaders. If leaders can see where their leadership can improve or to change their leadership style all together, then, by all means, feel free to implement or

apply the principles within this chapter to one's leadership. Throughout this chapter, several sources can be researched if the reader desires more information; they can use these sources to do their research.

Further research could study or examine different possibilities regarding the application of transformational leadership. Jesus' leadership is not limited to the book of John Gospel, nor is his leadership limited to Nicodemus's interactions. However, the reader should explore all that Jesus did to get a full story of this earthly life.

## DISCUSSION QUESTIONS

1. At what point does a follower desire to emulate the leader?
2. If a follower, at first, does not measure up to the high expectations of the leader, how much patience should leader show to that follower?
3. Is there a limit of how creative or innovative followers should be when it comes to challenging their leaders?
4. Is it possible for leaders to give followers too much individual attention, and would that be a detriment to the followers' growth and autonomy?
5. Could transformational leadership influence an entire culture of an organization?

## REFERENCES

- Alexander, M. S., Croucher, R., Espedal, B., & Selart, M. (2018). Intellectual stimulation and team creative climate in a professional service firm. *Evidence-Based HRM*, 6(1), 39–53.
- Allen, G. W., Attoh, P. A., & Gong, T. (2017). Transformational leadership and affective organizational commitment: Mediating roles of perceived social responsibility and organizational identification. *Social Responsibility Journal*, 13(3), 585–600.
- Anjali, K. T., & Anand, D. (2015). Intellectual stimulation and job commitment: A study of IT professionals. *IUP Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 14(2), 28–41.
- Anonymous. (2013). The power of transformational leadership. *Professional Safety*, 58(1), 19. Proquest document ID: 1287595438.
- Anthony, E. L. (2017). The impact of leadership coaching on leadership behaviors. *The Journal of Management Development*, 36(7), 930–939.

- Arunima, S., Ajeya, J., Sengupta, A. K., Mariamma, P., & Tripathi, K. K. (2014). Comparison of transformational leadership and its different attributes of leadership with emotional intelligence in Indian healthcare: An empirical aspect. *Advances in Management*, 7(10), 37–45.
- Asencio, H. (2016). Leadership, trust, and job satisfaction in the public sector: A study of US federal employees. *International Review of Public Administration*, 21(3), 250–267.
- Bass, B. M., & Bass, R. (2008). *The bass handbook of leadership: Theory, research, and managerial applications* (4th ed.). New York, NY: Free Press.
- Bonsu, S., & Twum-Danso, E. (2018). Leadership style in the global economy: A focus on cross-cultural and transformational leadership. *Journal of Marketing and Management*, 9(2), 37–52.
- Brouer, R. L., Chia-Yen (Chad) Chiu, & Wang, L. (2016). Political skill dimensions and transformational leadership in China. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 31(6), 1040–1056.
- Brown, R. E. (1966a). *The anchor Bible: The Gospel according to John (I–XII)*. New York, NY: Doubleday.
- Brown, R. E. (1966b). *The anchor Bible: The Gospel according to John (XIII–XXI)*. New York, NY: Doubleday.
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York, NY: Open Road Integrated Media Inc.
- Dartey-Baah, K. (2015). Resilient leadership: A transformational-transactional leadership mix. *Journal of Global Responsibility*, 6(1), 99–112.
- Dialoke, I., & Edeh, F. O. (2018). Transformational leadership and employee performance of selected private secondary schools in rivers state. *International Journal on Leadership*, 6(2), 14–22.
- Ellis, E. E. (1988). Background and Christology of John's Gospel: Selected motifs. *Southwestern Journal of Theology*, 31(1), 24–31.
- Frey, J. (2012). The diaspora-Jewish background of the Fourth Gospel. *Svensk Exegetisk Årsbok*, 77, 169–196.
- Grese, W. C. (1988). "Unless one is born again": The use of a heavenly journey in John 3. *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 107(4), 677–693.
- Hamad, B. H. (2015). Transformational leadership theory: Why military leaders are more charismatic and transformational? *International Journal on Leadership*, 3(1), 1–8.
- Hussain, G., Wan Ismail, W. K., Rashid, M. A., & Nisar, F. (2016). Substitutes for leadership: Alternative perspectives: MRN. *Management Research Review*, 39(5), 546–568.
- Jojko, B. (2019). Eternity and Time in the Gospel of John. *Verbum Vitae*, 35, 245–278.



- Jung, D. I., Bass, B. M., & Sosik, J. J. (1995). Bridging leadership and culture: A theoretical consideration of transformational leadership and collectivistic cultures. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 2(4), 3–18.
- Keener, C. S. (2003a). *The Gospel of John: A commentary* (Vol. 1). Peabody, MA, USA: Hendrickson Publishers.
- Keener, C. S. (2003b). *The Gospel of John: A commentary* (Vol. 2). Peabody, MA, USA: Hendrickson Publishers.
- Klein, W. W., Blomberg, C. L., & Hubbard, R. L., Jr. (2017). *Introduction to biblical interpretation* (3rd ed.). Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.
- Langat, G. K., Linge, T. K., & Sikalieh, D. (2019a). Influence of idealized influence on employee job performance in the insurance industry in Kenya. *International Journal of Research in Business and Social Science*, 8(5), 266–273.
- Langat, G. K., Linge, T. K., & Sikalieh, D. (2019b). Influence of inspirational motivation on employee job performance in the insurance industry in Kenya. *International Journal of Research in Business and Social Science*, 8(6), 1–7.
- Louw, L., Muriithi, S. M., & Radloff, S. (2017). The relationship between transformational leadership and leadership effectiveness in Kenyan indigenous banks. *SA Journal of Human Resource Management*, 15.
- Matzler, K., Bauer, F. A., & Mooradian, T. A. (2015). Self-esteem and transformational leadership. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 30(7), 815–831.
- Morkevičiūtė, M., Endriulaitienė, A., & Jočienė, E. (2019). Do dimensions of transformational leadership have an effect on workaholism? *Baltic Journal of Management*, 14(2), 312–329.
- Mounce, R. H. (2007). *John: The expositor's bible commentary* (Revised ed.). Grand Rapids, MI, USA: Zondervan, Kindle.
- Munn, G. L. (1994). Interpreting the Gospel of John. *Southwestern Journal of Theology*, 36(3), 69.
- Northouse, P. G. (2019). *Leadership: Theory and practice* (8th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Inc.
- Osborne, G. R. (2006). *The hermeneutical spiral: A comprehensive introduction to biblical interpretation* (2nd ed.). Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.
- Otieno, C. D., Linge, T., & Sikalieh, D. (2019). Influence of idealized influence on employee engagement in parastatals in the energy sector in Kenya. *International Journal of Research in Business and Social Science*, 8(5), 123–135.
- Pamment, M. (1983). Short note. *Novum Testamentum*, 25(2), 189–190.
- Rada, D. R. (1999). Transformational leadership and urban renewal. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 6(3–4), 18–33.
- Sahibzada, S., Kakakhel, S. J., & Khan, A. (2016). Role of leaders' idealized influence and inspirational motivation on employees' job satisfaction. *University of Haripur Journal of Management (UOHJM)*, 1(2), 86–92.

- Salas-Vallina, A., & Fernandez, R. (2017). The HRM-performance relationship revisited. *Employee Relations*, 39(5), 626–642.
- Smothers, J., Doleh, R., Celuch, K., Peluchette, J., & Valadares, K. (2016). Talk nerdy to me: The tole of intellectual stimulation in the supervisor-employee relationship. *Journal of Health and Human Services Administration*, 38(4), 478–508.
- Stein, A. (2013). The dark side of transformational leadership: A critical perspective. *International Journal of Cultic Studies*, 4, 62.
- Tabassi, A. A., & Bakar, A. H. A. (2010). Towards assessing the leadership style and quality of transformational leadership: The case of construction firms of Iran. *Journal of Technology Management in China*, 5(3), 245–258.
- Wigram, G. V. (2002). *The Englishman's Greek concordance of the New Testament* (4th ed.). Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers.
- Wu, J. (2019). The doctrine of scripture and biblical contextualization: Inspiration, authority, inerrancy, and the canon. *Themelios*, 44(2), 312–326.

# INDEX

## A

Accommodation, 145  
Action, 6, 8, 11, 15, 16, 22, 42, 66, 79, 80, 93, 95, 96, 127–129, 131, 132, 134, 135, 145, 148, 165, 176, 178, 192, 199, 212  
Adversary, 143  
Adversity, 79, 81, 89, 90, 93–95, 99, 100  
Agitation, 143  
Altruism, 60, 77, 78, 130, 134, 143, 145, 154, 196  
Anxiety, 154  
Apostle(s), 143–145, 153  
Atonement, 143  
Authenticity, 11, 25, 36, 40, 41, 53, 54, 57, 63, 73, 95, 105, 107, 131, 133  
Authentic leadership, 22, 23, 36, 53, 54, 63, 143, 150, 151  
authentic leaders, 154

Awareness, 19, 21, 25, 52, 54, 55, 57, 60, 61, 64, 66, 76, 116, 133, 189  
emotional, 51, 52, 57  
self-awareness, 23, 52, 57, 60, 63, 73, 77, 78, 197, 215, 218

## B

Behavior/behavioral, 143, 154  
Beliefs, 23, 33, 40, 41, 54, 63, 79, 80, 91, 93, 132, 147, 151, 154, 183, 192, 193, 195, 196, 200, 210, 216, 229, 235, 238, 239, 242  
Belonging, 130  
Biblical, 150, 151, 155  
Bounded rationality, 144

## C

Character, 4, 5, 10, 14, 15, 40–42, 54, 116, 150, 151, 164–167, 171, 178, 188, 219, 229

- Church, 143–145, 150  
 Coach(es)/coaching, 72, 75, 80–82, 97, 134, 234, 241  
 Communication/communicator, 1, 3–5, 7–9, 12–16, 19, 23, 24, 79, 149, 152, 159, 160, 163, 168, 170, 171, 175, 214–216, 218, 221  
 Compassion, 22, 41, 42, 60, 63, 77, 90, 91, 94, 95, 114–116, 197, 198, 215  
 Compromising, 145  
 Confidence, 154, 155  
 Conflict, 11, 20, 56, 130, 141, 144, 155, 179–182, 184  
   dysfunctional, 145  
   functional, 145, 155  
   goals of, 144  
   management, 20, 122, 175  
   resolution, 60, 144, 180, 183  
 Convict, 143  
 Convince, 143  
 Courage/courageous, 40, 42, 43, 45, 47, 63, 113, 152, 154, 192, 194, 202, 220  
 Credibility, 55, 73, 91, 96  
 Crisis, 143, 155
- D**  
 Decision making, 154  
 Deity/Divine, 4–6, 9, 13–15, 24, 31, 37–39, 41, 43, 56, 57, 92, 108, 152, 154, 164, 165, 191, 194, 200, 236  
 Development, 3, 6, 73, 76, 79, 80, 83, 105, 106, 112–114, 122, 123, 133, 146, 147, 150, 154, 159, 168, 169, 184, 188–195, 200, 207, 208, 210, 215, 217, 220, 221, 228, 237  
 Direction, 2, 24, 51, 52, 61, 95, 105, 115, 143, 145, 146, 183, 190, 191, 212, 213, 216, 217, 219, 222  
 Disciples, 143, 144, 148, 149, 151, 153  
 Diversity, 4, 52, 82, 107, 115, 132  
 Divided, 144
- E**  
 Effective leadership, 145  
 Emotional awareness, 51, 52, 57  
 Emotional intelligence (EI), 51, 53, 57, 60, 63  
 Empathy/empathize/empathetic, 21, 25, 52, 57, 60, 63, 66, 67, 95, 106, 114, 116, 196  
 Empowerment, 64, 66, 67, 95, 105, 106, 112, 114, 132, 135, 148, 150, 152, 154, 187–195, 197, 199–202, 228  
 Encouragement, 23, 37, 40, 47, 66, 76, 106, 113, 116, 125, 131, 133–135, 144, 147, 152, 154, 168, 170, 180, 192, 194, 202, 208, 211, 216–221, 236, 239, 241  
 Ethical, 150  
 Example/pattern, 2, 3, 15, 16, 19, 22–25, 33, 40, 43, 47, 57, 64–66, 78, 99, 100, 106, 110–113, 115, 122, 123, 125, 126, 129, 132, 142–145, 151, 152, 154, 155, 170, 176–178, 181, 187, 190, 194, 195, 197, 207
- F**  
 Faith, 15, 39, 46, 83, 91, 93, 94, 111, 125, 133, 134, 143, 145, 182, 187, 189, 190, 199, 201, 208, 213, 216, 230, 232  
 Father, 149, 151, 153

Fear, 143, 145, 154  
 Follower/followership, 11, 15, 20, 32,  
 51, 53, 57, 72, 78, 83, 95–99,  
 106, 108, 110–113, 116, 132,  
 134, 135, 143, 150, 154, 159,  
 160, 166–170, 180, 187–198,  
 200, 211, 216, 217, 227–229,  
 234, 235, 237–239, 241, 242  
 Forgiveness, 63, 122, 143, 144,  
 180–184, 198, 199, 202, 219,  
 220

## G

Global Positioning Satellite (GPS),  
 143  
 Goals, 16, 47, 79, 90, 94, 95, 97,  
 114, 145, 146, 159, 195, 196,  
 218, 219, 228, 242  
 God, 143–145, 148–151, 153, 155  
 God positioned spirituality. *See* God  
 GPS. *See* Global Positioning Satellite  
 (GPS)  
 Grace, 2, 3, 7, 14, 15, 23, 25, 141,  
 144, 152, 165, 181, 182, 184,  
 198, 200, 216  
 Group, 143  
 small, 143

## H

Healing, 4, 60, 71, 75, 91, 114, 211,  
 212  
 Hearts, 143, 153–155  
 Heaven, 143  
 Hope, 152, 154  
 Humbleness, 108, 110–112, 115,  
 132, 191  
 Humility, 63, 78, 105, 107, 109, 111,  
 112, 114, 116, 126–128, 132,  
 133, 135, 190, 191, 220, 222

## I

Imitation, 11, 125  
 Influence, 1, 11, 15, 16, 19, 23, 24,  
 53, 67, 72, 73, 83, 99, 108, 111,  
 112, 122, 134, 150, 171, 189,  
 195, 215, 218, 234  
 Innovation/innovative, 3, 9, 16, 20,  
 24, 94, 112, 193, 220, 238, 239,  
 242  
 Inspiration, 97, 108, 127, 134, 135,  
 237, 242  
 Instruction, 143  
 Interpersonal, 145  
 Intimacy, 149

## J

Jesus, 143, 145, 148–153, 155  
 Judgment, 144, 149

## K

Kingdom, 143  
 Kingdom of God, 230, 234–237  
 Knowledge, 144, 148, 149

## L

Leadership, 144, 150–152, 154, 155  
 authentic, 22, 23, 35, 53, 54, 63,  
 143, 150, 151  
 effective, 145  
 spiritual, 36, 63, 92, 98, 150, 152  
 Legacy, 31, 105, 169  
 Light, 1, 2, 10–12, 14, 19, 20, 24,  
 80, 107, 108, 110, 148, 230  
 Love/loving, 12–15, 21, 31, 39, 41,  
 42, 45, 95, 108–112, 115, 116,  
 122, 129, 152, 162, 165, 167,  
 176–179, 181–184, 187, 188,  
 190, 192–202, 210, 214, 219,  
 220, 232

**M**

Management, 145  
 Mentor/mentorship, 72–76, 78–83,  
 106, 107, 113, 114, 134, 193,  
 194, 199, 201, 241  
 Ministry, 143, 150, 153  
 Mission, 23–25, 36, 45, 51, 56, 57,  
 64–66, 74, 82, 122, 145–152,  
 155, 165–170, 176, 179, 180,  
 183, 184, 200, 207, 211, 219  
 Model(s)/modelling, 8, 9, 15, 16,  
 19, 20, 23, 24, 57, 63, 97, 99,  
 106–108, 112, 113, 115, 129,  
 150, 151, 154, 167, 181, 191,  
 194, 197, 208  
 Multiplication, 143

**N**

New Testament, 143

**O**

Openness, 143, 154  
 Optimism, 154  
 Organization/organizational, 144,  
 150, 152, 154  
 Organizational culture, 113, 114,  
 151, 155  
 Others, 144, 145, 152, 154, 155  
 Overcoming/overcomer, 2, 3, 11, 12,  
 25, 89, 93, 100, 111, 154, 193

**P**

Personal, 143, 150, 151  
 Pioneer, 143  
 Plan, 143  
 Planning, 93, 145, 146, 148, 159  
 Practical/practically, 143  
 Principle, 143, 152  
 Problem solving, 145  
 Prospective, 143

Purpose/purposeful, 1, 4, 6, 10,  
 18, 24, 25, 31, 71, 75, 78, 82,  
 97, 98, 107, 108, 111, 114,  
 125, 134, 145, 146, 161, 162,  
 178, 183, 197, 199–201, 216,  
 231–233, 235, 236

**R**

Reality, 151  
 Reciprocal, 145  
 Redirection/redirecting, 143–145  
 Relationship(s), 16, 19, 20, 22, 37,  
 45, 47, 55, 61, 64, 72, 73,  
 75–80, 82, 83, 92, 98, 116,  
 123, 124, 129, 132, 141, 144,  
 152, 154, 160, 165, 167, 175,  
 182–184, 190, 196, 200, 201,  
 210, 211, 217, 220–222, 227,  
 228, 230, 234, 237, 242  
 Repentance, 143, 144  
 Restoration, 91, 114, 116, 164, 175,  
 176, 178, 180–184, 193, 194,  
 196, 198–200, 219

**S**

Scripture, 144  
 Servant, 15, 18, 31, 40–43, 45, 47,  
 53, 54, 60, 63, 67, 74, 105–116,  
 124, 126, 130, 134, 165, 188,  
 198, 220  
 Service, 42–44, 108–111, 114, 115,  
 126, 133, 134, 190, 193, 196,  
 201  
 Solitude, 207–222  
 Spirituality, 10, 11, 18, 19, 35, 41,  
 53, 59–63, 65, 83, 89, 106, 110,  
 152, 191, 193–195, 199, 208,  
 210, 211, 214, 218, 235  
 Spiritual leadership, 36, 63, 92, 98,  
 150, 152

Succession planning, 159, 160,  
168–170, 190

## T

Temple, 31, 32, 34–39, 41–47, 55,  
209, 210

Transformational leadership, 53, 60,  
63, 76, 134, 188, 228, 229, 237,  
238, 241–243

idealized influence, 134, 228, 234,  
235, 241, 242

individualized consideration, 134,  
228, 241, 242

inspirational motivation, 134, 228,  
237, 241, 242

intellectual stimulation, 134, 228,  
238, 239, 242

Transparency, 143, 154

Trouble, 143, 153

Trust, 23, 40–42, 57, 61–64, 78–80,  
112, 116, 144, 151, 152, 154,  
180–184, 194, 218, 230, 235

Trustworthy, 67, 79, 96, 160, 228,  
235

Truth, 2, 3, 7, 10, 11, 14, 19, 23–25,  
34, 42, 52, 61–66, 74, 78, 133,  
146–148, 151, 162, 165–167,  
181, 182, 184, 191, 192, 216,  
221

## V

Values, 19, 21, 23, 25, 33, 54, 60,  
63, 98, 99, 106, 112, 116, 125,  
144, 147, 148, 150–152, 154,  
155, 169, 193, 195, 199, 200,  
229, 238, 239, 242

Vision, 16, 18, 19, 22–25, 41, 52, 73,  
74, 76, 97, 105, 127, 134, 146,  
148, 150, 155, 167, 168, 170,  
184, 214, 217, 218, 220, 228,  
229, 235, 237

shared vision, 127, 135, 235, 237,  
242

## W

Way, 144, 149, 151, 153, 155