Ethical Church Leadership:

A Conversation with the Beatitudes.

By

Jack T. Tsoai

Submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree

Master of Theology (M.Th.)

In

PRACTICAL THEOLOGY

In

FACULTY OF THEOLOGY

Of the

University of Pretoria

Supervisor: **Prof. Johann-Albrecht Meylahn**

2020

DECLARATION

I declare that *"Ethical Church Leadership: A Conversation with the Beatitudes"* dissertation is my own work and that all sources that I have used or quoted have been indicated and acknowledged by means of complete references.

Signature: _____ Date: _____

By Jack Tebogo Tsoai

Approved by: **Prof. Johann-Albrecht Meylahn**

_____

Signature

DEDICATION

DEDICATED TO MY WIFE, MARATWA TSOAI
AND OUR TWO CHILDREN,
THATO AND TEBOGO TSOAI

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My deepest gratitude goes to my Supervisor, Professor Johann Meylahn who has shown a great dedication in assisting me to complete this dissertation successfully. A big thank you to Dr. Phumzile Walter Maqoma for introducing me to some great literature while guiding me on how to incorporate such into my research. Many thanks to Professor Martin H. Pohlmann and Professor Piff Pereira both my former Baptist College lecturers for their insightful contributions to my studies; wise counsel and encouragement in my pursuit to further my theological studies at University of Pretoria.

I am also grateful to Professor Johannes Seroto, Professor Sello Mokwena, Mannie Pereira and Dr BP Chirwa who played a major role as my mentors by guiding my development as a person, man, husband, a father and a church leader. I am eternally grateful for my mother Mary Maletsema Tsoai, for her unceasing commitment to my well-being, love, care and generosity. To my friend William Tumishi Mahlabegwane, you have been such a great blessing and support partner in the Gospel, family, and life in general.

ABSTRACT

This research paper seeks to consider what contribution can the Beatitudes make in developing an ethical paradigm within leadership structures in ecclesiological settings. Therefore, the research will appropriate some exegetical processes as part of its methodology in treating aspects of the passage in Matthew chapter 5 which deals with a section of the beatitudes found in the Sermon on the Mount. The research will also attempt to answer the question "How might ethical leadership principles, derived from The Sermon on the Mount, enhance mentorship capability in the church? Osmer's (2008) four tasks of practical theological interpretation which are: the descriptive-empirical task, interpretive task, the normative task, and the pragmatic task will be used to develop a practical theology of leadership in answering this question. The four tasks will also help the research in drawing some ethical leadership principles from the study of the Beatitudes and suggest virtues that can be helpful as mentorship lessons to church leaders. It is interesting to note that Matthew 4, the chapter before the "Great Sermon", records the beginning of Jesus' ministry, which involves the calling of His first followers. Immediately following their calling, the disciples had to sit and listen to Jesus teaching on the Sermon on the Mount, which would serve as a philosophy of moral and ethical leadership model for them and the followers after them. This paper will therefore seek to understand the discord between what these disciples observed from Jesus' leadership and its exerting influence on them and the apparent lack of such ethical and moral values amongst church leaders today.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Research Rationale

We live in a day and age where there is an apparent lack of ethical leadership within ecclesiastical circles. In the geographical setting of South Africa, a country which I live in and have pledged my patriotism towards, there has been a cry from the greater community about the exploitation of many citizens by some religious leaders, particularly within the Charismatic[1] circles. Thus, this indictment has been pervasive in townships and rural areas in South Africa to an extent that the perversion reached the quarters of the "Union Buildings" such that Parliament called on the State to intervene[2] through its chapter 9 institution called "The Commission for the Promotion and Protection of the Rights of Cultural, Religious and Linguistic Communities" better known as (CRL-Rights Commission).

As a result, there are increasing levels of distrust of church leaders by many community members. Many suggest that there seems to be no difference today between leadership within a secular environment and leadership within a church setting. Although there has been great leaders within the South African church leadership landscape, leading with a high moral standard, however there has also been disappointing reports of some church leaders in South Africa who abuse and exploit members of the congregations they lead; abusing them in many aspects including making them eat grass, spraying them with doom, whilst invoking the name of God when doing these horrible deeds.[3] With the onslaught of many church leadership scandals as mentioned above and the prosperity gospel, the teaching that says Jesus came so that we could be wealthy, healthy, happy, and full of self-esteem

[1] For a comprehensive definition and a brief history of Charismatic theology see Theron's article in *Initiation into Theology* (1998), entitled: "Charismatic Theology"; which traces the roots of Charismatic Theology, its development from Oral Theology to Systematic Theology, and its distinctiveness. To critically evaluate on its distinctiveness you may reflect on Nel's reflections, entitled: "A critical evaluation of theological distinctives of Pentecostal theology".

[2] To read more on the formation of the CRL, see the CRL Rights Commission Report: Commercialisation of Religion & Abuse of People's Belief Systems Day 2 hearing & Commission response (2017).

[3] Mapumulo's (2017) scathing article on the abuse of power in churches begins by noting: "Money, not God, is the cornerstone of South Africa's unregulated and unscrupulous churches". To see examples of the abuse of the congregations by its church leaders, see Mapumulo's article entitled *Commission slates churches' abuse of* faithful.

and charismatic mysticism, today's society is eager for leaders who will exhibit strong ethics such as the ones mentioned in the Sermon on the Mount.

It is necessary for the church to reintroduce an ethical framework for training ministers who are going to lead congregations or another Christian organisation. Therefore, this research attempts to draw ethical leadership principles from the study of the Beatitudes, found within the Sermon on the Mount. The Sermon on the Mount which is found in the Gospel of Matthew chapters 5, 6 and 7, has been widely discussed within Christian circles. It is interesting to note that Matthew 4, the chapter before the "Great Sermon", records the beginning of Jesus' ministry, which involves the calling of His first followers. Immediately following their calling, the disciples had to sit and listen to Jesus teaching on the Sermon on the Mount, which would serve as a philosophy of moral and ethical leadership model for them and the followers after them.

Sanders (2007:62) observes that spiritual leaders who choose the "hidden path of sacrificial service" would inspire their followers to sacrificially emulate their example. I would suggest that the effectiveness of the entirety of Christ's teachings which includes sacrifice, should be in view here and must encompass and provide guidelines for ethical and moral leadership. It is therefore the aim of this research to highlight the need to revisit these ethical leadership principles outlined in The Sermon on the Mount for providing a framework for ethical and moral leadership for the church or any ecclesiological settings or organization today. The research will therefore consider what contribution can the Beatitudes make in developing an ethical paradigm within leadership structures in ecclesiological settings?

1.2. Research Realities

From around 2016, South Africa experienced many challenges which were mostly related to its national government leadership, to a point that many citizens began asking serious question about the moral ethics of the President of the country. In many of these reflections, the one that has made me to think thoroughly about leadership was the comment that was made by the chief Justice of the Republic of South Africa, justice Mogoeng Mogoeng two weeks after he delivered a historic judgment in the Nkandla case against President Jacob Zuma. The ruling followed a unanimous

judgment of the Constitutional Court which found that President Jacob Zuma breached his constitutional duty by ignoring the Public Protector's remedial actions.[4]

In his reflections and as part of one of his presentations beyond the judgment, Mogoeng Mogoeng noted that South Africa needs ethical leadership and there's no need for incompetent leaders who are corrupt to lead state institutions.

Nicolaides (2016: nn), in her article entitled: "*South Africa needs Ethical Leaders*" remarked that, Mogoeng says South Africa needs ethical leaders who can inspire and encourage the pursue of a common goal for the nation. Hot on the heels of the comment made by Mogoeng, the 2016 local government elections seemed to have exposed once again this lack of ethical leadership where most councilors were pursuing positions of power on the basis of the money they would make rather than serving the people. The same attitude was also evident in the recent May 2019 national elections where parties were making empty promises under the spell of corrupt practices from the past while promising a better life for all South Africans. These practices in themselves show lack of mentorship among government officials, as we see the same attitude which was seen in the president as per the Nkandla judgment. These immoral and unethical behaviors from politicians, seems to have found a place in the hearts of those who serve themselves instead of the nation. Sadly, this lack of ethical leadership to enhance mentorship seems to even be lacking in church circles today. The onslaught of many church leadership scandals and Charismatic mysticism in South Africa and elsewhere, exposes the rot in today's society where church leaders are eager to promote themselves at the expense of church members instead of exhibiting strong ethical and exemplary moral leadership acumen.

To make an attempt on resolving this sad reality, this paper would suggest that we reflect on the leadership of Jesus which is underpinned by high ethical and moral behaviour. The paper suggests that some of Christ's ethical leadership principles and righteous living are reflected in the Sermon on the Mount, as Mcknight (1992: 414) comments that "The Sermon on the Mount is a revelation of Jesus' teachings on righteousness, explaining what it is to do God's will and perform good works (Matt.

[4]For more on Mogoeng's Judgment see Merrian's article: "*Ethical leadership leaves no space for graft, says Mogoeng*" where she discusses the full judgment.

5:6, 16, 17-20, 21-48; 6:1-18, 33; 7:12, 13-14, 16-21, 23-27).” This is a section where Jesus was teaching on the importance of righteous living.[5]

It is therefore the aim of this research to highlight the need to revisit ethical leadership principles outlined in the Sermon on the Mount to provide a framework for ethical and moral leadership for the church or any ecclesiological setting or organization today.

A critical observation is made that we are alive in days when ethical behaviour is not valued. Even in the business world, most executives value the bottom line of profit margins over ethics. Newspaper headlines and the evening news reveal the scandals brought about by their unethical behaviours. We also have reality television shows about “preachers of L.A” where unethical behaviour should never appear, yet it is promoted by ministers of the gospel as part of their ‘real life’ experiences. However, Christian biblical traditions that encompass the history of human ethical and moral behaviour, have had their core values of relational realities anchored in knowing right from wrong. These traditional values enjoined leaders and citizens alike to act with compassion and thoughtful tenderness towards others, which is the hallmark of the noblest spirit of our humanity. As MacArthur (2004:146) notes that: “Self-control is absolutely vital to lasting success in any endeavour of life. Many do attain a degree of prominence on the strength of sheer natural talent alone. But the real, influential leaders are the ones who devote themselves to personal discipline and make the most of their gifts. Those who utterly lack self-control will invariably fail, and they forfeit the example of integrity so essential to the best kind of true leadership”.

Since those who have been called to lead the church are expected to exhibit godliness and integrity of heart, the resurgence of interest in church leadership ethics in the rapid changing world cannot be ignored. Witmer (2010:9) argues that, “though the Bible is not a detailed ‘book of church order’, the Lord has provided clear principles designed to guide his church for its ongoing health and growth, particularly with regard to the nature and functions of the church leaders”. In agreeing with Witmer, the number of moral failures in the ministry today warrants that we ask if church leaders have forgotten their “religious code of ethics”, a behaviour that should be grounded in biblical truth. If a person does not have a code of ethics, he/she almost has a license

[5] One must be mindful that there are two occurrences of The Sermon on the Mount in the gospels, the one this research makes reference to is the one found in the gospel of Matthew. The second one appears in the gospel of Luke and it is referred to as the Sermon on the Mount on the Plain; for more on this see Stanton (1992).

to behave in any manner he/she chooses and that cannot be true for a minister of the gospel. “There is no greater privilege than to be a man of God and preach His Word. But along that privilege comes a fearful responsibility” (MacArthur 2004:76). The fearful responsibility which MacArthur is implying on is when the preacher’s life and his/her message are in sink and how he/she first applies scriptural truth to his/her life.

Though some situational ethics fanatics suggest that as long as it does not hurt anyone, we should embrace the new worldview and surrender, I contend that this teaching is doing great damage to the church than good. In some instances, the majority of people who sit in the pews believe in undefined and unscriptural situational ethics rather than what the Bible teaches as part of moral ethics. This research’s intention is to address this ethical dilemma and contribute towards a more godly approach to the much needed ethical and moral leadership derived from the Sermon on the Mount. Each group of human beings determine what is right and wrong by their value system.

The believer’s value system is influenced by biblical standards on how to apply the scriptural truth to his/her life. Miller (2003:9) says, ‘the best spiritual leaders are those who are always learning’ and yet today, there is much arrogance and self-centeredness such that most church leaders no longer want to learn, listen, read or even be trained in the ministry. This kind of loose lifestyle and arrogance among leaders often affects not only their spiritual growth, but also their moral and ethical behaviour. “Although no exact equivalent for the term mentoring exists in the New Testament and early Christian texts, there are, however, some associated words that work together to express the concept” (Smither 2008:4). I believe that Smither has a point when he indirectly intimates that there is a need for mentoring and a return to sound biblical mentoring of leaders, a critical process for the long-term viability of moral and ethical leadership in the church is long overdue.

The early Christian church formed during a time of enormous change and tremendous pressure, constantly mentored upcoming leaders by ‘providing learning opportunities, feedback on performance, evaluation, support and crucially, an example to follow’ (Burke 1995:545). Leaders must be willing to learn and yield to godly principles for continuity and leadership development. It is therefore the goal of this research to unveil the necessity of ethical and moral leadership principles in the church, as essential in bringing to light the purposes of God, and how we as followers of Christ can live in

accord with God's will. The exercise of learning, mentoring and discipleship should not merely be for ordinary members of the church to the exclusion of their leaders, an effort toward personal transformation and attainment of maturity should be for all. The ultimate goal should be to help people recognize the call from Christ and discover that the call of Christ is to be conformed to His image through a process of transformation (Rom. 8:29).

In the final analysis, this research aims to answer the question: "How might ethical leadership principles, derived from The Sermon on the Mount, enhance mentorship capability in the church?

1.3. Research Methodology

In 2017, the faculty of Theology at the University of Pretoria was celebrating its hundred years of existence and reflecting on the different disciplines (usually referred to as departments) that make up this faculty. Included in this category/faculty, would be the department of the Old Testament, the department of the New Testament, the department of Missiology, the department of Dogmatics, and the department of Practical Theology. In a book where the Faculty was reflecting on the contributions of scholarship from these different disciplines; Wepener, Dreyer, & Meylahn (2017: 133-155) reflected on *The tradition of Practical Theology at the University of Pretoria*, and surveyed the different trends that have characterized the discipline of Practical Theology, particularly within the African continent.

Therefore, in the selection of the research methodology for this research, the paper will draw insights from this survey in the process of designing its research methodology. In reflecting on the history of Practical Theology, Wepener, Dreyer, & Meylahn (2017) comment that the development of the field can only be understood and appreciated against the backdrop of historical developments in the particular areas on the continent where the disciplines are practised. Against the background as alluded to by Wepener *et al. (*2017) and in terms of my personal experience from working closely with colleagues in African countries other than my native land South Africa, there is not a strong tradition in Sub-Saharan Africa to use the name 'Practical Theology'. Wepener *et al* (2017) discuss the four factors that played and still play a major role in the development of Practical Theology in South Africa.

The first factor is the political, social, cultural, economic and religious realities of the country which are important themes to be analysed in this factor. Within these themes there are other realities that are not reflected clearly in their study. In this regard, the apartheid legacy as well as many challenges that South Africa is currently facing, which should also be taken into consideration; includes poverty, people living with HIV or AIDS, unemployment, and widespread anger.

All these realities prevailing in the context of church-state relations where, in pre-1994 SA, the state was in a typically reformed manner and thus seen as an extension of the church. With the dawn of a democratic secular state, this situation changed and churches had to reposition themselves in order to be relevant and reclaim their prophetic voice to power. The second factor discussed by the authors is institutional infrastructure and the impact of huge-scale downsizing at institutions of higher education. Post-1994 South Africa has fewer departments of PT; however, it is well established in theological faculties at four of the traditional white universities connected to reformed churches' as well as at the University of KwaZulu-Natal and at the University of South Africa. Regarding the third factor, namely academic societies and publications, the establishment in 1969 of the Practical Theological Society of South Africa (PTSA) which organises annual conferences bears reference. The fourth factor discussed is regarding the fields of study, models and research methods. As elsewhere in the world, South Africa also bears witness to a movement to expand the object of study in the discipline to include lived religion. However, the accent is still strongly on pastoral actions and church life which reflects the continuing importance of churches and religious communities in South Africa.

In the past three decades there has been various approaches formulated to treat different phenomena under the umbrella of practical theology. For instance, in the 90's Browning (1996) produced a work entitled: *A Fundamental Practical Theology*, where he outlines descriptive and strategic proposals on how theology can be practical, writing in an age where many treated theology as only theory to an extent that others in the church were critical of theology and made disparaging comments, and this led others to accept a false, artificial dichotomy of "theoretical theology" and "practical ministry". This work is indispensable in that it treats the fundamental task in practical theology, which is: The theology Task.

Browning (1996:1-5) in the introduction begins by asking the question: Can theology be practical? As other academics in universities see it as a mysterious and arcane discipline that one clever phrasemaker called it a "systematically articulated superstition", and it is a totally mystifying subject hardly more respectable than phrenology, astrology, or alchemy. Hence, many critics have a difficulty comprehending the distinctive ways in which theology can be thought to be practical.

Nevertheless, Browning further on makes a consideration that the critics within the academic circles do not necessarily represent unanimity within scholarship, through noting that theologians such as Karl Barth, Paul Tillich, Johann Metz, Jose Bonino, Stanley Hauerwas, and Davis Tracy considered theology as practical and see theology as systematic reflection on the historical self-understanding of a particular religious tradition. Academic theology can be seen as less rationalistic, less deductive, and less apodictic, but when theology is seen as careful and systematic reflection on the self-understanding of a particular religious tradition such as Christianity, interesting and puzzling concepts such as myth, story, legend, symbol, and metaphor begin to play important roles. Therefore, Browning (1996: 6-7) notes that historical, systematic, and practical theology (in the more specific sense of the term) should be seen as subspecialties of the larger and more encompassing discipline called *fundamental practical theology*. Moreover, he contends that theology as a whole is fundamental practical theology and that it has within its four sub-movements of descriptive theology, historical theology, systematic theology, and strategic practical theology and this strategic practical theology being refer to what is commonly understood as the church disciplines of religious education, pastoral care, preaching, liturgy, social ministries, and so forth (Browning 1996:8).

In the early 2000, Swinston and Mowat in their work: *Practical Theology and Qualitative Research* (2006; with a second edition in 2016), explored new methodologies on how theological learning can be applied in practical situations. Considering important developments in the study of practical theology, it was helpful that these authors produced a second edition of their work, which would be the work this paper reflects on in this section as a helping tool. The aim of this work is to highlight the significance of qualitative research as evidenced in Swinston and Mowat's work in doing practical theological studies. As the authors note that the primary purpose of this book is to address this question: *How can we faithfully use qualitative research to provide authentic data for theological reflection?* Practical theology is first and

foremost a theological discipline. This means that it does not simply seek after knowledge for knowledge's sake. Rather, the knowledge generated by practical-theological research is intended to increase our knowledge and understanding of God and to enable us to live more loving and faith-filled lives (Swinston and Mowat 2016: xiii).

The outline of the contents page of the research referenced above, particularly in part two, describes the broad scope of the research projects within practical theology. These projects will include aspects such as: Researching Personal experiences: which treat matters such as depression and spirituality; Researching a Local Church: such as exploring the emergent church; Researching Ministry: such as doing an evaluation on the work of a Chaplain; Researching Pastoral issues: Understanding the impact of suicide within religious communities; Participatory research: where we research with and among the marginalized people; and Action Research: where we are researching the Spiritual lives of people with profound and complex intellectual disabilities (Swinston and Mowat 2016: v). It is worth noting here that the broadness of the scope of the study of practical theology does not assume that the study becomes superficial, rather it shows the depth of the research projects within this discipline. Thus, practical theology is theologically diverse; it spans the breadth of the theological spectrum from liberalism to conservatism and its practitioners inhabit a diversity of methodological positions.

Nevertheless, while there is diversity, there remains a good deal of continuity and commonality. Therefore, irrespective of the theological and methodological positions, the common theme that holds practical theology together as a discipline is its perspective on and beginning point in human experience and its desire to reflect theologically on such experience. Practical theology seeks to explore the complex theological and practical dynamics of particular situations in order to enable the development of a transformative and illuminating understanding of what is going on within these situations (Swinston and Mowat 2016: xi). The works of Browning (1996) and (Swinston and Mowat 2006) bring together a theological task of practical theology and the means of qualitative research to arrive at a new understanding of a particular theme under consideration.

Osmer (2008) surveyed the above approaches, in his quest to understand the fundamentals of practical theology, he outlined his reflections on the basis of practical

theology in his book entitled: *Practical Theology: An Introduction* (2008). In this work, Osmer introduced a new methodology which introduces an interdisciplinary approach which focuses on the spirituality of the leaders, who need to develop the knowledge and the skills to embody the essential tasks of guiding the congregation through listening, wisdom, discernment, and servant leadership.

Therefore, this research methodology is going to be constructed through Osmer's research guide to *Practical Theology: An Introduction* (2008). Osmer's approach to research in practical theology[6] serves as the research methodology employed in this research.

Osmer introduces the core tasks of practical theological interpretation by four questions which are answered through the four tasks of practical theological interpretation. These questions are: **What is going on? Why is this going on? What ought to be going on? How might we respond?**[7] According to Osmer (2008:4-6), answering each of these questions above is the focus of one of the four core tasks of practical theological interpretation.

The first task is the descriptive-empirical task, which is about gathering information that helps one to discern patterns and dynamics in particular episodes, situations, or context. The second task is the interpretive task, which draws on the theories of the arts and sciences to better understand and explain why these patterns and dynamics are occurring. The third task is the normative task, which uses theological concepts to interpret particular episodes, situations, or contexts, constructing ethical norms to guide our responses, and learning from "good practice." The fourth task is the pragmatic task, which will assist the researcher to determine strategies of action that will influence situations in ways that are desirable.[8] Therefore, all these four tasks will form the basis for this research, which will firstly diagnose the problem of lack of sustainable ethical practice within most ecclesiological settings. The second task will

[6] In his work referenced above: "*Practical Theology: An Introduction*".
[7] Highlighted to show emphasis and the central direction of this research.
[8] You would have noticed in the Table of Contents page that the first three tasks outlined above: the Descriptive-Empirical Task, the Interpretive Task, and the Normative Task are all treated together in chapter two, however, the fourth task: the Pragmatic Task is treated separately, individually towards the end of the research, in chapter seven because at this stage of the research one must start to propose strategies to resolve the problems which were discovered in the first task, to assist in making evident the patterns which have characterized the practices that led to the problems which were discovered in the first task, and to also realize the ethical injunctions realized in the third task. Hence, enacting strategies of action that influence events in ways that are desirable, which would lead to change (Osmer 2008: 176).

aim on interpreting the findings of the first task through articulating the problems in a paradigm of accepted theories and approaches within academic circles. The third task will begin to introduce the theological reflections of the Beatitudes as an ethical framework that can resolve the problems discovered in the findings of task one. Lastly, the research will employ the fourth task which will construct the practical ideas to implement the principles outlined in the resolutions arrived at in the third task. Therefore, "Together, these four tasks constitute the basic structure of practical theological interpretation" (Osmer 2008: 8-10). Osmer, in reflecting on paradigms at the level of pastoral and ecclesial practice as a reflection on his book: *Practical theology: An introduction* (2008), demonstrates how much contemporary practical theology attends to the four tasks along the lines of a hermeneutical circle or spiral:[9]

- Descriptive-empirical: What is going on? Gathering information to better understand particular episodes, situations, or contexts.
- Interpretive: Why is this going on? Entering into a dialogue with the social sciences to interpret and explain why certain actions and patterns are taking place.
- Normative: What ought to be going on? Raising normative questions from the perspectives of theology, ethics and other fields.
- Pragmatic: How might we respond? Forming an action plan and undertaking specific responses that seek to shape the episode, situation, or context in desirable directions.[10]

Although Osmer does not claim originality[11] of the framework above, it is still evident that the construction of this model of the above four tasks is a creation of his extensive

[9] He makes these reflections in his article entitled: *Practical theology: A current international Perspective*.

[10] It is worth noting here that the next paragraphs are a dialogue between Osmer's book (2008) and his article (2011), which shows a good reflection of the thesis of his book and demonstrates his reflections on his paradigm. As I note his reflections, I will also draw on a few examples which pertain on my particular research.

[11] Hence he makes these comments in his article (cited above) "I believe that something like these four tasks have commonly been represented for many years in the writings of various practical theologians, as well as within the Clinical Pastoral Education (CPE) and Doctor of Ministry programmes and field education seminars.1 This leads me to believe that the four tasks I have highlighted are indicative of a particular paradigm in contemporary practical theology – what I will call here a paradigm of reflective practice. The historical roots of this paradigm extend back to the advent of modernity in Europe and the various challenges it posed to traditional, medieval patterns of life, including religion. In the context of modernity, it was not enough for Christian leaders simply to hand on the traditions and practices of the past. Nor was it enough for theologians simply to hand on the Christian cultural heritage of the West along the lines of the liberal arts tradition of the Renaissance and Reformation universities. In both the church and academy, the challenge of developing new forms of Christian practice in a modernising world and providing good reasons to justify these practices was

research in the field of practical theology. He remarks that whilst the historical roots of the reflective practice paradigm lie in the modern period, I believe this interpretive model did not fully emerge until the 20th century.

The reasons for this are many and only a few can be noted here. In the USA and Europe, the remnants of Western Christendom were still in place through the 19th century but gradually crumbled over the course of the 20th century. Religious, cultural, ethnic and lifestyle pluralism have become more pronounced. Religion also has become 'deinstitutionalised', as denominational identities and structures have become less important.

Moreover, the expansion of global telecommunication, migration, law and capitalism have eroded local traditions, evoked fundamentalist reactions and made encounters with cultural 'others' a part of our everyday life. If reflective practice in the context of modernity could still assume a fading Christendom, it can no longer do so today. Church leaders cannot even assume that a programme working well in one congregation will work just as well in a similar congregation which is in another part of their own country. Indeed, they cannot even assume that a programme that is appealing to middle-aged and older adults will appeal to youth and young adults who belong to the same congregation (Osmer 2011: 2-3).

Thus, this tradition is drawn from the New Testament practice, which portrays the themes of promise and fulfilment and God's new covenant in Christ, which is reflected in the three offices of Christ. Therefore, Osmer (2008: 28-29) remarks that Building on the tradition of the threefold office, I developed a practical theology of leadership in which the four tasks of practical theological interpretation are portrayed as facilitating the congregations participation in Christ's priestly, royal, and prophetic mediation of salvation. To anticipate what follows, the descriptive-empirical task is a form of priestly listening, grounded in a spirituality of presence: attending to others in their particularity within the presence of God. The interpretive task is a form of wise judgement, grounded in a spirituality of sagely wisdom: guiding others in how to live within God's royal rule. The normative task is a form of prophetic discernment, grounded in a spirituality of discernment: helping others hear and heed God's Word in particular

front and centre. It was in this context that practical theology first emerged as an academic discipline in the modern, research university. In the face of modernity, its task was to develop 'theories of practice' and 'rules of art' that might guide the reflective practice of the leaders of the church.

circumstances of their lives and world. The pragmatic task is a form of transforming, grounded in a spirituality of servant leadership: taking risks on behalf of the congregation to help it better embody its mission as a sign and witness of God's self-giving love.

The research methodology outlined above made reference to Osmer's (2008) methodology in practical theology; however, considering that this research paper will also construct its ethical theory through using a biblical text, exegesis will also be a part of the basic guide to drawing evidence for this research. Thus, Du Toit's (2009) work on *New Testament Exegesis in Theory and Practice* will serve as the methodology in chapters that will use an exegetical process to build its framework.

The exegetical process drawn from Du Toit's work provide the methodological framework for the exegetical work undertaken in the aspects of this paper that require thorough exegesis. In the article, *New Testament Exegesis in Theory and Practice*, Du Toit proposes a twelve-step exegetical program which incorporates insights from linguistic and literary studies, which are necessary to help one to do responsible exegesis and be effective in their exegetical work. Du Toit (2009: 120) divides this process into three phases. The first phase is the preparatory phase, the second phase is the main phase, and the last phase is the concluding phase. The first four steps in the process of exegesis make up the preparatory phase of the process.

The first step is the preliminary selection of the passage. Considering that the focus of the exegetical work of this research is the Beatitudes, so the passage which would be the centre of the exegetical work will be a section on the Sermon on the Mount.The second step is first reading, which Du Toit (2009: 124) remarks that it should not be taken absolutely, as the exegete would have been to that particular text before, so it will not be the first time they are reading that text. In my engagement with the text, I selected to read it with a set of new pair of eyes, as I was not reading it for the first time; rather, I read the text with new insights drawn from the discipline of textual criticism, as that enriches one's understanding of the text.[12] The third step is the demarcation of the text, where one may demarcate a text according to a chapter or a pericope; since these distinctions are relative and pericopes may coincide. Du Toit

[12] Greenlee (1964), in his book: "*Introduction to New Testament Textual Criticism,*" defines the study of Textual Criticism and outlines the principles and practices of Textual Criticism, and its priority in New Testament Studies.

(2009: 126-135) also provides the criteria for demarcating the passage, as he gives three steps to do this; and the steps are: Lexico-grammatical criteria, literary criteria, and Semantic criteria.[13]

The passage which this research is demarcated is found in Matthew 5: 3 – 12. The fourth step introduces textual criticism, which is a process that considers the text-critical status of a passage under investigation, and this process requires proficiency in working with New Testament Greek.[14]

From that step, one is now ready to start the main phase of exegesis, which introduces the following five steps of the process of exegesis, which are built on the previous four steps. So, step five is about determining the socio-historical setting of the passage; part of this step looks at the "intratextual" and "extratextual" context. The sixth step will be determining the literary type of the text, where one considers the genre of the text. The seventh step is about determining the place of the micro text within its literary macro structure. The eighth step will be about analysing the structure of the text, as Du Toit (2009: 141) remarks that "this is necessary in order to determine how the different pieces on the mini chessboard of the paragraph or *pericope* are related to each other, how the argument flows and what the main theme and possible themes are." Then, step nine is the detailed analysis where word-by-word and verse by verse analysis of the text is undertaken (Du Toit 2009: 141).

The last three steps form the concluding phase where one moves to interpretation, for both the immediate recipients and the contemporary reader. So, step ten is about formulating the message for the first readers; what the text under investigation meant for the first readers/hearers of that text. Perhaps, we must also ask, as Du Toit (2009: 146-147) asks, "How would the message touch their lives, challenge their complacency, open their eyes, broaden their perspectives, change their attitudes, guide them towards a decision, bring them to a re-appraisal of their priorities, nurture their spiritual lives?" This step helps one to appropriate the text for today's hearers; hence, step eleven provides suggestions for actualizing the text for today.

Du Toit (2009: 147) remarks that this step may prepare the exegete to cross the hermeneutical bridge and transform the message to the first addressees into a relevant message for today's readers/hearers. The last step, which is the twelfth step,

[13] For a thorough explanation of this criteria please see Du Toit's text (2009: 126-135).
[14] See Jordaan (2009) who explains the process of Textual Criticism extensively in chapter 5 in the same book.

will be translation. Thus, “At this stage, the exegete should be in a good position to attempt a translation that would be, at least to some degree, the semantic equivalent of the original text” (Du Toit 2009: 148).

Therefore, this research will also appropriate Du Toit’s exegetical process as part of its methodology in treating aspects of the research which require exegesis. Even though it did not follow the process in the above given consecutive order, the research has drawn insights from all the steps. As Du Toit (2009: 121), in his introduction of these three phases of the process commented that, though the sequence of the various phases in this program makes good sense, other options could be chosen and the exegete may start with another step, instead of step one.

CHAPTER 2. SURVEYING THE SITUATION

In the first chapter of this research, through introducing this Paper's research rational, research question, and research hypothesis, the methodology of this research is drawn from Osmer's four tasks of Practical Theology: the descriptive-empirical task, the interpretive task, the normative task, and the pragmatic task. This chapter is going to use the first three tasks to highlight the problem that led to this research, to explore why this problem persists, and thirdly to propose what alternatives can be explored to resolve the situation;[15] hence, all these three processes – guided through Osmer's framework – will assist the researcher to "survey the situation" which demands ethical church leadership as drawn from the perspective of the Beatitudes.

2.1 The Descriptive-Empirical Task

The Descriptive-empirical task treats the question: What is going on? In this process we are gathering information and reflecting on the prevailing situations in a particular discipline or aspect of life. In doing so, we are able to better understand particular episodes, situations, or contexts. In this research, the researcher is focused on the necessity of ethical church leadership, or the lack thereof. In some context there has been an increase of moral failures by church leaders, where we are bombarded and, perhaps, shocked by the revelations of the moral failures of senior leaders who were trusted by their congregations, but leaving the church members in utter confusion, and feeling betrayed by the leaders they trusted[16]. Since the descriptive task puts context to the question, what is going on? I relate disturbing occurrences in some of the churches in South Africa in the recent past led by Prophet Shepherd Bushiri and Pastor Timothy Omotoso who are reported to have abused their powers in one form or another. Bhengu (2019) notes that The Commission for the Promotion and Protection of the Rights, Cultural, Religious and Linguistic Communities (the CRL Rights Commission) says it has encountered numerous cases of church leaders who abuse their power and take advantage of their congregants.

[15] This chapter does not include the fourth task, known as the Pragmatic Task because this task will be explored in another chapter later on, which will suggest strategies on how to move forward in meeting the objectives that would have emerged from the normative task.

[16]Ramantswana (2019), posted an article in OASIS Publishing titled 'Prophets praying for, or preying on people's faith: ….notes that this is clergy malfeasance – commonly defined as misconduct of church officials such as prophets or pastors who intentionally commit illegal acts while preying on congregants. We substantiate further on this issue with references to other articles in this research.

According to Kallinen (2019:40) Prophet Shepherd Bushiri is the founder of the Enlightened Christian Gathering church, which has several branches all over Africa, including South Africa. Though famous for performing 'miracles' in his church, a social anthropologist, Van Wyk (2019) posits that Bushiri and his wife were arrested by the police's special crime investigative unit on suspicions of fraud, money laundering and foreign exchange control irregularities. On the other hand, Phahle (2019) observed that Timothy Omotoso, head of Jesus Dominion International, was arrested by the Directorate for Priority Crime Investigation, known as the Hawks, at the Port Elizabeth Airport and charged with rape and human trafficking[17]. The list of examples of church leaders who have been caught on the wrong side of the law is endless.[18]

The two cases I have chosen, are however a perfect example of the painful reminder that the Bible shows us the moral failure of many leaders like David[19], Solomon[20] and Saul (just to name a few) to remind us of the fact that even those we consider to be near to God are also tempted to turn away and fall. The carnality[21], lack of moral integrity and what Kgatle (2019) calls 'mafia tendencies and their disregard for social justice, displaces and subject their followers to questionable lifestyles that leaves many of them permanently scarred by sexual abuse, unemployment and other psychological forms of displacement'.

---

[17] To see the gravity of this offence (abuse of church congregants by church leaders) and its continual impact of reflections on church leadership, to an extent that even the civil movements and the governing authorities have been engaging church leadership to resolve this abuse of power. These situations are current, thus, see article by Shamiela Fisher: Lockdown leaves Omotoso sex trafficking trial in limbo; available: *https://ewn.co.za/2020/04/14/lockdown-leaves-omotoso-sex-trafficking-trial-in-limbo*.

[18] This problem of the lack of ethical leadership within churches is persisting. For instance, in 2020 the South African community has been shocked by the story of the IPHC's church's leadership feud which resulted in the killing of five people; see https://www.newsweek.com/five-killed-megachurch-plagued-leadership-feud-money-disputes-1517194.

[19] In contrast to Uriah's noble life, David may here break half of the Ten Commandments in Exodus 20/Deuteronomy 5: coveting another's wife, stealing her, adultery, lying, and murder. One wonders if it also occurred on the Sabbath! (A comment on 2 Samuel 11:1-15). See https://www.enterthebible.org/Controls/feature/tool_etb_resource_display/resourcebox.aspx?selected_rid=630&original_id=30

[20] 1 Kings 11:1-2 "But King Solomon married many foreign women besides the daughter of Pharaoh: women from Moab, Ammon, Edom, and Sidonia, along with Hittite women, too, 2 all of them from nations that the Lord had ordered the Israelis, "You are not to associate with[b] them and they are not to associate with you, because they will most certainly turn your affections away to follow their gods." Solomon became deeply attached to them by falling in love".

[21] The Bible defines the word carnal as follows (2): from G4561 (sarx); pertaining to flesh, i.e. (by extension) bodily, temporal, or (by implication) animal, unregenerate: - carnal, fleshly. By these two definitions, we find that the word carnal describes something that is fleshly or physical in nature. The Bible adds to this the idea of being temporal, meaning that is earthly and temporary and not heavenly or eternal. With these definitions in mind, a carnal Christian would be a Christian that behaves in ways that are motivated by fleshly desires. Available: https://www.patheos.com/blogs/christiancrier/2015/04/06/what-does-it-mean-to-be-a-carnal-christian/

Enegho (2011) observed somewhat a similar occurrence in the Nigerian context that social problems in the church are caused by the behaviour of the domineering, self-serving new 'elite' class of leaders, thus leadership is exercised "through an increasingly assumed (and artificial) credibility" (Balda & Balda 2013:38). This is what prompts me to ask, where has the accountability been? How can so many church leaders fall into moral sin without thinking about their actions and the impact thereof on those that they are leading? Why has there not been vocal and upright men and women of God to challenge such deviant behaviours and leave this responsibility in the hands of government through the CRL rights commission? As a Christian leader who has sought to live in a way that brings honour to God (though I myself fail too many times as well), it pained and grieved me to see these leadership scandals in the church unfolding in our eyes over lack of moral uprightness which distorted the view of the image of God in the eyes of all the congregants, especially when you hear some witnesses like Cheryl Zondi as reported by Maphanga (2019)[22] in Omotoso's case.

I however had to quickly remind myself that moral failure is but one expression of the problem of sin and that no one is above temptations. The two scandals as mentioned above gave me an opportunity to practice what Osmer refers to as a spirituality of presence;[23] listening attentively to Christians who might have felt betrayed by the actions of both Bushiri and Omotoso in one way or another and maybe reflecting on a much broader problem in church leadership and shepherding as a whole. As, according to Osmer (2008: 34) "Ultimately, the descriptive-empirical task of practical theological interpretation is grounded in a spirituality of presence. It is a matter of attending to what is going on in the lives of individuals, families, and communities". Since these scandals broke out, the constant question that has been lingering in my mind was, where do we go from here and where do we turn to for help and answers?

[22] https://www.news24.com/news24/SouthAfrica/News/omotoso-trial-this-is-about-justice-cheryl-zondi-prepared-to-testify-over-and-over-again-201903

[23] Spirituality of presence in this context refers to the spiritual orientation of attending to others in their particularity and otherness within the presence of God. The key term here is "attending", relating to others with openness, attentiveness, and prayerfulness. Such attending opens up the possibility in which others are known and encountered in all their uniqueness and otherness, a quality of relationship that ultimately depends on the communion-creating presence of the Holy Spirit. Therefore, it is a matter of opening up ourselves to the forming and transforming Spirit of God who remakes us in the image of Christ within his body. Unless we first learn to attend, we cannot really lead (to know more on how to develop a spirituality of presence, see Osmer 2008: 33-40).

These two prominent leaders of Enlightened Christian Gathering church (Bushiri) and Jesus Dominion International (Omotoso) were not transparent, diligent, and good shepherds[24] as they constantly intimidated, manipulated and abused their powers as leaders and this happened while many of us were watching with shock. “Without pre-judging Omotoso‘s case, it is important to point out that there are far too many men of the cloth who misuse the trust bestowed unto them by vulnerable black women” (Mitole 2019). It is the rise of these unregulated[25] churches in South Africa that has resulted in people being exposed to leaders who Mitole (2019) refers to as abusers of the trust bestowed upon them, as they run these churches like their little fiefdoms or own possessions. Many of these allegations which included sexual abuse and cheating people out of money and property would often leak out into social media.

When one observed all these happenings, my heart sank to the bottom of my belly and I knew that the proverbial “elephant in the room” is facing us as men and women of the cloth who lead churches in South Africa. Though the state intervened in these cases, I felt like we, church leaders should have entered into the priestly role as referred to by Osmer (2008: 35); where we listen to the Cheryl Zondis (one of the victims) as a demonstration of priestly listening, care and support.

> It is important to begin with this understanding of the priestly ministry of the entire congregation. Priestly listening is, first and foremost, an activity of the entire Christian community, not just its leaders. It reflects the nature of the congregation as a fellowship in which people listen to one another as a form of mutual support, care, and edification. Within the priesthood of all believers, congregational leaders are set apart by the congregation to carry out ministries that will enable it to participate more fully in the priestly office of Christ. When leaders engage in priestly listening, they therefore do so on behalf of the congregation as a whole (Osmer 2008:35-36).

Thus, I believe that we needed to listen and understand the submissions from different groups of people within these congregations, as they were impacted by the moral failures of Bushiri and Omotoso to the point of grief, denial, anger, depression, and ultimately acceptance.

[24] “The accusations came after Bushiri allegedly intimidated his staff when they demanded payment for helping him perform "miracles". https://www.timeslive.co.za/news/south-africa/2018-12-27-church-scandals-that-left-sa-shooketh-in-2018/

[25] David Steadman writes an article titled*: An explosive, unregulated and unaccountable phenomenon*. “While this phenomenon is not peculiar to Africa, this kind of public abuse of the pastoral and prophetic ministry seems to be more obvious here than elsewhere,”.

Given all this information, it was very painful for me to realise that the church in general has failed many of its followers by not acting on these abuses until the state intervened[26]. Harney (2018), in an article entitled: *Responding to Moral Failure in Church Leaders* published by *Christianity Today*, reflected on a few examples of the moral failure of church leaders, but singled out immorality as the most prevalent and dangerous and suggested ways on how to deal with it in the church.[27]

Therefore, what is going on in our two particular scenarios (Prophet Bushiri and Pastor Omotoso) is explored from two angles: firstly, it is about the preparation of church leaders to a point where they display ethical paradigms in their leadership acumen; secondly, it is about assisting church members who have been betrayed by unethical church leaders.

These two church leaders, would as Christians be expected to act, behave and conduct themselves in a manner that is befitting for church leaders based on norms and values reflected in their confession of the Christian faith; however, their failure in moral leadership is representative of many other leaders within the church. Steve Farrar, in his book: *Finishing Strong* (2000) summarizes this reality of a lack of moral leadership in many Christian circles through noting that "In the Christian life, it's not how you start that matters. It is how you finish…. It has been my observation that just one out of ten who start out in full-time service for the Lord at twenty-one are still on track by the age of sixty-five. They're shot down morally,… they get obsessed with making money… but for one reason or another nine out of ten fall out." Therefore, "Out of every ten (10) people who start serving God in their twenties (20's) only one (1) is still serving God in their sixties (60's)" (Farrar 2000: 18-19). Overcoming moral failure as a leader has more to do with an internal struggle; hence, Farrar (2000: 222) further on asks potential church leaders: What makes you think that you won't be one of the nine who fall short of the mark? The man who finishes strong, after all, is the exception. Why? Because when it comes to finishing strong, the odds are against you. Finishing strong is not impossible. It is, however, improbable.

[26] The Global Citizens' Human Rights Coalition has called for urgent government intervention to stop some religious institutions in the country from abusing their members. It says recent court cases involving some well-known religious leaders such as Prophet Shepherd Bushiri are concerning. See https://www.sabcnews.com/sabcnews/government-urged-to-intervene-in-religious-institutions/

[27] To read the insights Harvey (2018) shares on how to deal with immorality in the church see: https://www.christianitytoday.com/edstetzer/2018/may/responding-to-moral-failure-in-church-leaders.html Accessed.

It's going to take some tough choices and an experience or two of personal brokenness in order to have a strong finishing kick when you hit the tape at age sixty-five, seventy-five, eighty-five, or whenever it is that God calls you home. It is the rare man who finishes strong. It is the exceptional man who finishes strong. It is the teachable man who finishes strong.

That is why it takes ethical virtues for a leader to finish strong morally. Ndoga (2015:4-5) in his reflections on why most pastors do not finish strong in their service to God and his church outlines the following Startling statistics:

- 1 500 Pastors leave ministry each month due to moral failure
- 70% of Pastors do not have a close friend or mentor
- 80% of Pastors' spouses feel their spouse is in the wrong field
- 85% said their greatest problem is dealing with elders, deacons and other leaders
- 90% say that their training did not prepare them adequately for ministry
- 1 500 leave the ministry each month due to spiritual burnout or contention in the church
- 40% admit to having had an extra-marital affair
- 50% of pastors' marriage end up in divorce
- 70% say the only time they spend in God's word is when they are preparing sermons
- 95% say they do not pray with their spouses and on average spend less than 15 minutes in daily prayer

Therefore, these realities confirm some of the challenges of leadership in Christian circles and sanctions the need for virtues as espoused in the beatitudes in pursuit of moral and ethical Christian leadership. Both those terms: Leadership and Ethics, are concepts that are weighty and connote many realities and could be discussed exclusively. However, for this research the focus is on virtue ethics as it impacts on leadership, and on the concept of leadership with an undertone of general biblical moral principles of ethics. There are many definitions of leadership and it is difficult to exhaust; Ndoga (2015) in his guide to preparing young church leaders lists a few definitions which may be helpful.

For instance, according to Clinton[28]: “Leadership is a dynamic process in which a man or woman with God-given capacity influences a specific group of God’s people toward His purposes for the group”. According to Barna (1998:106) “A Leader is someone who effectively motivates, mobilizes resources, and directs people toward the fulfillment of a jointly embraced vision”. In Ndoga’s (2015) perspective, “A leader is an Individual with the enviable capacity to solve problems in a given context so that everyone and everything thrives. Leadership is not about a position but disposition. Leadership is not about a title but influence”. We are living in a time where the role of a leader in society is being questioned and put under scrutiny. Somehow, as with everything else, we have lost the original design of the nature and the role of a leader. It would seem the world has lost the sense of establishing certain qualities that should qualify a person to be in leadership.

2.2 The Interpretive Task

When we move to the Interpretive task, we ask the question: why is this going on? In the process of answering this question we are entering into a dialogue with the social sciences to interpret and explain why certain actions and patterns are taking place. In this task I had to draw from my insights first as a former high school teacher, as a pastor, and a leader in my community. My father who is a Dutch-Reformed minister and a former lecturer at University used to say to me that what you have learned in your previous field as a school teacher will always come handy in your next career and now here I am gleaning from the disciplines of Education and Theology to aid my interpretive task based on my experience in these fields. Operating for almost three decades in these fields has exposed me to distinct thinking patterns applied by different scholars trying to resolve various leadership conundrums in both education and church.

For an example, dealing with the issue of indiscipline in schools, Steyn, (2009) asserts that it’s important for principals to understand leadership as a process and to develop human relation skills in order to understand why violence is taking place in schools and to promote joint action in dealing with what is going on to ensure school improvement and effectiveness.

[28] Leadership is a key component in the health of any church or ministry. https://www.christianitytoday.com/edstetzer/2019/september/defining-leadership-christian-serving-god-empower-people.html

As a former teacher, I have witnessed first-hand how many principals and teachers seem to have become anxious and despondent because of lack of respect from learners as everyone was grappling and wrestling with the big "WHY" of such violent behaviour in schools. In expressing the concern around indiscipline of learners, a situation that is still "going on" and prevalent in our schools, Oosthuizen, Roux and Van der Walt (2003:373), posit that indiscipline ranks as one of the main apprehensions expressed by many stakeholders in the education system. In 2017, Steve Mabona,[29] the spokesperson of Gauteng Education Department (GED) released an official media statement on cases of student unrest and indiscipline noting that 'the Gauteng MEC for Education, Mr Panyaza Lesufi visited Norkem Park High School to verify the series of videos depicting learners involved in violence and he implored the Educators and SGB to maintain discipline and ensure that education is not disrupted by unruly elements.' As expressed by Mabona (2017), many experts and education practitioners like (Joubert, De Waal & Rossouw, 2004:84; Zulu, Urbani, Van der Merwe & Van der Walt, 2004 and Ncube & Harber 2013), show in their respective research work that cases of students' indiscipline are on the upsurge in South African schools. According to Oosthuizen, Roux and Van der Walt (2003:373), learner indiscipline ranks as one of the main apprehensions expressed by many stakeholders in the education system. Mnyaka (2006) also found that indiscipline and disruptive behaviour of students in primary and secondary education in South Africa led to the breakdown in teaching and learning.

It was in these kinds of situations where I learned that the principal who occupies the official position as a school leader, required certain leadership qualities to enable participative and co-owned school discipline policy development among all stakeholders. The preventative measure of creating a code of conduct for learners, was meant to encourage co-operative and supportive disciplinary approaches in schools and Rapcan (2008:13-15) suggested some 'key practices that have helped parents, teachers and school management to implement positive discipline effectively' as follows:

[29] The department's Steve Mabona says: "Family members coming to the school, bringing weapons. "We saw on the picture a gun and we're saying the MEC will be going there today, just to have an understanding of what's really happening so that we can then take decisions that will make sure that the schooling environment is conducive for everyone." https://ewn.co.za/2017/08/18/lesufi-to-visit-kempton-park-school-over-school-violence

- **Show interest and pay attention**. Create opportunities to talk and listen, so that you get to know each child. In this way children will feel valued and may not need to seek attention as often as they do. Asking children about their personal interests and hobbies can also foster self-esteem and a sense of belonging.
- **Set a good example**. Children learn by observing the adults around them. If adults regularly behave aggressively, then children may react in the same way towards others. Model the positive behaviour that you expect from children such as kindness, patience and tolerance.
- **Shared decision-making**. Involve children in drawing up the code of conduct and deciding on the consequences. When children are involved in making the rules, they are more likely to follow them and to take responsibility for their actions.
- **Listen before judging**. Ask questions to find out why children misbehaved or did not complete a homework task – only then can you make a fair judgement. Listen to children's explanations because their reason for not doing their homework may be valid and related to conditions at home. Unfair punishments can lead to disruptive behaviour and erode positive relationships.
- **Focus on the positives**. Build children's self-confidence by acknowledging and affirming positive behaviour. This will encourage the likelihood of children repeating that behaviour. Explain how their positive behaviour can contribute to a safe and caring environment.
- **Be consistent**. Be fair and consistent and avoid showing any favouritism. Apply the same rules to everyone. If you do decide to make an exception, discuss this with the learners and explain the need for compassion because the circumstances of children have to be considered.
- **Cultivate mutual respect for rights**. Children have the same human rights as adults and they are more likely to respect the rights of others if their own rights are being respected. In schools and homes there should be respect for human dignity and physical integrity of both adult and child. It is not acceptable for an adult to hit a child – at school or in the home.

What I learned in this aspect of dealing with school indiscipline is the fact that the degree to which some principals as idealized school leaders, followed the basic framework approach as suggested by Rapcan (2008) in attending to why violence is an ongoing challenge which affects effective teaching and learning, should have guided me to enter into the priestly role as referred to by Osmer (2008: 35) in the issues relating to church scandals as mentioned above. These principals employed some listening skills to the concerns of learners and sympathized with their different and difficult background situations, which brought about renewed attempts to support them in curbing the crisis that has been predicted by many experienced educationists ever since the early '90s with the real prospect of having a 'lost generation' that we never imagined in the past, Kallaway (2009:10).

Now mindful of the fact that one of the most important qualities or aspect of the interpretive task is thoughtfulness, Osmer (2008: 82), posits that when we describe people as thoughtful, we usually mean one of two things about these people; we mean that they are considerate in the ways they treat others or they are insightful about matters in everyday life; thus, both these qualities are important for a leader's interactions with others. Therefore, principals as school leaders had to be thoughtful and considerate in dealing with issues of indiscipline as aided by scholarly work as mentioned above. However, the happenings in both Enlightened Christian Gathering church (Bushiri) and Jesus Dominion International (Omotoso) showed that the two leaders were not considerate or thoughtful in the way they treated their members hence their actions did not show love, grace, compassion, recognition and empowerment for the people as Browning (1996:29) would note in one church experience. I make no claim to originality in my description of the events of Prophet Bushiri and Pastor Omotoso, but I believe that the extensive media coverage and other platform's reports, represent for many of us an indication of neglect and carelessness on the part of church leaders.

What I will call here a paradigm of reflective practice for the church in South Africa, helps me to appropriate the other quality or aspect of the interpretive task, which is theoretical interpretation. This will enable me to critique and collaborate my approach to Osmer's question: why this is going on and thus, creating an integrative framework to enable the process of bringing together various disciplines such as the school aspect of education as mentioned above into play. We will then delve into the theorical

interpretation in relation to the happenings in the two churches and draw some valuable lessons therein.

As Osmer (2008:83) remarks that our approach must take into consideration the fallibilist and perspectival understandings of theoretical knowledge; fallibilist being an awareness that the theories constructed by human reason offer an approximation of the truth, not truth itself. Hence, theories are fallible and always subject to future reconsideration. Perspectival meaning that those theories construct knowledge from a particular perspective, or position. Thus, becoming deeply aware that no one perspective captures the fullness of truth and that, often, many perspectives are needed to understand complex and multidimensional phenomena. It therefore becomes necessary to engage with the other social disciplines because our normative task is going to draw from the study of the New Testament. We draw particularly from New Testament ethics, and the formation of the ethical leader thereof, because that is where our dominant interpretive pattern is located and focused. Hence, when we approach the study of the New Testament, we must engage the world from which this text arose.

As we approach the study of the New Testament it is important to be aware that as twenty-first-century readers/hearers of the New Testament writings, we are entering the first-century C.E. as foreigners who live in a different social setting, and so we need to understand the social system these writings were written in. Malina (1993: xi) notes that for one to understand what another person says and means requires a listener or reader to somehow share in the world of meaning of the speaker or writer; thus, to understand what people say one must know their social system. As our study is of the New Testament, Malina (1993: xi) reminds us that the social system supporting the New Testament is that of the Eastern Mediterranean of the first-century A.D. [C.E.]. Understanding this world will help us to see what is common between the first-century world and the twenty-first-century world, and through that discovery we will be able to transport the biblical principles from the biblical world to our world; and doing this will help us avoid ethnocentric anachronisms.[30] Thus, “The only way to avoid

[30] Ethnocentrism is a belief that one’s ethnic group is superior to another one, and anachronism refers to something located in a time when it could not have existed or occurred. So in relation to our study, ethnocentric anachronism, according to Malina (1993: 11) is imposing the cultural artifacts, meanings, and behaviour of your own period on people of the past. In his other work on *Social-Scientific Methods in Historical Jesus Research*, Malina (2002: 3-26) also suggests that the social-scientific research offers us proper filters to keep out anachronism and ethnocentrism (See full article in the book: *The Social Setting of Jesus and the Gospels*, 2002, edited by Stegemann, Malina, and Theissen).

such misinterpretations, such ethnocentric anachronisms, is to understand the culture from which our foreign writings come" (Malina 1993: 12).

This culture serves as the larger frame from which we interpret these writings. This culture is formed by six cultural cues: Perception, Feeling, Acting, Believing, Admiring, and Striving.[31]

So, using these cultural cues to understand another culture we become involved in the process of abstract thinking. Hence, every higher abstraction is a kind of a bigger picture. What abstraction enables us to do is to represent and to create some order among the countless experiences we undergo in the course of our interacting with our multiple environments. Our ability to think abstractly enables us to generate some ordered or patterned understanding of our complex experiences (Malina 1993: 12–26). The word "culture" is such an abstraction. Through this abstraction we find models or paradigms that enable us to draw principles from the biblical world to the contemporary world. Thus, "models really cannot be proved right or wrong. After all, they are postulated, that is, they derive from a sort of insight that seem to hold experiences together in such a way as to make sense" (Malina 1993: 19). Therefore, the model that is postulated in this paper for understanding the Beatitudes as presented in the New Testament are essential for the formation of a church leader.

Part of the reason why this is going on in these two churches is understanding that leadership is made up of human beings who have a fallen nature prone to develop flawed structures which are based on self-centred leadership approach instead of a gospel-centred approach. Kabir, Akash, Jesmin and Akter (2019) suggest that humans are complex beings and their behaviour, and their mental attitude is the result of interaction within and between their internal biological, psychological, and social systems and their physical and social environment. Grounded in the doctrine of original sin, which is a widely accepted "dogma" that all human beings are equally in need of the salvation in Jesus Christ. Considering that we are drawing from a biblical perspective and framework of the Beatitudes, this research approaches the "self" as part of the make-up of the human being in his/her sinfulness who needs the redemptive teachings as outlined in the sermon on the mount. Hence, "there is also a pervasive complacency about sin that seems to characterize the world in which we live"

[31] See Malina (1993: 15-17) for a longer description of these cultural cues and how they make up the essential core of a given culture.

(Pohlman 2006: 20), which always reminds us that "Sin is a reality and not an illusion" (Bancroft 1976: 213).

By sinning, man gradually loses his commitment to God and the reality of sin and its horrendous effects in his life become a trivial matter; as Bekker (2002: 25) remarked that, "Sin often causes a gradual decline in zeal and holiness in believers' obedience to – and communion with – God. All decline comes from sin. Spiritual decline stands out as evidence of the continuing power of sin". I suppose this triviality, in not seeing sin as very serious, in the reality of human kind is caused by a lack of understanding of the nature of sin and its effects in the lives of human beings; moreover, there is also an apparent ignorance of the centrality of the doctrine of sin amongst all other doctrines and realities which have a bearing on human structures. Erickson (1998: 580) notes that, "The doctrine of sin is both extremely important and much disputed. It is important because it affects and is also affected by many other areas of doctrine". In this regard, we see its implications in the approaches towards leadership in both Bushiri and Omotoso churches. The sinfulness of a man's heart, that's why the reported shameful acts of "sin" happened unabated.

"A first aspect in which sin appears to the natural conscience, likewise in Scripture, is as transgression of moral law" (Orr 1910: 29); John says that "Everyone who sins breaks the law; in fact, sin is lawlessness" (1 John 3: 4).[32] Therefore, "the law is a `mirror` or a `source` for the knowledge of our sin" (Berkouwer 1971: 183). The Bible also says that "by the law is the knowledge of sin" (Rom. 3:20). Bancroft (1976: 214) explains this verse by describing the knowledge of sin through noting that the word knowledge (*gnosis*) is more than the recognition or the knowing about anything; it is *epignosis*, which signifies an exact knowledge, a personal acquaintance with a person or thing. This knowledge of sin is brought about by the law, and the basic biblical word for law is *torah*. *Torah* means not only instruction of teaching, but, fundamentally direction. Rushdoony (1973: 689) clarifies the meaning of this word by commenting that, "The law gives the God-ordained direction to life; a lawless life is a directionless life in the sense that no true meaning exists apart from God. Evil is not an absence or

[32] Scripture, mostly, defines and describes sin as a violation or disobedience of the divine commandment, or the law of God; as the most commonly used biblical words for sin is the Hebrew verb *hata,* and the Greek verb *hamartanein,* both meaning `to miss the mark`, implied a deviation from an objective standard (see Garrett 1990: 456). Moreover, the idea of `Missing the mark` is probably the most common of those concepts that stress the nature of the sin and the hundreds of examples of the word's moral use require that the wicked man misses the right mark because he chooses to aim at a wrong one and misses the right path because he deliberately follows a wrong one" (see Erickson 1998: 586).

thinness of being, but is an ethical, not a metaphysical, departure from God. The greater departure, the greater the loss of meaning".

Moreover, "the law is the revelation of God and His righteousness. There is no ground in Scripture for despising the law" (Rushdoony 1973: 6). Thus, according to Paul all human beings [this includes all those aspire to be leaders] have sinned and fall short of the glory of God" (Rom. 3: 23). Therefore, no man can escape the reality of sin; hence, "sin is universal. In fact, "the presence of sin carries results for life now – results for our standing before God and for our existence in the world" (Grenz 1994: 268). Grenz (1994: 268), further on, describes how sin destroys the community of God by stating the state of the human situation after sin; he summarizes the nature of this situation by presenting it in four metaphors: alienation (interpersonal relations), condemnation (legal standing), enslavement (cosmic forces), depravity (personal ability).

Erickson (1998: 638) argues that not merely a few isolated individuals or even a majority of the human race, but all humans, without exception, are sinners and my submission as to why these things were happening in the two churches as widely reported, is the sinful nature that leads to leadership breakdown because of self-centred approaches with no accountability. Although our view of the impact of sin upon leadership structures may seem enigmatic and inexplicable, however, it is evident that "turn in what direction one will, sin confronts one as a fact in human life – an experience of the heart, a development in history, a crimson thread in literature, a problem for science, an enigma for philosophy" (Orr 1910: 2).

Therefore, this forms part of the primary reason why challenges like the ones in Bushiri and Omotoso churches could happen leading to the moral failure in church leadership. Through recognizing that not every local church community appropriates the Gospel-centred approach to leadership as described above in the section of the descriptive-empirical task, sin makes this task even more complicated. As a result, many churches default to alternative church leadership models that inadvertently promote the self-centred approach which is characterized by lack of integrity, sexual immorality, abuse of power, financial embezzlement, and lack of accountability as mentioned in the example of the two leaders (i.e. Prophet Bushiri and Pastor Omotoso).

Understanding why all of the different aspects discussed above lead to why is this going on, leads us to the third quality or aspect of the interpretive task, which is wise judgment.

According to Osmer (2008:84), wise judgment is crucial to good leadership. This is the capacity to interpret episodes, situations, and contexts in three interrelated ways: firstly, it is through the recognition of the *relevant particulars* of specific events and circumstances; secondly, it is through discernment of the *moral ends* at stake; thirdly, it is through the determination of the most *effective means* to achieve these ends in light of the constraints and possibilities of a particular time and place. It is through understanding the aspect of wise judgements where one recognizes the necessity of cardinal virtues which form the foundation for the normative task.

For instance, Osmer (2008: 85) notes that in classical Western Christianity, wise judgment in the form of prudence is one of the cardinal virtues (along with justice, fortitude, and temperance). It is a 'hinge' on which the cardinal virtues pivot. Wise judgment is necessary to determine when an action is courageous, not reckless, and the available means to pursue courageous action in a given time and place.

It is also required when choices between various goods must be made, since circumstances make it impossible to achieve them all. As a virtue or moral capacity rooted in the character of a person, prudence has a deep connection to spirituality. Moreover, as Osmer (2008:85) continues to contend that some theologians argue that the "theological virtues" of faith, hope, and love are more important to prudence than experience. Thus, contemporary narrative theologians call attention to the conceptual patterns that determine what counts as virtue and to the ways the narratives and spiritual practices of different traditions shape the character and wise judgment of their members.

It is through the reflection of the necessity of virtues where this research proposes to develop the normative task; developing a framework of what should be going on, through reflecting on the virtues of the beatitudes. Drawing wisdom from Jesus' teaching on The Sermon on the Mount.

2.3 The Normative Task

The Normative task – which is also known as 'Prophetic Discernment', employs three approaches to normativity, which are: Theological Interpretation, Ethical Reflection, and Good Practice. These approaches help us to answer the question: What ought to be going on?[33] In this task we are raising normative questions and reflections from the perspectives of theology, ethics and other fields, as this task involves an extensive interdisciplinary approach. Although this task involves an interdisciplinary approach, it is also helpful in framing the normativity of dialogue within these different study disciplines in theological interpretation. This is so because the worldview from which this study is developing, seeks to address a particular theological thesis in answering the question: what ought to be going on? As theology could be referred to as the discipline which is all embracing and still in other contexts it is referred to as "the queen of all sciences"[34], theologising on the normativity of Osmer's third question becomes imperative.

Thus, in this task the dominant normative discipline is practical theology in cross-dialogue with the other disciplines. This posture, perhaps, qualifies as prophetic discernment within the normative task, as expounded by Osmer (see Osmer 2008:132-139). Hence, such prophetic posture demands both inward and outward reform through hearing, interpreting, and practicing God's Word. Osmer (2008:135) remarks that "prophetic discernment is the task of listening to this Word and interpreting it in ways that address particular social conditions, events, and decisions before congregations today. Such discernment is a matter of divine disclosure and

[33] Osmer (2008:161) summarizes the three approaches to the normative task in this way: (1) Theological Interpretation: using theological concepts to interpret particular episodes, situations, and contexts, informed by a theory of divine and human action. (2) Ethical Reflection: using ethical principles, rules, or guidelines to guide action toward moral ends. (3) Good Practice: deriving norms from good practice, by exploring models of such practice in the present and past or by engaging reflexively in transforming practice in the present.
[34] A worldview comprises of different elements; for instance, it includes: an ontology, which explains the theory of existence; an epistemology, which explains the theory of knowledge; a teleology, which explains the theory of the destination; a praxeology, which explains the theory of action. A worldview is all-encompassing in that it should seek to be comprehensive; the *imago Dei Weltanschauung* conveys, as Naugle (2002: 4) remarks, that as a theistic system it exhibits the rational coherence of the biblical revelation. So, a theory qualifies as a worldview if it speaks to the different factors that affect humankind; such as: economics, politics, law, history, ethics, and other disciplines. [34] Noebel (2001) thoroughly discusses the ten disciplines that are essential for any idea or outlook to qualify as a worldview; these disciplines are: Theology; Philosophy; Ethics; Biology; Psychology; Sociology; Law; Politics; Economics; History. He also highlights that Biblical revelation is a comprehensive worldview as it influences all these disciplines.

theological interpretation in the face of popular or official theologies that may be leading the world toward disaster".

Through the Normative task, this research is attempting to answer the question: What ought to be going on in the churches led by Prophet Bushiri and Pastor Omotoso as discussed in the descriptive empirical task? In raising normative questions from the perspectives of practical church leadership ethics in the context of the challenges faced by these churches, this study draws from theological ethics as it relates to general norms, values and moral practices in church circles. So, this illustration of churches led by these two leaders will assist us in the practice of discerning this phenomenon of a lack[35] of moral and ethical leadership within churches and providing a normative approach to avoiding the repeat of situations as reported so widely from Bushiri and Omotoso churches.

Hence, "discernment is the activity of seeking God's guidance amid the circumstances, events, and decisions of life. To discern means to sift through and sort out, much as a prospector must sift out the dross to find nuggets of gold" (Osmer 2008:137). The sustenance of effective leadership is preceded and is dependent on a solid ethical presupposition, and for this research this ethical presupposition is informed by the Word of God. So, when we discuss ethics we are reflecting on the moral framework which is influenced by that very ethical presupposition, and Jesus is the full embodiment of that Word.

The New Testament draws on the prophetic traditions of Israel in a variety of ways. Jesus is portrayed as similar to the prophets of old, announcing God's word to the people. There are many indications that this is how he was popularly understood, as one like Elijah or Jeremiah (Matt.16:14). It is telling that his disciples on the road to Emmaus describe him as "a prophet mighty in word and deed" (Luke 24:19; cf. 7:16) (Osmer 2008:135). So, Jesus informs both the ethics and the morality of our normative

[35]Pamela Maringa writes an article titled ' What has become of our church today'?.....the most recent sensation is the Nigerian pastor, Timothy Omotoso, who has been arrested and charged with rape and human trafficking. My aunt went on to share that she dislikes this new foreign pastor. He showed up and everyone left their church's to join him. She has been to Bushiri's church a couple of times and, she says, he (Bushiri) is a fraud. She shared how people would pay to receive prayers. The article is available here: *https://www.jesuitinstitute.org.za/articles/what-has-become-of-our-church-today/*

approach. Although ethics and morality express what is considered good, other scholars find a distinction between ethics and morality.[36]

To make a distinction between morals and ethics or to differentiate between the two, Gaster (1988: 34) differentiates the two by noting that morals are the standards traditionally recognized as necessary for ensuring what is deemed good in society and in individuals. These are determined by the exigencies of a particular society and vary with its ever-changing culture. Ethics, on the other hand (on which, to be sure, morals are ultimately based), has as its province the determination of what constitutes 'good' in the first place and implies an antecedent premise. Yet ethics are intertwined and a reflection of theology; hence in the normative task we consider both the theological and ethical interpretation. For "theological and ethical interpretation is the most formal dimension of the normative task" (Osmer 2008:139).

Therefore, in introducing the normative task as it relates to this research, attempting to appropriate the theological interpretation, ethical interpretation, and good practice as normative reflection, this section will largely draw insights from the discussion of the ethical theory from the work of Julia Driver, titled: *Ethics: The Fundamentals* (2007). This does not however imply that the whole normative task will be based on a singular ethical theory of Driver, but reference will also be made to notable various Christian theories and wisdom literature such as Stout (2001)'s work on *Ethics After Babel,* Adams (1999) *Finite and Infinite Goods: A Framework for Ethics,* and Boone (2017) *Ethics 101.*

In her work, Driver extrapolates a dialogue between the three approaches which are *God and Human Nature, Divine Command Ethical Theory and Ethical Egoism Theory*. Through reflecting on chapter two of Driver's work, titled: *God and Human Nature* as its point of departure in explaining ethical theory, it is evident that the two contrasts in ethical theory is Divine will versus Human will; because as one constructs an ethical paradigm one is confronted with a stark contrast between the view of ethics that comes from above/God – hence divine, and the other view seemingly coming from below/human nature. Driver, in presenting the two ethical theories, investigates their source of normativity, as whether can one trust their claims as being normative.

[36] See Brawley's exposition of ethics in the accounts recorded in the four Gospels and in the book of Acts in a book edited by Green (2013), entitled: *The New Testament and Ethics,* highlights the aspect of Jesus' ethics in his extensive treatment of ethics in the Gospels and Acts.

The concept of normativity is useful to our construction of an ethical paradigm because it translates our judgments into theories, which help to make our evaluations of morality universal; thus, "theory enables us to delve beyond our surface intuitions about what is right and wrong to get at the underlying explanation for that judgment – a very important judgment, since it enables us to provide justifications for our actions and evaluations" (Driver 2007: 4). Further on she annotates:

> The role of normative ethical theory is to better understand moral justification, one important point to stress is that normative ethics is about giving an account of what we ought to do, or what we ought to be like. This is distinct from giving an account or a theory of how people do in fact act, and how they do in fact go about praising and blaming. That is the subject of descriptive, not normative, ethics (Driver 2007: 4).

One should take notice of two important clauses in the statement quoted above which are: what we ought to do, or what we ought to be like, for they describe two important features in ethical evaluation: action and character.

I think these two must be related in a certain order which stipulates that character should precede action; what we ought to be like influences what we ought to do. Thus, the focus of our evaluation should be on the character of the individual than on what they do. Driver's work is significant in our understanding of various normative ethical theories because she maintains that all the theories should be regarded as useful; even when she may reject either of those theories she does so substantially. All the evidence she provides for each theory is sufficiently presented for any reader to make an intelligent decision about the choice he/she will make. Perhaps, chapter two of her book – the chapter in discussion – is significant for one's understanding of Driver's framework of normative ethical theory and its development because of where she chose to place this chapter in the whole book; hence, I think that placing the discussion of God and human nature at the beginning of the book is not done randomly, but rather strategically to understand the whole book.

I suppose the two terms used in the title of this chapter – God and Human Nature – form the basis of understanding ethical theory; and both these could be regarded as the fundamental source of any normative ethical theory. One's evaluation either begins at looking at mankind or looks at another transcendent being who created the human being, or an inspired text or Scriptures.

In this regard, an ethical theory is an indispensable feature of evaluating morality and for justifying character and actions. What is also important in one's evaluation is to find a universal character of the theory assessed or in discussion. Julia Driver, in the introduction of her work notes that: When it comes to ethical theories, we also look for novel guidance. Ethical theories are supposed to provide us with decision, procedures, and/or criteria for evaluation of actions and character. They are, in that way, practically oriented.

If a theory does not give us answers that go beyond our intuitions, then the theory is not doing any independent work for us, and this would be a drawback (Driver 2007: 11). What also makes chapter two interesting is that Driver (2007: 17), after discussing a popular challenge to normative ethical theory known as Moral Universalism – which suggests the truth-value of moral claims is relative, picks on the subject of God and Human Nature as the first alternative to misguided Moral Universalism. Thus, Driver (2007: 21) remarks that even though Moral Universalism is initially appealing, it is untenable; hence, there is a quest to find other alternatives that provide fundamental norms and values.

2.3.1 God and Human Nature

God and Human Nature provide us with two positions from which we can develop any normative ethical theory. Driver, in her definitions of these two positions already makes a distinction of their source of normativity. However, at the beginning of her presentation of these two classic theories she sounds ambiguous because she defines the Divine Command Theory as totally exclusive of human nature and Ethical Egoism as directly intertwined with human nature. For instance, she notes that, "Divine command theory holds that moral norms depend upon God's will, and in that way these norms find their authority outside human nature. Ethical egoism, on the other hand, is the view that moral norms serve the function of promoting the self-interest of individuals" (Driver 2007: 22).

Her relation of the source of normativity and morality by the use of the terms such as transcending or falling outside human nature of other theories suggests that an ethical theory can be constructed outside human nature. However, I don't think that you can create an ethical theory that transcend or falls outside human nature, because even one's understanding of the divine will already inadvertently take on a view of human nature – this obviously depends on which divine person you are referring to. However,

the difficulty here is one of making theology relevant to current public discourse. Stout (2001: 163), in his brilliant work: *Ethics After Babel* suggests that "Academic theology seems to have lost its voice, its ability to command attention as a distinctive contributor to public discourse in our culture". Further on, Stout annotates that "this dilemma is by now a familiar one, much remarked upon by theologians themselves.

To gain a hearing in our culture, theology has often assumed a voice not its own and found itself merely repeating the bromides of secular intellectuals in transparently figurative speech" (Stout 2001: 163). As a result, most societies have become secularized and have done all they can to discount, undermine, and marginalize any religious views on most disciplines, even in the discipline of theology. However, before we discuss the Divine command theory, we have to realize that, as Stout (2001: 109) comments that, "If there are many languages of morals, some of them surely show the influence of religious beliefs and practices".

2.3.2 Divine Command Ethical Theory

It is plausible to assume that the God who from whom the Divine command theory is derived or is made reference to in this book, is the Judeo-Christian God, for the illustration of Abraham provided in Driver's chapter to explain Divine command theory is from the Bible – in particular the Hebrew/Jewish text – used by both Judaism and Christianity. The author's reference to Augustine's use of the narrative of Abraham proves the point she makes that "this story has been taken to represent a view of morality, Divine command theory, which is the view that what is right is completely a matter of God's will" (2007: 23). To confirm this she draws insight about this story from an astute Christian philosopher and theologian: Thomas Aquinas, who is cited as arguing that God was not making an exception for Abraham contra the injunction against committing murder, rather Abraham consented to slay his son because his son was due to slain by the command of God, who is Lord of life and death (2007: 24).

The challenge here is the interpretation of this story, as one is left with having to make a decision about the interpretation of this story, whether one should interpret it literally or figuratively/allegorically. Moreover, Driver's notation: "Divine command theory seems quite a natural theory to adopt, given that we believe that a divine, supernatural being created the universe in its entirety", can be misleading because there are a few creation accounts that have vast implications, especially when they relate to morality.

One view is the *ex nihilo* creation account which claims that God created from nothing and nothing has existence outside of him: thus:

> God has the power simply to will situations to be, and they immediately come to pass exactly as he has willed. Second, creation is an act of his will, not coerced by any force or consideration outside himself. Further, God does not involve himself, his own being, in the process. Creation is not a part of him or an emanation from his reality (Erickson 1998: 397).

The other view of creation is referred to as the All-Inclusive Nature which suggests that God created everything at once and everything has been unfolding through time from that original creation. One could also follow the view of naturalism where God, after the original creation, left everything to humankind to cultivate. Apart from the ones mentioned above, history is also full of other obscure and unusual strong creation story telling techniques to explain the complexities and variations from one source to the next.

Therefore, before one accepts Divine command theory as a natural theory one must adopt a creation account that is relevant to their ethical theory. For instance, Thomas Aquinas made reference to this idea that an ethical theory is underpinned by a creation account; thus, Driver (2007: 28) comments that:

> Thomas Aquinas held a version of natural law theory. This theory is not a variation of divine command theory. It does not hold that God's will is necessary and sufficient to make a particular action right or wrong. However, a very popular version of this theory does hold that God created the universe in such a way that morality is revealed to us in His creation. There are laws of morality in the fabric of the universe.

Bretzke (2004: 43), in his discussion of the natural law begins by quoting a text from the Bible: Romans 2:12-17,[37] and explains that this text is relevant to prove the relation of natural law to morality. He notes that, "we must keep in mind that for Christian ethics even our natural law theory must in some sense be subject to *norma normans* ("norming norm") of God's revelation.

[37] "**12** All who sin apart from the law will also perish apart from the law, and all who sin under the law will be judged by the law. **13** For it is not those who hear the law who are righteous in God's sight, but it is those who obey the law who will be declared righteous. **14** (Indeed, when Gentiles, who do not have the law, do by nature things required by the law, they are a law for themselves, even though they do not have the law. **15** They show that the requirements of the law are written on their hearts, their consciences also bearing witness, and their thoughts sometimes accusing them and at other times even defending them.) **16** This will take place on the day when God judges people's secrets through Jesus Christ, as my gospel declares. **17** Now you, if you call yourself a Jew; if you rely on the law and boast in God;" (Rom.2:12-17).

Boone (2017:124) argues that divine command theory is not a religion, or at least not exactly. It is a principle of religion, because modern organized religions certainly have an element of divine command theory in their dogma. They provide nuanced systems of life rules, cultural and social histories, and theology, as well as moral philosophy.

Driver asks the question: "If God created everything, then isn't God who is responsible for morality's existence?" In an attempt to qualify the notion that God is responsible for the existence of morality, Clauson (2015) argues that the results of scriptural foundations for the creation of human beings (by God) have very crucial applications to virtually every area of life and thought, from personal moral ethics and the family to politics, economics, and beyond, thus making God responsible for such moral existence. Adams (1999) also posits that Divine Command Theory provides an objective metaphysical foundation for morality, thus putting God in the 'command' position of the divine lawgiver. John Hare (in Wilkens 2017:117) says a proper response in divine command theory to those who believe that morality in grounded in nature and not in God, is that the primary God's commands "both in the Hebrew Scriptures and primarily, for a Christian in the teaching of Jesus…..we learn that we are to love our enemies, for example, in the Sermon on the mount and in the parable of the good Samaritan", something our natural reaction would not easily accept. For those committed to the existence of objective moral truths, such truths seem to fit well within a theistic framework of a God who created everything and therefore derive their morality.

However, Driver in answering this question, draws from an analogy of Samuel Morse's invention of the telegraph that just as Morse invented the telegraph so God also invented morality. Unfortunately, the analogy creates an ambivalence in its limitations, because if the telegraph depended on Morse for its existence but its operation afterwards was independent of Morse does not explain the intricacies of God's creation of morality for if God wills morality then he continues to be involved in its manifestation. Maybe that's why Clauson's argument sounds closer to the God who is responsible for morality's existence than the Morse analogy of an invented telegraph.

In many peoples' minds this theory creates a connection between religion and morality, thus, "the central idea behind the theory that treats God's will as fundamental to morality is that something is right if and only if it is God's will, or if and only if God commands it" (Driver 2007:29). My struggle with such an assertion is how does one

know God's will; is it discovered through intuition, or through prophecy of other 'spiritual gifts', or is it found through reading the Bible or any other religious book – if this is the case then one has to give an interpretation of what they have read or use other hermeneutical tools provided by different schools of thought to reach an adequate interpretation.

Driver (2007: 31) makes this valid point to prove a difficulty in finding the will of God by noting that without access to the mind of God, there is a good deal of uncertainty about the contents of God's will. Thus, this makes an attempt to find God's will more difficult because any one can claim to hear from God especially in our age that is characterized by relativism and pluralism. Hence, Driver (2007: 25) remarks that "the basic theory is not essentially a Christian one – very many religious perspectives could endorse a version of divine command theory and simply spell it out differently, according to the nature of the god set out in the religious tradition". So, the will of God will be firstly determined by the religious tradition that undergirds the god referenced, and as a result may lose any kind of universal description. However, the description that other ethicists give of what may be the will of God may be misleading because it evaluates God's view of the act not the character of God. Driver (2007: 26) states that:

> If there are reasons why God deems an action to be 'right' and 'wrong' – not God's will. It forces us to choose between two unpalatable options: (i) what is right is completely determined by God's will, or what God wants, and is thus capricious in a way that seems incompatible with rightness; or (ii) God does not determine what is right, but is simply in the best position to discern or perceive what is right, since he is infallible.

The second option seems reasonable because it moves its focus away from action – of whether it is right or wrong – rather it focuses on the person of God; it is from His holy character that a decision is made of whether an action is right or wrong. Therefore, Morality depends upon what God believes is right and wrong. This is often referred to as the "doxastic" interpretation of divine command theory. On this view God is, in effect, an ideal observer. He has all the virtues that we associate with the ideal epistemic agent and moral judge. He is *impartial*, since He loves all persons equally; He is rational and thus makes no errors of reasoning; and He has full information, so He will not be making mistakes on the basis of partial information. If God, then, who is not swayed by bias or prejudice, who is completely fair, and who knows all of the relevant facts… Thus, a distinction can be drawn between the volitional and the doxastic versions of the theory (Driver 2007: 27). The doxastic version of the Divine

command theory is the most reasonable and adequate for a normative ethical theory because it accounts for a universal description which is necessary for evaluating both character and actions. Bretzke (2004: 99), in his discussion of how Scripture is meant to function as a normative voice in moral issues, supports Divine command theory by noting that:

> I believe from the perspective of fundamental moral theology the question becomes one of how we can take the Bible off the shelf and bring it back into ethical discussions in a way which uses Scripture in a constructive and authentic dialogical manner – a way that may not "clinch" moral arguments from the start by closing off any subsequent debate or discussion, but through a process that will allow the voice of Scripture to be heard, engaged, and evaluated in a manner that properly forms and informs both our character and our moral reasoning which flows out of that character.

Nevertheless, this ethical theory, though gained a lot of popularity, it has not existed without opposition or contrast. Thus, one of the theories that challenged the Divine command theory was Ethical Egoism.

2.3.3 Ethical Egoism Theory

This ethical theory is concerned about the preservation and well-being of individuals. It maintains the view that "moral norms serve the function of promoting the self-interest of individuals – thus, what we ought to do depends upon what promotes our own individual self-interest" (Driver 2007: 22). In her description of this position, Driver notes that, "Egoism is one of the earliest attempts to articulate a normative ethical theory by appeal to human nature. The attraction of this view was that it made ethics an outgrowth of our humanity" (2007: 39).

One of the philosophers that popularized this view, though indirectly, was Thomas Hobbes; Driver (2007: 31) quotes him as noting that a general inclination of mankind is a perpetual and restless desire of power after power, which ceases only in death. This view, to some extent, seems to be providing an anthropological horizon that underpins most ethical theories that begin their investigation with human nature. For instance, this view may be related to normative relativism because its ethical theory is also depended on what an individual may think is right or wrong according to them.

Relativism has always been problematic because it denies the fact that any value may be universal, that all human beings can hold to the same moral claims.[38]

Beauchamp (2001: 32) notes that "Cultural relativism might reasonably be said to hold that 'what is right at one place or time may be wrong at another… Normative relativism has sometimes been crudely translated as 'anything is right or wrong whenever some individual or some group sincerely thinks it is right or wrong'".

This view, as a contrast to Divine command theory, perceives individuals as fundamentally driven by self-interest; thus, one ethical departure is the human being's interest – in that regard it is the human will that has superiority over the divine will. Driver (2007: 31-32) further on divides this ethical egoism into three categories: (i) Psychological egoism; (ii) Ethical egoism; and (iii) Rational egoism. Psychological egoism is the descriptive view that all human action is motivated by self-interest; whereas, Ethical egoism is the normative view that holds that all action ought to be motivated by self-interest; and Rational egoism holds that an action is rational if and only if it maximizes the agent's self-interest.

During the discussion of how egoism manifests itself in these various categories one realizes that rational egoism is lost and it only referred to in relation to either psychological egoism or ethical egoism; it is rather related as an element of ethical egoism because "some think that if ethical egoism is the correct view; however, then it seems quite clear why – because it is rational (Driver 2007: 35). Hence, there are two categories of this view. Driver (2007: 34-35) further on remarks that:

The normative counterpart to psychological egoism is ethical egoism. Again, this is the view that the agent should act on his self-interest. Note the difference between this view and psychological egoism. Psychological egoism is a descriptive rather than a normative claim. Psychological egoism is a theory of human nature that purports to describe what motivates persons to act. Ethical egoism, on the other hand, is normative. It purports to tell us how people ought to act.

Therefore, the preferred of these two is ethical egoism because it is a form of "enlightened" self-interest and many think that it offers a solution to the problem of

[38] This paper does not engage the different perspectives of the concept of relativism, as help by other credible Christian scholars, such as James K. A. Smith. To read more on the debates or different perspective on relativism, see the book: *Who's Afraid of Relativism?* (2014).

moral motivation. The trouble here is that not all human beings instinctively have self-interest that has the possibility of enriching the other person; as a matter of fact, most human beings are naturally inclined to promote themselves and gain at the expense of others, even when it harmed them. Hence, the Divine command theory becomes the most reasonable ethical theory because – when considered as a whole – it is honest about the nature of humankind before their encounter with the divine. Thus, ethical egoism is not thorough in discussing the negative potential of the human being which is characterized by narcissism.

This position raises a lot of problems that have the potential of creating confusion; because on the one hand, it seems to be based on selfish humanism and on the other hand, it promotes a self-interest that treats the others as one ought to be treated.

Normative ethics theory is mostly concerned about universal justification that shows an interest in the other person than on the self. Hence, Driver (2007: 2) confirms this by noting that "someone who wrongfully harms another does something that he or she ought not do in the moral sense of 'ought'. It is this sense that is the subject of normative ethics, and it is an understanding of this sense of 'ought' that is at the heart of normative ethical theories".

Sidgwick, (cited by Driver 2007: 36), presents this position clearly by suggesting that there is a practical contradiction between the pursuit of self-interest and universal benevolence (a concern to promote the well-being of as many as possible. Thus, it is counterintuitive because it rejects some of the virtues – like altruism or generosity – which are necessary for moral living. Thus, the arguments purportedly in favor of ethical egoism don't seem to work. Further, there are plenty of reasons for doubting that this theory accounts, at the very least, for some of our deeply held moral intuitions, since it seems to get the point of morality entirely wrong. It's true that if morality and self-interest coincided, then it would be great news. But in those cases where it does coincide it does so by chance – there is no conceptual connection (Driver 2007: 38).

Therefore, the above statement by Driver (2007: 39) clearly portrays the author's position – of whether she supports or she rejects this ethical theory; she seems to reject it – even though she gave some consideration to ethical egoism distinct from psychological egoism – because it does not transcend person intuitions or self-interest. She concludes by noting that, "Indeed… we shouldn't be motivated by self-interest at all, even though our own well-being is a by-product of moral virtue".

Therefore, the primary argument that Driver raises in chapter two of her book is the source of normativity; so in comparing Divine command theory with Egoism she investigates their source of normativity. In the opening statement of the chapter she states that, “one issue of enduring interest to philosophers working in normative ethical theory is the issue of the source of normativity” (Driver 2007: 22).

It is important to note here that the author introduces these positions – as she will also do in the other chapters of the book – with a critical eye. Although Driver presents both these positions brilliantly, I argue with her in how she presents the Divine command theory as not making a claim about human nature as ethical egoism, as she asserts that the norms of Divine command theory find their authority outside human nature (2007: 22). Moreover, she makes a conclusion from only one event – that of Abraham in Genesis 22 – of the whole narrative. However, the narrative earlier on in Genesis 1 had already made a universal claim about human nature, that God created man – both male and female – in his image. Thus, it should be from this ideal of human nature that an ethical theory must be constructed. She continues to claim that psychological egoism makes a radical and interesting claim about human nature.

However, both ethical theories – divine command theory and egoism – are supported by a particular view of human nature; even any other ethical theory is constructed by a particular view of human nature. Hence, to treat both realms – human nature and ethical theory – exclusively is artificial. For instance, if I truly hold to a view of human nature that claims that all human beings are created in the image of God and are equal, then, inevitably that assertion will shape my ethical paradigm.

Though the area of human nature and ethics could be treated distinctively, however, in real life situations they are intertwined and should be treated adjacently. Any ethical theory is based upon an anthropological horizon; and, therefore, in our quest to create an ethical theory that is adequate we must first find a common anthropology and then inform our moral evaluation mechanism!

Having looked at the insights from the discussion of the ethical theory from the work of Julia Driver in addressing the normative task, which used theological concepts to interpret particular episodes, situations, or contexts to construct ethical norms to guide our responses, this research proposes that we look at the Sermon on the Mount which outlines the ethical virtues which are necessary for the formation of an ethical leader. The sermon will assist the researcher to determine strategies of action for an ethical

theory that informs the fourth task which is the pragmatic task. Learning from Jesus on the mount to “good practice” that will influence leaders to have a biblical basis for ethical leadership.

CHAPTER 3. THE BACKGROUND OF *THE SERMON ON THE MOUNT*

The beatitudes appear within the Sermon on the Mount. In the Sermon on the Mount which deals with every aspect of the human heart and condition, believers are called to put God first in their motives and their actions, in their business, language, thought life and their priorities. Jesus in the sermon is stating that these perspectives would become the mental state of mind and attitude indicators for all who would become His disciples in declaring the supremacy of God in all things.

Given that the focus of this research is on the teaching of the beatitudes, in *The Sermon on the Mount*, where Jesus outlines the values of the Christian life –the Gospel according to Matthew would come handy as our reference point compared to Luke where we find the same. To understand the context of this teaching we have to give a bit of background to the book of Matthew.

The structure of Matthew is built around a double outline that can be traced by recurring phrases in the book. The first is biographical and is quite similar to the framework of the biography of Jesus as given in Mark and Luke. The two points of division are Matthew 4:17, which says: “From that time on Jesus began to preach, "Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is near."”. This indicates the rise of Jesus’ preaching career, which brought him into public prominence. The second point of division is Matthew 16:21, which says: “From that time on Jesus began to explain to his disciples that he must go to Jerusalem and suffer many things at the hands of the elders, chief priests and teachers of the law, and that he must be killed and on the third day be raised to life.” This passage marks the beginning of the decline of his popularity and points toward the culmination of his career at the cross.

Thus, these two faces of his life indicate that the purpose of the author is to present the two aspects of Jesus’ biography. Part of this biography included the portrayal of Jesus as being a teacher of principles of the kingdom of God;[39] however, it is important to understand Jesus’ principles of the morality of the Kingdom of God alongside other dominant prevailing moral theories.

[39] To read more on the introduction of the Gospel of Matthew see Brown (2013).

3.1 The Sermon on the Mount and Ethical Theories[40]

To understand the words of Jesus, in the Sermon on the Mount, as foundational for constructing a moral understanding for the citizens of the Kingdom of God, we need to understand these teachings in the context of a moral theory. Hence this interpretation of the Sermon on the Mount transcends the different reductions of the understandings of this sermon. Hence, McKnight (2013:1-3) reflects on what do these (re)interpretations look like?

- First, some have said the Sermon is really Moses or the law ramped up to the highest level and that Jesus' intent is not to summon his followers to do these things but to show just how wretchedly sinful they are and how much they are in need of Christ's righteousness; however, the Sermon, then, is nothing but a mirror designed to reveal our sinfulness.
- Second, he continues to remark that others assign the sayings of Jesus in the Sermon to the private level, sometimes as little more than disposition or intention or striving and other times to how Christians live personally and privately as a Christian but not how they live publicly. In this regard, the Sermon, then, is a code for private morality.
- Third, others think these sayings belong only to the most committed of disciples, whether monk, nun, priest, pastor, or radical. If they are designed only for the hyper committed, the ordinary person can pass them by. The Sermon is for the elite Christian.
- Fourth, the tendency today is to see the Sermon as *preceded by something*, and that something is the gospel and that gospel is personal salvation and grace. That means that the Sermon is a sketch of the Christian life but only for those who have been so transformed by grace that they see the demands not as law but as grace-shaped ethics that can only be done by the person who lives by the Spirit. The Sermon, then, is Christian ethics, but it can only be understood once someone understands a theology of grace.

[40] To help us understand studies that have reflected on Jesus' teachings on the Sermon on the Mount in the context of Moral Theories this research has extensively drawn from McKnight's (2013) commentary on the Sermon on the Mount in the series: The Story of God Bible Commentary. Therefore, there will be extensive quotations (both direct and indirect) from this source in this section.

Mcknight (2013) argues strongly against the four interpretations above as they reduce the correct interpretation of the words of Jesus in the Sermon on the Mount; because, the danger of this is that *those who take this approach more often than not end up denying the potency of the Sermon and sometimes simply turn elsewhere – to Galatians and Romans and Ephesians – for their Christian ethical instruction.* What many such readings of the Sermon really want is Paul, and since they can't find Paul in the Sermon, they reinterpret the Sermon and give us Paul instead. As many think that it is far wiser to ask how Paul relates to the Sermon than to make Jesus sound like Paul, and many today are showing that Paul's ethics and Jesus' ethics – their theologies – are not as far apart as some have made them out to be. Hence, others attempt to improve the ethics of Jesus, in light of Paul's writings. However, when we seek to "improve" the words of Jesus in the Sermon on the Mount by setting them in a larger theological context, we too often ruin the words of Jesus.

Therefore, McKnight (2013:3) remarks that there is something vital in letting the demand of Jesus, expressed over and over in the Sermon as imperatives or commands, stand in its rhetorical ruggedness. Only as demand do we hear this Sermon as he meant it to be heard as the claim of Jesus upon our whole being. Therefore, to appreciate the impact of the Sermon on the Mount we must understand the prevailing, dominant ethical theories within the modern philosophical landscape; as McKnight (2013: 3) notes in his commentary:

> The Sermon on the Mount remains the greatest moral document of all time. To justify this claim I want to probe Jesus' moral vision by comparing Jesus' Sermon to other moral theorists. From Moses to Plato and Aristotle to Augustine and Aquinas to Luther and Calvin, and then into the modern world of thinkers like Kant and Mill all the way to contemporary moral theorists like Richard and Reinhold Niebuhr, John Howard Yoder and Stanley Hauerwas, and also Oliver O'Donovan and Alasdair MacIntyre, some of the thinkers have applied their energies to ethics. How does Jesus fit into that history?

According to McKnight, there are three dominant ethical theories to understand, though reductive interpretations or theories, in comparison with the ethical theory of the Sermon on the Mount. These three are Virtue Ethics, The Categorical Imperative, and Utilitarian Ethics.

3.1.1 Virtue Ethics

The person with whom virtue ethics begins is ultimately Aristotle, whose theory has been influential both in wider culture and in the church. Aristotle (383-322 B.C.E.) is another outstanding thinker from Athens; another influential Greek philosopher whose thoughts also greatly impact the contemporary scene, as those of his mentor, Plato. Aristotle "joined Plato's Academy at the age of seventeen, and the influence of Plato on his thought is obvious" (Stevenson & Haberman 2004: 87). However, he did not accept his entire mentor's presuppositions, thus he changed the direction of his inquiry. As one critically and comprehensively studies the works of both, one discovers distinct philosophical impressions in both on human nature. In summary, one observes that Plato was more interested in transcendence and Aristotle was more interested in the extraordinary mysteries in the ordinary situations.[41]

Plato's writings were in a different format, seen as more abstract and technical; thus, he became known as the philosophers' philosopher. "His prolific writings cover three phases: the Platonic period of the Academy, the transitional, and the phase of the lyceum, which was devoted mostly to logic, metaphysics, natural sciences, ethics, politics, and philosophy" (Kelly & Tallon 1976: 9).[42] Aristotle's writings were especially influential in Aquinas and the monastic tradition of the Catholic Church, including devotional and spiritual greats like Benedict and Bonaventure. Others come to mind: Alasdair MacIntyre and N.T. Wright and Stanley Hauerwas are each, in one way or another, deeply influenced by Aristotle's virtue ethics. Therefore, it is important to see just what Aristotle had to say in order to grasp the core of virtue ethics (McKnight 2013:4). McKnight (2013:4-5) comments that three ideas will give us handles on Aristotle's ethics. First, the goal of life was human *flourishing* (Greek word *eudaimonia*). Second, a moral, reasonable person could only become a virtuous person in the context of *friendship*. Put in broader categories, virtue ethics are defined by and take shape within a community. Third, Aristotle's approach was to practice the habits that made virtue the core of one's *character*.

[41] According to Aristotle, there are three areas of theoretical science: Physical sciences, Mathematics, and Metaphysics; moreover, there are also three practical sciences: Ethics (concerns the individual), Economics (concerns the family), and Politics (concerns the community); and his book: *Nicomachean Ethics* is devoted to the first which is ethics (Houser 1995: 49-87).

[42] Kelly and Tallon (1976: 9) provide a commentary on how all the themes that Aristotle treated relate, and they make an emphasis on his discussion of Soul as a substantial matter and functions of the Soul.

The word “virtue,” then, is tied to the word “character,” and character forms as a result of good habits. The good person (character) does what is good (virtues), and doing good (virtues, habits) over time produces good character. The question, then, is not so much “What should I do?” but “Who should I be?” or “What does it look like to be a virtuous person?”

Other Christian ethicists have their own version of virtue ethics, such as one of the great Christian philosophers: Dallas Willard, especially his work on spiritual formation studies. That is, a person with vision and intention needs to practice the habitual means of the spiritual disciplines to become a person with character sufficient for a flourishing (or blessed) life. Willard’s theory of spiritual formation is a radically revised version of virtue ethics reshaped by the Christian theology or revelation and grace.[43]

3.1.2 The Categorical Imperative

The famous German philosopher Immanuel Kant,[44] whose work reshaped all philosophical thought in the Western world, sought to establish ethics on the basis of reason alone, and his normative theory, often called deontological ethics (*deon* means “ought, duty, or obligation”), landed on the “categorical imperative.” Kant improves the concept of reason by suggesting that in man this reason reaches a level of understanding in that man is able to organize various thoughts and arrive at a certain cause which leads him to act. However, human actions are influenced by two causes: hypothetical imperatives, and categorical imperatives; the former is an empirical character, and the latter is an intelligible character.

[43] McKnight (2013:5) argues against this ethical theory through commenting that “I will argue that virtue ethics push us to the rim of the inner circle but do not completely come to terms with Jesus in his Jewish world. The fundamental problem with virtue ethics is that Jesus does not overtly talk like this; he does not teach the importance of habits as the way to form character.”

[44] Immanuel Kant (1724-1804) enters the “philosophic scene” in a significant age of scientific development known as the *Enlightenment*, and became the key philosopher of his time. Thus, “Kant was surely the deepest thinker of the enlightenment. He believed in the potential for human reason to improve the human condition (here using the term ’reason’ in a wider sense than philosophical rationalism, to mean science and its social applications)” (Stevenson & Haberman 2004: 120).
His life was also impacted by the twin influences of his age: Christianity and Science, which seemed to be at war with each other. So, Kant set out to create a synthesis of both; hence, “The overarching problem of Kant’s philosophy was to reconcile the claims of morality and religion with scientific knowledge. He hoped to paint one big, though complicated picture, giving human nature its appropriate place within physical nature” (Stevenson & Haberman 2004: 124).

Hypothetical imperative is when an action follows a cause of own desire to satisfy that desire; whilst, a Categorical imperative is an action that follows an obligation or a moral order – a reason for an action that we must perform irrespective of our self-interested satisfaction. However, "He does not accept the notion of a moral sense, believing instead that human beings use the same faculty to make moral judgments as they do to gain knowledge of the world. That faculty is *reason*" (Stewart 2007: 150).

Further on Stewart (2007: 150) annotates: Kant also does not argue for a universal morality or anything like natural law. Instead he proposes to explain in purely formal terms what makes an action moral and articulates a formula that can be applied anywhere by anyone to determine what the moral action is. This formula he calls the categorical imperative. That it is categorical means it is not conditional on any particular end to be achieved. To say that it is imperative means it is a command, but a command that we give to ourselves. Here is Kant's best-known formulation of the categorical imperative: *Act on the principle that can be a universal law of nature*. Some people think this sounds like the Golden Rule: Do unto others as you would have them do unto you. Kant says that the categorical imperative is different. To capture that difference would be to state it in the following way: Do unto others what you are willing for everybody to do. Thus, Kant sees perfect human nature as that which conforms to the latter cause of action: Categorical imperative. Therefore, "this is what Kant calls 'pure' or a 'priori' practical reason; he means that morality is fundamentally a function of our reason, not just our feelings" (Stevenson & Haberman 2004: 126). In his classic work: *God as a Postulate of practical Reason,* Kant (2007: 156) remarks that If we inquire into God's final end in creating the world, we must name not the happiness of rational beings in the world but the highest good, which adds a further condition to the wish of rational beings to be happy, *viz*., the condition of being worthy of happiness, which is the morality of these beings, for this alone contains the standard by which they can hope to participate in happiness at the hand of a wise creator. Kant framed the categorical imperative in a number of ways:

> Act only in accordance with that maxim through which you can at the same time will that it become a universal law. The focus here is on the *universality* of true ethics. … so act that you use humanity, whether in your person or in the person of any other, always at the same time as an end, never merely as a means. [Here the emphasis is treating humans *as humans deserving of profound respect*… the idea of the will of every rational being as a will giving universal law… And here we are to see that *each person, as an individual*, can be an expression of the universal ethic (McKnight 2013:5).

These three statements - universality, humanity, individuality - are each variations and developments of the categorical imperative: what is true for one must be true for all, and if we treat others as an end and therefore value humanity inherently, we will act in such a way to live rationally and ethically. Two more ideas: At work here (1) are both intention and practice, with intention having even more weight than practice. Also, at work, because Kant thinks of ethics in terms of universality, is (2) that what "I" ought to do becomes a *right* for everyone else as well as my *duty* to other people.

Therefore, McKnight (2013:5-6) remarks that it could be argued that Kant's categorical imperative is a variant on the Golden Rule (Matt 7:12) or the Jesus Creed (Mark 12:18-32), but this is inaccurate. In fact, Kant's categorical imperative is far more useful in telling us what not to do – do not lie – than what to do – make promises and live by them.

3.1.3 Utilitarian Ethics

The third ethical theory McKnight (2013:6) presents is the Utilitarian Ethics, advocated by two English thinkers, Jeremy Bentham (1748-1832) and John Stuart Mill (1806-1873). Classic utilitarianism can be said to have three leading points: it is consequentialist, universalist, and (in some cases) hedonist. It is consequentialist in that what makes an action right is the consequences of that action. It is universalist in that utilitarian judges the consequences for *everyone* affected by the action. It is hedonist in that the classic utilitarian (and here we are thinking of Bentham, not Mill) identifies "good" with "pleasure" and "bad" with "pain." So, an action is right if, and only if, it produces (thus, consequentialist) the greatest good (hedonism), and for the greatest number (universalist). We are asking if Jesus fits into such a scheme of ethical thinking.

Christian thinking can in some ways adapt or even colonize consequentialism and reframe ethics into that which brings the greatest pleasure of all, namely, glorifying God. In addition, one has to begin to think of Christian eschatology, including the final judgment as well as the new heavens and the new earth, as the final consequence toward which all ethics need to be shaped. A kind of consequentialism plays an important element in the ethical theory of Jesus, but it needs to be said that the utilitarian model secularizes, flattens, and rationalizes eschatology.

Furthermore, consequentialist ethics entail a major issue that postmodernity has brought to the fore: *Who* decides which ethic is most consequential? What groups do we include when we say the "greatest number"? It must be said once again: far too often we discover an ethic shaped and controlled by the privileged and powerful.

3.2 Jesus' ethical Theory

Jesus was fully dependent on the complete revelation of the Hebrew Scriptures, also referred to as the Old Testament, and his ethical theory was derived from the broad understanding of these Scriptures. McKnight (2013: 7–14) succinctly gives an overview of Jesus' ethical theory, as derived from different sections of the Old Testament and culminating in the Messianic, Ecclesial, and Pneumatic perspectives, all of them reshaped to make Jesus' ethical theory.

Hence, Jesus doesn't fit neatly into any of the theories outlined above, and the Sermon on the Mount requires a better "theory." However, each of these theories – virtue, deontological, and utilitarian ethics – does say something true about how Jesus "did" ethics. But using these categories runs the serious risk of colonizing Jesus into the history of philosophical thinking. It might be wiser for us to begin by wondering what Jesus sounded like – morally, that is – in a first-century Galilean Jewish world.

This warning about imposing philosophical categories to Jesus leads to a warning against theologians doing the same. There is something about the Sermon on the Mount that makes Christians nervous, and in particular it makes Protestants nervous, especially those whose theology's first foot is a special understanding of grace. Now, perhaps, we may not say that grace is not an important foot in the dance, but for some, grace has to be said first or nothing works right. This realization leads many theologians to say something like this: "Nothing in the Sermon can be understood until you know that you are saved by grace and that, as a result of God's regenerative work in your inner person, you can listen to Jesus and follow Jesus." Or they may pose law (Sermon without grace) against gospel (grace leading to Sermon). No one said this more poignantly than John Wesley: "If they [the words of the Sermon] are considered as commandments, they are parts of the law; if as promises, of the gospel." And Kenneth Cain Kinghorn, who edited Wesley's sermons on the Sermon, put it this way: "Wesley taught that the moral law is the gospel presented in the form of a requirement, and the gospel is the law presented in the form of a promise."

However, this posture of introducing the Sermon is expressed, the Sermon still makes many Christians nervous. Why? Because Jesus does not "do" ethics the way many want him to do them. You can squeeze some texts all you want, but Jesus does not say, "First grace, then obedience." He dives right in. There may be – indeed *is* – a reason Jesus simply dove in. Stanley Hauerwas (2006) recognizes that Jesus' new wine doesn't fit into the ethical-theory wineskins: "Virtue may be its own reward, but for Christians the virtues, the kind of virtues suggested by the Beatitudes, are names for the shared life made possible through Christ." Or later, "Yet Christians are not called to be virtuous. We are called to be disciples."

To sketch Jesus' "theory" this research suggests first that Jesus "did" ethics from four angles: Ethics from Above, Ethics from Beyond, Ethics from Below, and then these are shaped in the setting where each of these fit into the context of Jesus' messianic ethics designed for the messianic community in the power of the Spirit.

3.2.1 Ethics from Above: Torah

Jesus emerges out of a history, and that history is Israel's history. One of the central elements of that history is that God speaks to humans in the Torah – the law of Moses. The paradigmatic story is found in Exodus 19-24, with the Ten Commandments found in Exodus 20, all rehearsed in a new form in Deuteronomy. What strikes a reader is that this is top-down communication from God: God descends to the top of Mount Sinai and *reveals* divine law for Israel through Moses. That God spoke, of course, was nothing new, nor did God speak only once to Israel. The singular expression of the prophet, still known in the King James Version, is "Thus saith the LORD." Everything about Jesus' ethics emerges for this history of God having spoken directly to Israel.

Perhaps the most astounding feature of Jesus' ethics is that while Jesus clearly speaks for God and Jesus clearly fits the profile of a prophet, Jesus never says, "Thus saith the Lord." He speaks directly *as the voice of God.* His words are no less than an Ethics from Above. The Sermon on the Mount ends with words to this effect: When Jesus had finished saying these things, the crowds were amazed at his teaching, because he taught as one who had authority, and not as their teachers of the law" (7:28-29).

No one in the last two hundred years seems to have grasped this self-authoritative dimension of the ethics of Jesus, namely, the encountering force of God-with-us in Jesus as King and Lord and Savior, like Dietrich Bonhoeffer did in his *Discipleship.* This classical book blows apart the common distinction between justification and sanctification, and that move enabled Bonhoeffer to get closer to the heart of the Sermon than most. (If someone entered my house and stole every book I own, Bonhoeffer's *Discipleship* would be the first one I'd purchase the next morning – if I waited that long.)

Classic virtue, Kantian, and utilitarian ethics never make the claim to be divinely revealed words, but this is at the heart of the ethics of Jesus (and the Bible). When Christians express Christian ethics through such philosophical theories, they have to modify and reformulate both the content and the theory to make the theory fit. Variations on this Ethics from Above are found in the Christian tradition. Perhaps the strongest form is divine command theory. This theory of ethics emphasizes divine revelation as the first word in all ethical discussions, with the added emphasis that what makes a moral demand right is that God issues that demand. The ancient philosophical debate in Plato was whether an act was good because God commanded it or whether God commanded it because it was (already) good. But divine command theory today has found a way out of that thicket to make the claim that because God is good God's demands are good and right and loving.

The newest kid on the block when it comes to ethical theory is narrative ethics, and by this we mean theories of ethics that contend we are part of humanity with a story, that such a story (human) formed our ethics and is designed to shape us yet further. Stanley Hauerwas's capturing of ethics into an ecclesial narrative is perhaps the best-known example of a narrative-shaped ethic, but our point here is that *this story is a revelation, that is, the story in which we dwell comes to us from God*, and we appropriate this story as divine revelation through Scripture, the tradition, the Spirit, and the church. Christian narrative ethics, then, require an Ethics from Above.

I would contend as well that N.T. Wright's virtue ethics work so well because of his commitment to the Story (God's), and a biblical eschatology, one that takes seriously the created order as continuous in some ways with the new heavens and the new earth. Thus, Wright substantively reshapes virtue ethics in part by an Ethics from Above that is shaped by a kind of narrative ethics.

These could be framed as Jesus' gospel and the apostolic gospel as making sense only in the context of the Story of the Bible, the Story of Israel, and that the fulfillment of that Story is the Story of Jesus. That is, the gospel itself is a way of narrating God's Story in this world as moving from Adam through Abraham and Israel and David to Jesus and then beyond Jesus into the church of the prophets and apostles. If Jesus is the Messiah of that Story, and that is the gospel itself, then all ethics for Jesus involve at least, as one element, an Ethic from Above in the form of that narrative. But narrowing how Jesus "did" ethics to a divine command posture or, better yet in his day and in his terms, to a Torah posture won't adequately capture how Jesus' ethics operated. Yes, to be sure, God speaks to us through Jesus, no more ethically than what we find in the Sermon on the Mount, but simply a vertical movement of words from God to us isn't sufficient for the fullness of Jesus' ethic.

3.2.2 Ethics from Beyond: Prophets

The genius of Israel's prophets was that they revealed God's will to his people, and at the heart of the prophets' ethic was bringing God's future to bear on the present. This is what I mean by an Ethics from Beyond, and it takes us one step beyond an Ethics from Above and one step closer to how Jesus "did" ethics. There is little corresponding ethic in modern ethical theory to this Ethics from Beyond except perhaps in a social contract that sustains a society into its future, or a progressive ethic that hopes beyond hope in some form of a world getting better and better, or a green ethic that urges humans to live now in light of the earth's future (or catastrophe). But social-contract, progressive, and ecological theories run out of steam just where Jesus began: his ethical posture toward the present was robustly shaped by a certain knowledge of God's future. Jesus' ethics flowed directly from God's kingdom; they are kingdom ethics.

The sheer force of Jesus' kingdom language, found more than a hundred times in the Synoptic Gospels and then advanced to some degree by John's conceptualization of kingdom in his expression "eternal life", which is crystallized in several Pauline observations (like Phil 2: 6 - 11 or 1 Cor 15: 20 - 28) and somehow gloriously sketched in Revelation 20 - 22, puts the listener of Jesus' ethic up against an eschatological ethic, a set of norms grounded in his belief of what is to come. What is to come for the person is consequentialist in that the future determines how one lives in the here and now. It can be said that Jesus' ethic was one for now in light of the kingdom to come.

In the words of Stanley Hauerwas, “The sermon is the reality of the new age made possible in time.” Or, as Joe Kapolyo framed it, “These disciples have the responsibility of living their lives in terms of the values that prevail in the kingdom of heaven.” We often call this “inaugurated” eschatology, and that means Jesus’ kingdom ethic is an inaugurated-kingdom ethic.

The most notable element of Jesus’ Ethics from Beyond was that the future had already begun to take effect in the present. This is the point of Matthew 4:17, words that drum up the Sermon on the Mount and propel the words of Jesus throughout: “From that time on Jesus began to preach, ‘Repent, for the kingdom of heaven has come near.’”

Over and over again in the Sermon and in Jesus’ teaching, the future impinges on the present in such a way that a new day is already arriving in Jesus. Thus, “these are not ordinary ethics, nor are they merely an extension of intensification of Jewish ethics … They are the ethics of the kingdom.”

The utilitarian, consequentialist ethic of Mill is a dry bone when compared to Israel’s prophets and Jesus, for their consequentialism is not just a better world or even personal happiness, but ultimately the glory of God when God establishes his kingdom in this world. And a virtue ethic with no eschatology, which is what Aristotle offered to the world, can’t be compared to the virtue ethic that one finds in Jesus. Here I think of how NT ethics are unfolded in Tom Wright’s *After You Believe*, in Oliver O’Donovan’s magisterial *Resurrection and Moral Order*, and in Glenn Stassen and David Gushee’s *Kingdom Ethics*. An ethic unshaped by eschatology is neither Jesus’ nor Christian. But once again, there’s a dimension of Jesus’ ethics that is neither covered by an Ethics from Above or an Ethics from Beyond, but which is inherent to Israel’s Story and, in fact, have become the predominant form of ethical reflection in the history of humankind.

3.2.3 Ethics from Below: Wisdom

This third dimension of Jesus’ ethic emerges from a dimension of the Bible and Jewish history that is too often ignored in contemporary ethical theory, and it is an irony that a discipline known as the “love of wisdom” (*philo-sophia*) so rarely today lets itself become absorbed in wisdom motifs.

An example of such a moral philosopher is Martin Buber (1878 -1965), an Austrian Jewish and Israeli philosopher whose work: *I and Thou* remains monumental. Those familiar with Israel's wisdom tradition, and Buber's work, will know that there is a striking absence, or at least a major de-emphasis, of a Torah-shaped ethic and revelatory-based set commands. Wisdom was not an Ethic from Above or, since it lacked an eschatological shaping, and Ethic from Beyond, wisdom writers, and here I'm thinking of Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Job, and the non-canonical Ben Sirach, don't say, "God says do this"; neither do they say, "Here comes God, better shape up!" No, the wisdom tradition anchors itself in *human observation*. Wisdom, then, is how-to live-in God's world in God's way, but this kind of wisdom can only be acquired by those who are humbly receptive to the wisdom of society's sages. A wisdom culture trusts human observation and through intuition discerns God's intentions for this world. Jesus, too, frequently teaches his followers how to live in light of inductive observation. In the Sermon this is clear, for instance, in going the second mile in Matthew 5:38-42, or in 6:19-34, where Jesus teaches a single-minded righteousness. Each day has enough gripes, so why engage today in tomorrow's griping?

Yet this earthy, horizontal, and inductive – dare one say empirical? – framing of ethics too often leads to the elimination of an Ethic from Above and an Ethic from Beyond. One sees this in Aristotle as well as in Kant, who wanted to frame all ethics on the basis of reason alone. This is also observed in Bentham and Mill; and also expressed in the egoistic ethical theory of Ayn Rand. Even our modern world whose obsession is within the dictates of cultural relativism in which belief in a revelation or a kingdom has been surrendered; such elimination of an ethic from above is observed. One sees it even more in evolutionary ethics that seek to frame ethics on the basis of what is natural to human evolution; where B.F. Skinner's behaviorism has in fact, all but surrendered anything like ethics as a framing on the basis of reason. A good example of the struggle as explained above, is Bernard Gert's attempt to establish moral theory on reason alone. Perhaps we first learn about the futility – but ultimate cynical posture - of framing ethics entirely from below in the Bible itself, in Ecclesiastes, which reminds us that so much of human striving is nothing but vanity. But others are extending through discernment Jesus' Ethics from Below in light of how the Bible speaks about a variety of pressing topics, and I think here of both William Webb, in his *Slaves, Women, and Homosexuals*, where he thoroughly maps his "redemptive-movement

hermeneutic," and of Samuel Wells, in his *Improvisation*, where he contends that the proper posture of the Christian is to improvise rather than simply to perform the script.

The reason Webb and Wells ethics are assigned together from Below is because they singularly focus on learning to discern, in wisdom, how to live out the Bible in our world in a way that breaches the script in order to advance a Christian ethic into new territory. Any use of the Sermon on the Mount that does not extend it into our world by plowing new ground converts into a mere Ethics from Above and fails to embrace that Jesus himself "did" Ethics from Below. How we can "follow" Jesus and not learn to do ethics as he did? This we need to contend with as we do ethics with Jesus from both Above and Below.

3.2.4 Jesus' Ethical Theory: Messianic, Ecclesial, And Pneumatic.

Given Ethics from Above, Ethics from beyond and Ethics from Below, this paper propose here that Jesus' ethic is a combination of the three as mentioned above, which would include – the Law, the Prophets, and the Wisdom Literature. But there's more because those three elements for his ethics are tied to his messianic vocation, his conviction that an ethic can only be lived out in community (the kingdom manifestation in the church) and through the power of the Spirit now at work. The above, beyond, below are each reshaped because it is Jesus' ethic, which is relevant for his followers as the Spirit is unleashed on them.

Jesus' ethic is distinct because He saw himself as Israel's Messiah. At the core of this ethic, it is Jesus sacrificial offer of Himself as nothing other than a Messianic figure. Nothing makes sense about the Sermon until we understand it as messianic vision, and once we understand it as such, we can understand it all – especially its radical elements. Tom Wright (cited by McKnight 2013: 8) seem to get it right when he says: "The Sermon… isn't just about how to behave. Its' about discovering the living God in the loving, and dying Jesus, and learning to reflect that love ourselves into the world that needs it so badly." Or, as the German New Testament scholar and Lutheran bishop Eduard Lohse, put it: "Jesus' word is not separable from the one who speaks it."

At the core of Jesus' ethics, then, is a belief about himself, that he indeed was the one who brought the Old Testament Law and the Prophets (as well as Wisdom Literature) to their completion or defining point in who he was, what he did, and what he taught.

There is a Torah dimension; there is a Wisdom dimension; and there is a Prophet dimension. But King Jesus pushes each of these to a new level where Jesus himself is the Torah, the Wisdom, and the Prophet who was to come. Only in association or relationship with Jesus does the Sermon make sense.

Jesus does not offer abstract principles or simply his version of the Torah for a new society. Instead, he offers himself to his disciples, or put differently, he summons them to himself and in participation with Jesus and his vision the disciples are transformed into the fullness of a kingdom moral vision. But Jesus' Messianic Ethic is not for isolated individuals. Transcending what Aristotle meant in his discussions of friendship and recapturing Israel's own sense of family identity, this ethic of Jesus was to be lived out in the context of a kingdom community, the ecclesia. As the Messiah formed a community of followers, so the ethic of Jesus is a messianic and kingdom-community ethic. The Sermon on the Mount is supremely and irreducibly ecclesial. Few have emphasized this theme as central to Christian ethics like John Howard Yoder. Or, as Hauerwas said it, "The sermon, therefore, is not a list of requirements, but rather a description of the life of a people gathered by and around Jesus." Church, then, forms the context for the ethic of Jesus.

There's more in the pages of the New Testament as ethical reflection lumbers toward the second century: Jesus' ethical vision was only practicable through the power of the Pentecostal gift of the Holy Spirit who took human abilities to the next level and human inabilities and turned them into new abilities. This Spirit-driven ethic was to be sustained in the ecclesia by sacraments, by Word, by the gifts of the Spirit, and by memory of our common Story. Much more could be said, but this sketches how Jesus did ethics. *The Sermon on the Mount*[45] expounds the Laws Jesus gave of his kingdom[46]; however, these laws are actually principles, and they are principles that can be appropriated in a leadership setting, and these are undergirded by moral principles. Thus,

[45] It is important here to remember that the original biblical text did not have chapter and verse divisions in its construction and it did not have headings which appear in modern translations/versions; thus, it is suggested by others that the traditional title: *The Sermon on the Mount* seems to have originated with the commentary of St. Augustine: "Concerning the Lord's Sermon in the Mountain" (394 AD). See the article entitled "*Sermon on the Mount/Plain*" by Yang in the *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels* (2013:845-854)

[46]The Sermon on the Mount is a collection of sayings and teachings of Jesus, which emphasizes his moral teaching found in the Canonical Gospel of Matthew. According to chapters 5-7, Jesus of Nazareth gave this sermon (estimated around AD 30) on a mountainside to his disciples and a large crowd in Capernaum.

> The Sermon on the Mount is the moral portrait of Jesus' own people. Because this portrait doesn't square with the church, this Sermon turns from instruction to indictment. To those ends-both instruction and indictment –this commentary has been written with the simple goal that God will use this book to lead us to become in real life the portrait Jesus sketched in the Sermon (McKnight 2013:1).

The principles are presented as moral laws because they are the fulfilment of the Mosaic Law. Therefore, in the sections which follow this one I will consider the historical background of the Sermon on the Mount; secondly, its structure, and thirdly, the purpose of the sermon.

3.3 The Historical Background

The 'Sermon on the Mount' is the first exposition of Jesus' teachings in the New Testament.[47] It is estimated that Jesus gave these teachings in about 30 C.E. (previously referred to as A.D.).[48] Many of its features suggest that it reflects the very beginnings of Jesus' thought, or the philosophy or manifesto of the kingdom he came to present. Moreover, *The Sermon on the Mount* represents both the original kernel and the normative foundation of Christian morality.

Many people have turned to these teachings of Jesus, which are currently presented in three chapters in Matthew, because the principles found within these few pages transcend time, culture, and structure. The insights drawn from these instructions remain relevant in every organisational context – whether ecclesiastical, business, or political. Hence, despite many changes and adjustments Christianity has undergone since the time of its inception, Jesus' Sermon on the Mount remains the lasting source of inspiration for all organisations that seek to represent Christ well in the world.[49]

As Stott (1992: 30) remarks that the beatitudes simplicity of word and profundity of thought have attracted each fresh generation of Christians, and many others besides. The more we explore their implications, the more seems to remain un- explored. Their

[47]First here should be interpreted in the context of the gospel of Matthew, as when we look at Jesus' teaching chronologically we will have to engage the study of the recent four source hypothesis theory that has a bearing on the dating and authorship of the gospels.

[48] It is suggested that the original sermon was composed probably by the end of the third decade of the 1st century AD. Both Matthew's and Luke's version of it were written down sometime between 65 and 95 AD.

[49] McKnight (2013:1) argues that many people have treated the Sermon on the Mount with less seriousness to an extent that they neutralized its effective understanding; and he further on cites Pinchas Lapide who noted that "In fact, the history of the impact of the Sermon on the Mount can largely be described in terms of an attempt to domesticate everything in it that is shocking, demanding, and uncompromising, and render it harmless" (See the footnote of McKnight).

wealth is inexhaustible. We cannot plumb their depths. Truly, 'We are near heaven here!" On the surface or on first-time exposure to these teachings it was not easy to live strictly by the precepts of the original Christian morality.

Matthew groups Jesus' teachings into five discourses, of which the Sermon on the Mount is the first.[50] The others concern instructions for the disciples, parables of the Kingdom, instructions for the church, and a harsh denunciation of scribes and Pharisees. The best-known written portions of the sermon comprise the Beatitudes, found at the beginning of the section. The sermon also contains the Lord's Prayer and the injunctions "resist not evil" and "turn the other cheek" (5:39), as well as a version of the Golden Rule. Other lines often quoted are the references to "salt of the earth", "light of the world" and "judge not, lest ye be judged."

Other scholars[51] believe that the Sermon on the Mount is a form of commentary on the Ten Commandments. It portrays Christ as the true interpreter of the Mosaic Law.[52] As one draws ethical leadership principles from Jesus' teaching on The Sermon on the Mount as it appears in the Gospel of Matthew chapter 5 verse 1 through to chapter 7 verse 29, it will also be important to reflect on its supposedly, summarized version which is found in the Gospel of Luke chapter 6 verses 17 to 49. Luke, however, intimates that the sermon was given on a "level place"; perhaps, if so, we can refer to its proper title as "The Sermon in the Plain".

By underscoring the external similarities with the epiphany on the mount of Sinai, Matthew apparently wanted to associate Jesus' proclamation of the Gospel morality with the revelation of Divine Law to Moses. Perhaps, Matthew or the author of this book implicitly suggests that Jesus is the new Moses. Thus, the new Law of Jesus as pronounced on the Mount in Galilee should be taken on a par with the Mosaic Law given on the Mount of Sinai. The sermon makes a strong case not only that Jesus' teaching builds upon the work of Moses but also that he brings finality to the Law. In

[50] Considering the different positions different scholars hold about the authorship of the Gospel of Matthew it will be essential for the reader who seeks more information on these matters to consult Guthrie's boos: New Testament Introduction (1990) and New Testament Theology (1981) Leicester.
[51] See the works of a group of New Testament scholars such as Tenney M., Elwell, W. A., & Yarbrough, R. W.
[52] As one initially reflects on The Sermon on the Mount it is natural for most Christians to assume that this teaching was given in one event; however, other scholars suggest that the sermon does not necessarily reflect a single event from Jesus' preaching tours, as it could have been a later literary concatenation of sayings taken from several different speeches Jesus had delivered during his lifetime.

this regard, we can see these laws in a new light, and in the context of this research, as an instruction for leadership at both an individual and corporate level.

3.4 The Rhetorical Structure

The rhetorical structure of the sermon could be divided into four main parts: Blessings, Analogies, Positions, and Examples. This order of the rhetorical structure of The Sermon on the Mount suggests important aspect of leadership which may exist both dialectically and evolutionary; the former referring to how these four aspects feed from each other, where the leader develops through the appropriation of these aspects of leadership; and the latter referring to the process of leadership development through seeing the exemplary aspect of the leader being founded on the other three parts. However, because of the limitation of space, scope and word count requirement, I will only develop, briefly the first aspect of the rhetorical structure: blessings; and only introduce the second aspect: analogies as it relates to the first aspect.[53]

3.5 The Purpose of the Sermon on the Mount

The Sermon on the Mount which is found in the Gospel of Matthew chapters 5, 6 and 7, has been widely discussed in the Christian circles. Opinions and perspectives have been much divided concerning the design, scope, and application of the Sermon on the Mount and it has engaged the attention not only of commentators and theologians, but the Christian community in general.

Most commentators have seen in it an exposition of Christian ethics. Some have regarded it as the setting forth of a "golden rule" for all people to live by. “It is true that Matthew’s Gospel of Jesus Christ is pictured as a second lawgiver, like Moses, but the point of the comparison lies mostly in the area of contrast” (Boice 1972:8). Others have dwelt upon its dispensational bearings, insisting that it belongs not to the saints of the present age but to believers within a future millennium. I believe however that the two inspired statements reveal its true scope and purpose.

While it is clear that in Matthew 5:1-2, Christ was teaching His disciples, in Matthew 7:28-29, it is clear that He was also addressing a great multitude of the people. Thus, it is evident that this address of our Lord contains instruction both for believers and

[53] For more on the structure of the Gospel of Matthew, see Carson, D. A. & Douglas, J. M. 2005. *An Introduction to the New Testament*.

unbelievers alike. His design was not only to teach Christian ethics, but to expose the errors of Pharisaism and to awaken the consciences of His legalistic hearers.

In Matthew 5:20, He said, "Unless your righteousness exceeds that of the scribes and Pharisees, you will never enter the kingdom of heaven." Then, to the end of the chapter, He expounded the spirituality of the Law so as to arouse His hearers to see their need of His own perfect righteousness. It was their ignorance of the spirituality of the Law that was the real source of Pharisaism, for its leaders claimed to fulfil the Law in the outward letter.

It was therefore our Lord's good purpose to awaken their consciences by enforcing the Law's true inner import and requirement; however, sadly, as McKnight (2013:1) comments, for many "the contrast between Jesus' vision and our life bothers many of us. Throughout the church history many have softened, reduced, recontextualized, and in some cases abandoned what Jesus taught-ironically, in order to be more Christian!"

Now since the research's focus is on deriving principles of ethical leadership through the conversation with the Beatitudes, I make an observation that Jesus saw a variety of people with unique talents, skills and gifts as he spoke to the crowd, and started teaching them. When Jesus was speaking to this large group of people, he was reflecting upon the spiritual dynamics to help them grow while defining the ethical beliefs of those who would be his followers. It therefore becomes important to look at the virtuous ethical principles from the Sermon on the Mount as we seek to apply them in church leadership.

CHAPTER 4. VIRTUES OF LEADERSHIP IN THE BEATITUDES

The sermon starts with the section entitled the beatitudes in modern translations; each beginning with the word “blessed” or, as in other translations translated as, “happy”. Growing up in church, hearing this word “blessed” meant having good things all the way. I had no idea that the word is related to being “poor in spirit, mourning, meek, hungering and thirsting for righteousness, merciful, pure, peacemakers, and persecuted” as mentioned in Matthew 5:1-12. So, how could such things lead one to be labelled as “blessed” or even worse “happy”? It seems like there is more to the notion of being "blessed" in this context which might refer to the state of being of those who put their trust in God - and it might be helpful to look at this word before we touch on the virtues.

What does “Blessed” mean?

Many translations have done their best to find the perfect English equivalent word to translate the underlying Greek *“Makarios”* word that Jesus actually used in the Beatitudes[54]. McKnight (2013:32) argues that the secret to understand this word is to see it in light of the Bible’ story about who is blessed and who is not. Once we get that story’s perspective, we are given parameters and content for understanding this word in this context and once that happens, we can examine the history of the quest for the good life and happiness. There are at least five major themes at work in this word “blessed”, but we will just look at four.

First, the one who is “blessed” is blessed by the God of Israel. The entire Biblical story is in some sense shaped by God watching over his elect people Israel, evaluating their covenant observance and either approving or disapproving of them in tangible ways. This theme has two primary points of origin: Leviticus 26-27 and Deuteronomy 28 as well as the Wilderness tradition where it refers to a tangible, flourishing life rooted in common sense, hard work, and listening one’s elders (Ps 1; Ps 32:1 - 2; Prov 3: 13; 8: 32; 20: 7; 28: 20).

[54] History of the word ‘*Makarios*’ (“Blessed”). Matthew (reflecting Jesus' thoughts) uses this word in a totally different way. It is not the elite who are blessed. It is not the rich and powerful who are blessed. It is not the high and mighty who are blessed. It is not the people living in huge mansions or expensive penthouses who are blessed. Rather, Jesus pronounces God's blessings on the lowly: the poor, the hungry, the thirsty, the meek, the mourning.

The theme of God's blessing on the obedient, shapes the historical books like Judges, 1 and 2 Samuel, 1 and 2 Kings, 1 and 2 Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah. It clearly reverberates throughout the prophets and in many ways gave rise to the sectarian movements at the time of Jesus like the Pharisees and Essenes who were seeking God's blessing.

Second, there is a clear *eschatological* focus[55] in the word "blessed". If a focus of the Old Testament was on present-life blessings for the Torah observance, there is another dimension that deconstructs injustice and sets the tone for Israel's hope: the future blessing of God in the kingdom when all things will be put right; no text in the Old Testament fits more here than Isaiah 61.[56] This second dimension shapes the Beatitudes because Jesus' focus is on future blessing. The tense used in the promises for the blessing is often future, as in "they will…." In verse 4-9.

Notably, the present tense of the first eight blessings (5:3,8), where we find the identical promise ("theirs is the kingdom"), surrounds the future tense, perhaps indicating the certainty of those future promises. As Dale Allison correctly points out, 'we have here (in the Beatitudes) not common sense wisdom born of experience but eschatological promise which foresees the unprecedented: the evils of the present will be undone and the righteous will be confirmed with reward'. This blessing, while its focus is future, begins now (Matt 11:6; 13:16).

A third theme at work is *conditionality:* those blessed are marked by specific attributes or characteristics and those who are implicitly not blessed (the Bible's word is "cursed"; see Luke 6:20-26; cf, Deut. 28) are marked by the absence of those characteristics and by the presence of the opposite characteristics. But a word of caution is in order: clearly these blessings of Jesus are not directed at ethical attributes, as if this is Jesus' version of Paul's fruit of the Spirit (Gal 5:22-23), nor is this a virtue list by which to measure our moral progress. Instead, these blessings are heaped on *people groups* who are otherwise rejected in society, which means the blessings console those whom many would consider hopeless.

[55] Theologically speaking, then, the term eschatology refers to "the study of final things" in the Bible. It concerns both personal eschatological issues such as death and the intermediate state as well as themes with a more general or corporate focus. https://bible.org/seriespage/9-eschatology-end-times

[56] Stassen, Living the Sermon. 41-62. Stassen makes the following alignments with Isaiah 61: Matt 5:3 (Isa 61:1); 5:4 (61:2); 5:5 (61:1,7); 5:6 (61:3,8,11); 5:8 (61:1); 5:10 (61:1); 5:11-12 (61:10-11).

Thus, the conditionality here is not to be seen as a covert command for something we are to do, as if those who want blessing need to work at poverty of spirit or meekness. We are not to go out and become poor or start mourning or get ourselves persecuted. Instead, Jesus here blesses people groups. The beatitudes reveal that Jesus' ministry; as can be seen so clearly in Jesus' so-called inaugural sermon (Luke 4:16-30), focuses on the down-and-out and oppressed. Jesus is casting a vision so that his audience will come to know that things are not as they look. Instead, God's eyes are on all and God knows those who are living properly, regardless of their circumstances and conditions. The Conditionality of the Beatitudes is a reversal of typical conditions because it has the omniscience of God in knowing who is in and who is out. The Beatitudes force the listener to *expand and contract who is in the kingdom of God.*

Fourth, this list concerns of the person's *relational disposition.* It is easy to think of the "blessed" as those who are in proper relation to God alone. But what stands out in the Beatitudes is one's relation to God as well as to self and others. When Matthew adds "in spirit" to "poor", we find what we also find in the third blessing ("meek"): an inner disposition that relates to God and others because of a proper estimation of oneself. Furthermore, some blessings are for those who relate to others in a loving disposition: "mourn" and "merciful" and peacemakers. Others are concerned more directly with one's relation to God: "hunger and thirst for righteousness' and "pure in heart" and probably those who are persecuted. But the blessed people are noted by godly, loving relations with God, self, and others. Having looked at the four themes at work in the word "blessed", my sense is that the blessings as pronounced by Jesus in Matthew 5:1-12, endorse a new morality by stating eight (8) virtues and their respective benefits. It is also interesting for me to notice the "somewhat" positive tone of these beatitudes as other translations translated the word "blessed" as, "happy", contrasting it with the prohibitive style of the Commandments. As they read: "Happy are those who (know they) are spiritually poor"[57] (spiritually)[58];

[57] It is interesting to notice the difference of the translation of the phrase Jesus used when he referred to the poor, between Matthew 5:3 and Luke 6:20; as the Greek word used here is *πτωχοὶ*(*ptochos*), which literally denotes a destitute person, a person who lives from alms (thus "poor"). However, as evidenced by Luke's text, it seems that Luke's phrase, which has only the phrase "poor" without any specification, was probably the original wording of Jesus. He typically did not speak to the rich and strong but to the weak and marginalized. Jesus wanted to find those who humble and of a contrite heart, as they are the ones who could open the Kingdom of Heaven, and such were not among those who possessed the Kingdom of the World.

[58] Could Matthewhave changed the original connotation of "poor" by adding the qualification "spiritually" which is translated as *πνεύματι* (*pneumato*) which suggested rather a servile deference than economic poverty. 'Spiritually poor' are thus those who are conscious of their feebleness and insignificance as opposed

"Happy are those who mourn"; "Happy are the meek"; "Happy are those whose greatest desire is to do what God requires"; "Happy are those who are merciful to others"; "Happy are the pure in heart"; "Happy are those who work for peace among men"; "Happy are you when men insult you, and persecute you, and tell all kinds of evil lies against you because you are my followers". Whatever reading we choose there are only 8 virtues even though Jesus pronounces 9 blessings in total.[59] Carson (1994: 18-33) refers to these virtues within the beatitudes as "The Norms of the Kingdom". These very virtues are attributes that reveal God's character; so, when we reflect these qualities, we become God's mirror to this world.

It is noteworthy here to comment that the list of virtues presented in the section of the Beatitudes, in *The Sermon on the Mount* is not intended to be exhaustive but rather representative. There are other passages in the New Testament that lists other virtues which are not included in the Beatitudes; for instance, in Galatians 5:22, Colossians 3:12-13, and Romans 12:9-21 the list of virtues include other virtues such as love, joy, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, self-control, forgiveness, generosity and hospitality. All the virtues listed are written for the occasion and tailored to their contexts. In this case, they have been fashioned to address the crowds on how they are to be formed internally. So, the Beatitudes include a broad range of attitudes and behaviors, which suggests that practicing them displays the image of Christ in a leader's life. It is also important, in the context of this passage, to note that most of these components have to do not only with the internal life of the individual believer but also with the corporate life of the community. Hence, the setting at the beginning of the passage hints on that the following teaching – which is given to the disciples – is directed not so much toward the individual, but toward the Christian community. These virtues are accompanied by certain blessings or rewards which prove that effective leadership is recognized by the fruits it bears; a leader of integrity, whose life is characterized by these virtues, will show great progress in their leadership. Therefore, ethical and moral leadership should exhibit these eight (8) virtues in increasing measure.

---

to the arrogance of those who pretended to know who was God and what did he want. If we add 'who know' (as some translators do) we'll get another qualification that further softens the harshness of the original phrase. But the text does not warrant these modifications in translation.

[59] The 8th virtue in v. 10, "Blessed are those who are persecuted because of righteousness," is, perhaps, echoed in v.11 to 12 which reads: 11 "Blessed are you when people insult you, persecute you and falsely say all kinds of evil against you because of me. 12 Rejoice and be glad, because great is your reward in heaven, for in the same way they persecuted the prophets who were before you."

.

4.1 A Leader's humility

*Blessed are **the poor (in spirit)** for theirs is the kingdom of the heavens.*

The key word in the beatitudes *Μακάριοι* which appears at the beginning of each one is important to consider. It comes from the root *μακάριος.* The word means to be congratulated in a deeply religious sense and with more emphasis on divine approval than on human happiness (Gundry 1982:68). It therefore denotes a deeper inner joy. In its Hellenistic background, it describes those of good fortune. However, in the context of the New Testament and this one in particular, Jesus was not using the word as it was normally used in its secular understanding but rather a more spiritual sense. It does not refer here to general happiness, but it describes the deep inner joy of those who participate in the kingdom announced by Jesus. So, the *blessed* are the supremely deeply happy. Some have suggested that the word be translated as a *'congratulation'*. Therefore, it would congratulate the persons of the qualities, actions, and behaviours that Jesus describes (Hare 1993:35).

The word poor *πτωχός* refers to one who is poor, needy, dependant on others, a bagger. It also has an element of humility to it. (Davies & Alison 1988:442). The primary meaning outside of Jewish and Christian literature is in reference to economic poverty. However, over time the word 'poor' became a self-designation to the meek, humiliated, and oppressed people of God. This is the sense in which it is used in this text (Dave & Alison 1988:442). The emphasis that Matthew brings by the insertion of 'in spirit' removes the focus of economic poverty to a religious one. Spiritually poor-humble. Therefore, the word *poor* here is although it has an element of economic poverty, is not entirely economic. This means therefore, that more than an external condition, it has reference to an internal disposition (Davies & Alison 1988:444).

Furthermore, the poverty in view here, '*poor in spirit'* does not refer to religious poverty or the dispirited. It rather refers to those whose dependence is on God, i.e. the humble. The promise of the kingdom of heaven to them is presented in the present tense with the use of the present *to be* verb 'is' which points to a present but also future blessedness. The meaning here is dual having both a present and future references (Hanger 1993:91-92).

The first virtue the beatitudes introduce to us is the virtue of humility. The virtue of Humility carries with it the blessing of enjoying and participating in the Kingdom of Heaven, which suggests that the leader's humility develops the leader's capacity to reign with Christ, as the leader is primarily accountable to Christ. Thus, the primary calling of the leader is private leadership, where a leader serves before the audience of ONE, who is Jesus Christ. Paul presents Jesus as the greatest example of humility, in Philippians 2 v.8, which reads: "And being found in appearance as a man he humbled himself…"

Christ, having taken the appearance of a man, man in his fallen state is characterized by arrogance, he had to humble himself to be able to reflect the image of God. Jesus lived a humble life and humility was at the core of his philosophy. Humility is one of those qualities/ virtues which are hard to define. Boice (1998: 72) even remarks: "how little we know of humility, even after many years of Christian life. Yet how essential humility is to true discipleship." The best way to understand humility is to find out what it is not. Humility is the antithesis of pride, and pride itself seems to be one of the biggest problems in human relations.

Jeffress (2002: 186) defines pride by noting: "Pride is the attitude that credits ourselves with our successes and blames others for our failures." Proverbs 29:23 says: "A man's pride will bring him low, but a humble spirit will obtain honour".

The problem about pride is that it is very subtle, most of the time it is hard to notice. Sanders (1994: 154) in his attempts to define pride gives three tests every individual must go through to determine the level of their pride:

- The first test is the test of precedence, which asks: How do you react when another is selected for the position when you expected to fill the position? When another is promoted instead of you, when another's gifts seem greater than your own?
- The second test is the test of sincerity, which asks: "When we are honest with ourselves, we often admit our problems and weaknesses; but how do you feel when others identify the same problems and weaknesses in you?"
- The third test is the test of criticism, which asks: "Does criticism lead you to immediate resentment and self- justification? Do you rush to criticise the critic?"

Pride seems to be evident in most human relations and an individual is able to effectively deal with it only when they encounter God; as St. Augustine (1958: np), in his classic work: *The City of God*, captures this reality when he remarks that: "I know, of course, what ingenuity and force of arguments are needed to convince proud men of the power of humility. Its loftiness is above the pinnacles of earthly greatness which are shaken by the shifting winds of time – not by reason of human arrogance, but only by the grace of God."

Pride disqualifies us from further advancement in the kingdom of God. Proverbs 16:5 "*The Lord detests the proud…*" Therefore, Humility is the ticket to true greatness; the Bible teaches us that if we humble ourselves God will exalt us. James 4: 10 "*Humble yourself by the side of the Lord and He shall lift you up*". I Peter 5: 6 "*Therefore humble yourself under the mighty hand of God, that he may exalt you in due time*". Prov. 30: 32, "*if you have been foolish in exalting yourself …put your hand on your mouth."*

Humility puts one in a position that allows God to make them become what He had already intended them to be when He created him or her. Jeffress (2002:186) notes that; "*The essence of humility is voluntarily surrendering our rights to achieve a greater purpose in life.*" Humility makes one to be teachable, as Jesus. Luke 2: 46 *"...Sitting in the midst of the teachers, both listening to them and asking questions*".

Acts 18: 24-26, says that Apollos was humble and was willing to listen to his lay people in his meetings, and he was teachable despite that he was an expert in the law. Prov.25:6, 7 in the Message says *"Don't work yourself into the spotlight; don't push your way into the place of prominence. It is better to be promoted to a place of honour than face humiliation by being demoted*."

Ravi Zacharias (2000: nn) said that, "*Only God is able to humble us without humiliating us and to exalt us without flattering us."* Humility makes us realise that we can do nothing without him; John 15: 5 Jesus says "*for without me you can do nothing*". In John 5: 30 Jesus says, "I can of myself do nothing". Sometimes we brag about what we have achieved, and most of the people who do this usually will tell you what they did hundred years ago! Forgetting that, according to John Wooden: ***"****Talent is God-given, be humble; Fame is man-given, be thankful; Conceit is self-given, be careful*."

The power of this humility impacts every aspect of living. It could best be exemplified by the attitude that seeks to honour others above ourselves, as in the verses that precede the example of Christ's humility. Paul describes this state by noting: "Do nothing from selfishness or empty conceit, but with humility of mind regard one another as more important than yourselves; do not merely look out for your own personal interests, but also for the interests of others" (v.4). Moreover, Williams (2003: 190) cited Stowell who commented that, "Humility is not a quiet, reserved super-sanctimonious posture in life. The truly humble person can be appropriately bold and can enjoy life to the fullest – laughing and crying with great expression. Humility is the driving desire to give God the glory in all things and to obey him regardless."

Humility as a virtue has a rich background that find its construct in theological literature which Murray (2016:38) defines simply as "the disposition which prepares the soul for living on trust." Banks (2018: n.n.) postulates that "humility in leadership is not so much about leading as it is about following, because the virtue is revealed when we can learn from God's Word, follow God's Word and live a life that reflects God's Word in love, respect, truth and service to God and others" (Proverbs 3:5-8). In my dealings with the church in the township and its fallen leader, a lack of humility as a temperance virtue, significantly contributed to the pastor's excesses in developing an arrogant behaviour which led to the crisis. Although the virtue and posture of humility has been seen as the hall mark of authentic and servant leadership in his early years of leading the church, it became harder by the day for the pastor to remain a humble leader and he ended in a different place from the one he started at.

Instead of being a humble leader, willing to serve others and make them successful followers of Christ, the pastor started thinking highly of himself, not seeing a heart of pride growing inside of him, taking delight in claiming to be the author of the greatness of his church successes while seeing people as projects rather than those he was called to serve. Eventually, pride and arrogance destroyed his ministry and leadership abilities without even realising it. As Banks (2018) puts it that 'humility is revealed when we recognize that we are not here to be served but to serve God and others in a way that the world will see Jesus. Jesus did not come to this earth to be served but to serve others' (Matt.20:25-28). The pastor in this township church failed this test, an elusive act of collateral damage of the pragmatic task leading by the ethical virtues such as humility.

4.2 A Leader's Compassion

*Blessed are the **mourning** for they shall **be comforted**.*

The key word in this beatitude is the word mourning πενθοῦντες – *the ones mourning.* In the Greek we can see that the word is a present, active participle, indicating a continuous action. Therefore, this may be translated as 'those who *continuously* mourn. The semantical variety of this word includes, lamenting, mourning and grief. But what is important to note is its purpose. The context of Isaiah 61:1-3 helps us to understand the purpose of the mourning which is referred to. The righteous were suffering at the hand of their wicked slave masters for which mourning was the result.

The action of *mourning* in the text is not over sins, the guilt of sin, or the shame as a result of sin, nor is it over the deceased. It is rather due to persecution. The mourning is a response of the disciples to persecution. As a result, the disciples are promised that they will be comforted *παρακληθήσονται*. The use of the passive voice here is known as the 'divine passive', seeing God as the subject of the comforting (Hanger 1993: 92).

Jesus introduces the second virtue and its blessing in these words: "Blessed are those who mourn, for they will be comforted" (v.4). The virtue of Mournfulness suggests that a leader is compassionate; he/she is able to identify with those he is leading.[60] According to Stott (1992: 41) one might almost translate this second beatitude 'Happy are the unhappy' in order to draw attention to the startling paradox it contains. What kind of sorrow can it be which brings the joy of Christ's blessing to those who feel it?

It is plain from the context that those here promised comfort are not primarily those who mourn the loss of a loved one, but those who mourn the loss of their innocence, their righteousness, their self-respect. It is not the sorrow of bereavement to which Christ refers, but the sorrow of repentance. Moreover, it is not only the sins of others, however, which should cause him tears; for we have our own sins to weep over as well.

[60] I am using the word leader here as synonymous with the word believer/disciple which this text is directly addressing; every believer is also a leader in their own right, especially in this context where this instruction is directed towards the formation of virtues towards Christlikeness, which are internal.

A leader must set an example in mourning with others as they struggle in their different circumstance, even when they struggle with overcoming sin in their lives; however, it seems that the author also directs us to the leader's struggle with their own sin, and doing the best they can – as they rely on God – to overcome, hence they are comforted.

As the calling of a leader is a great calling (see 1 Tim 3: 1), and comes with great demands, particularly regarding living an exemplary lifestyle before those we lead; because sometimes a leader falls short of those standards, and they may be discouraged in the process. So, God grants comfort to leaders who mourn over their struggle to overcome their sin. This consolation restores hope in these leaders to persevere.

4.3 A Leader's Gentleness

*Blessed are the **meek**, for they will inherit the earth*

πραεῖς, the meek, are those who are humbled before God, which then naturally translates to relations with others. There is not much difference between being poor in spirit and being meek. Yet there is a distinction. Poor in spirit is in reference to a person in himself whereas meekness refers to how he is in relation to God and his fellow man (Hendrickson 1973: 271).

The third Beatitude speaks of a leader's gentleness, which connotes meekness. As the author of Matthew writes: "Blessed are the meek, for they will inherit the earth" (v.5).[61] The Greek word used here is *πραεῖς* (*praotes*) and in other versions it is translated as meekness. It describes a person who is so much in control of himself; one who possesses this quality, as Aristotle remarked, is always angry at the right time and never angry at the wrong time.

This virtue conveys at least the sense of humility toward oneself, that is, a proper estimation of oneself before God, and consideration toward others. According to Galatians 6:3, it is this virtue at work in those who do not think too highly of themselves, but who, in humility, considers others better than themselves (Phi 2: 3).

[61] This word or virtue in also made reference to in the following passages: 1 Co.4:21; 2 Co.10:1; Gal.5:23; Eph.4:1-2; Col.3:12; 1 Ti.6:11; 2 Ti.2:25; Tit.3:2.

Therefore, this quality means three things: firstly, it means being submissive to the will of God (Matt 5: 5; 11: 29); secondly it means being teachable, not being proud to learn (James 1:21); thirdly, it means to be considerate (1 Cor 4: 21; 2 Cor 10: 1; Eph 4: 2). The above three attitudes or behaviours characterize leaders who are meek and always looking for opportunities to lift others up; as a result, their influence become so great that God blesses them with the privilege of inheriting the earth.

Meekness, according to Lloyd-Jones (1976: 75) is essentially a true view of oneself, expressing itself in attitude and conduct with respect to others. The man who is truly meek is the one who is truly amazed that God and man can think of him as well. This makes him very gentle, humble, sensitive, and patient in all his dealings with others.[62]

Therefore, Stott (1992: 44) in echoing Lloyd-Jones, noted that meekness was never expressed more aptly than in Psalm 37, which Jesus seems to have been quoting in the beatitudes: “Fret not yourself because of the wicked… The meek shall possess the land… Those blessed by the Lord shall possess the land... Wait for the Lord, and keep to his way, and he will exalt you to possess the land; you will look on the destruction of the wicked.”

Thus, the same principle operates today. The godless may boast and throw their weight about, yet real possession eludes their grasp. The meek, on the other hand, although they may be deprived and disenfranchised by men, yet because they know what it is to live and reign with Christ, can enjoy and even 'possess' the earth, which belongs to Christ.

4. 4 A Leaders’ Obedience

*Blessed are **those who Hunger and thirst for righteousness**. For **they will be filled***

This Beatitude carries metaphors that we all causally relate to. Hunger and thirst are realities that we all know and experience. Therefore, the idea behind them is readily comprehensible. A deep kind of desire that longs for fulfilment. Hunger pangs and thirst force us to respond to them.

This is the idea that Matthew employs here. Interesting to note is that both hunger and thirst may be said to be passive in that they happen upon the subject. However, in the

[62] For more explanation of Lloyd-Jones explanation of the virtue of meekness/gentleness in The Sermon on the Mount, see his book: Studies in The Sermon on the Mount (1976: 67-76).

Greek, we see that in this passage, these words are both present, active participles. The *hungering* πεινῶντες and *thirsting* διψῶντες are not passive but active. Indicating an active seeking and longing for righteousness. Moreover, the action is not just a once off, but it is continuous. The implication is that *one continuously hungers and thirsts for righteousness.*

Therefore, a leader must be one who really hungers and thirsts for God. He must be characterised by a longing and hunger for the righteousness of God and not of self, as opposed to that of the Pharisee in the parable of the Pharisee and the tax collector. The righteousness of man is contrary to that of God. This then cannot be the righteousness in view. Some scholars note that the word *'righteousness'* here focuses more on to the justice of God as opposed to personal righteousness (Hagner 1993:92).

In that the poor and those who are downtrodden long for God's intervention and justice, yet on the other hand, personal righteousness may not be altogether ruled out from the understanding of this word. The lesson here is about a hunger and thirst for righteousness as a hungry man for bread and a thirsty man for water. Those who hunger and thirst for righteousness will be filled. The caution in the promise of this Beatitude is not to fall into the trap of assuming that the teaching of this text is that man will be given sinless perfection by the filling.

The hunger and thirst which is described above results from a life of obedience; hence, the Beatitude that follows after the one that highlights a virtue of meekness is the one which encourages leaders towards obedience to God. Hence, "Blessed are those who hunger and thirst for righteousness, for they will be filled" (v.6).

A gentle leader is characterized by obedience to God, as we see in the life of Christ, who, as the writer of the epistle of Hebrews writes, had learned obedience from what he suffered (Heb 5: 8).

He suffered through the "way of the cross", which was self-denial; he was gentle enough that he even died like a criminal, as the Philippians 2 hymn continues to convey that: "And being found in appearance as a man, he humbled himself and became obedient to death - even death on a cross!" (v.8).

Thus, choosing an ethical lifestyle may not necessarily be popular and it may lead to a form of suffering (see Philippians 1: 29). Obedience is one of the marks of true leadership, and that is for all leaders in their different contexts. As the writer of the

book of Deuteronomy encourages the readers that, if we diligently obey the voice of the Lord and carefully observe his commandments, He will exalt us (See the whole chapter of Deuteronomy 28). Therefore, our success as leaders is not dependent on how much we do; rather, it is dependent on our obedience unto God. We must not be satisfied with submitting to obedience in things that are easy, but we must obey with our whole heart even in things that are most difficult.

4.5 A Leader's Mercy

*Blessed are **the merciful** for they will receive mercy*

Mercy or *merciful* ἐλεήμων is understood more as an activity requiring action not merely an attitude (Hare 1993: 40). The promise here as in the second, fourth and eighth Beatitudes uses the 'divine passive' where God is understood to be the subject who performs the action. Many people tend to be confused about the difference between the virtue of mercy and the quality of grace.

In differentiating between the two, Boice (2006: 45) comments that what makes mercy different from grace is the quality of helplessness or misery on the part of those who receive mercy. Grace is love when love is undeserved. Mercy is grace in action. Mercy is love reaching out to help those who are helpless and who need salvation. Mercy identifies with the miserable in their misery. A leader's mercy is characterized by a leader's kindness, which is expressed in his/her ability to forgive.

This virtue is very important for all people to apply as Jesus, in Matthew 6:14 - 15, continues to note that: "For if you forgive other people when they sin against you, your heavenly Father will also forgive you. But if you do not forgive others their sins, your Father will not forgive your sins." Thus, Stott (1992: 47) explains this text by noting that this is not because we can merit mercy by mercy or forgiveness by forgiveness, but because we cannot receive the mercy and forgiveness of God unless we repent, and we cannot claim to have repented of our sins if we are unmerciful towards the sins of others.

Nothing moves us to forgive like the wondering knowledge that we ourselves have been forgiven. Nothing proves more clearly that we have been forgiven than our own readiness to forgive. To forgive and to be forgiven, to show mercy and to receive mercy: these belong indissolubly together. Every leader, as an individual walking and working with other individuals, will be offended by someone or something within those

relationships; hence, it is essential that every leader develops the virtue of mercy in their lives.

This virtue is necessary for the development of both the leader who shows mercy and for those who receive this mercy. The formation of Christlikeness happens in the process of a leader showing kindness to those who least deserve it.

4.6 A Leader's Purity

*Blessed are **the pure in heart** for they will see God*

There is need for us to carefully consider how we understand this Beatitude. More particularly the meaning of the words *'the pure in heart'* καθαροὶ τῇ καρδίᾳ. This expression, purity of heart, does not refer to complete sinfulness. If that were the case, then none of us would see God. For Paul writes that all have sinned and fallen short of the glory of God (Romans 3:23). In this light it becomes clear that the purity of heart does not refer to sinless perfection. We then need to explain its meaning as it is key to understanding the passage.

We see in Ps 51:10 where there is a reference to a purity of heart and hands. In the Hebrew and Aramaic understanding of heart, these refer to the inner core of a person. The Hebrew לֵב or לֵבָב has this understanding of heart, true self, and intellect. This is where the purity lies. The lesson here is that the leader must be one who is sincere, upright before God, and have integrity of heart. When this is achieved only then can we see God. The sixth Beatitude reads, "Blessed are the pure in heart, for they will see God" (v.8). The primary calling of every disciple is to be like God, according to John 17:3.[63] The primary responsibility of a leader towards others is to lead them to God and to God's agenda.

Thus, Hebrews 12 verse 14 echoes Jesus' words in saying that a leader or a disciple must make every effort to live in peace with everyone and to be holy; without holiness no one will see the Lord. Therefore, a leader's purity expresses a life of holiness.

The vision of our spiritual life is to attain holiness in all of life; in thought, word, and deed. The Bible tells us that we are created to be like God; Psalm 99: 9 says: "Exalt

[63] "Now this is eternal life: that they know you, the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom you have sent" John 17:3).

the LORD our God and worship at his holy mountain, for the LORD our God is holy." So if we must become like God then we must seek holiness in all of life.

Sproul (2000: nn) comments: "We were created in the image of God. To be God's image meant, among other things, that we were made to mirror and reflect God's character. We were created to shine forth to the world the holiness of God." 1 Peter 1:15 - 16 echoes Leviticus 11: 44 - 45 by saying: "But just as he who called you is holy, so be holy in all you do; for it is written: "Be holy, because I am holy."" Ephesians 1: 4 says: "For he chose us in him before the creation of the world to be holy..."

1 Thessalonians 4:3, 4, says: "It is God's will that you should be sanctified: that you should avoid sexual immorality; that each of you should learn to control his own body in a way that is holy and honourable" (the word Sanctification connotes the same concept as holiness). v.7 continues to say: "For God did not call us to be impure, but to live a holy life." 2 Corinthians 7:1 says, "...let us purify ourselves from everything that contaminates body and spirit, perfecting holiness out of reverence for God." Ephesians 5:25-26 says: "...Christ loved the church and gave himself up for her to make her holy..." And Romans 12:1 says, "Therefore, I urge you, brothers, in view of God's mercy, to offer your bodies as living sacrifices, holy and pleasing to God-this is your spiritual act of worship."

These texts noted above show us at once that holiness is both God's gift and his command; as 2 Peter 1: 3 says that "His divine power has given us everything we need for life and godliness..." Therefore, we should seek to practice it each and every day of our lives, and in all circumstances. Holiness was the goal of our election and redemption, and holiness remains God's basic requirement of us and the goal of all His providential dealings with us. How should we define the believer's holiness? J. I. Packer (2009: nn) remarks that: "The holiness of a holy person is the distinctive quality of his living, viewed both as the expression of his being set apart for God and as the outworking of his inward renewal by God's grace."

Since holiness and sanctification are the same Greek word, then John Owen's definition of sanctification (as cited by Packer 2009) will supplement our definition, he notes:

> Sanctification is an immediate work of the Spirit of God on the souls of believers, purifying and cleansing of their natures from the pollution and uncleanness of sin, renewing in them the image of God and thereby enabling them, from a

> spiritual and habitual principle of grace, to yield obedience unto God, according unto the tenor and terms of the new covenant, by virtue of the life and death of Jesus Christ.

Therefore, holiness, thus viewed, is the virtue of purity which brings the blessing of having an intimate relationship with God. therefore, a leader who wants to be effective must keep in a good, growing relationship with God, through a life of holiness so that they may lead others to the same place.

4.7 A Leader's Peacefulness

*Blessed are the **peace makers** – for they will be called **sons of God***

Peacemakers *εἰρηνοποιοί* are those who take the necessary effort to establish peace and also maintain it. The peace making not at the expense of others, but for the welfare of all. The sense of peace referred to here is captured more fully by the Hebrew understanding of the word שָׁלוֹם *shalom* which refers to a state of peace, or wholesomeness. The kind of peace that surpasses only the absence of war but extends to a state of being. That is the kind of peace that God can bring. Those who make effort to bring such peace will be called sons of God as a result, because this is the kind of peace that is only attainable through God's enabling. The leader is to strive to bring about this kind of peace.

In this light, Jesus was teaching something contrary to how the Zealots as well as Jewish revolutionists were expecting. They hoped to bring the kingdom of God through violence, yet Jesus shows that it is not acts of violence that will bring the kingdom of God but rather peace instead. A leader who walks in holiness towards God also walks in peace towards others, as the text we quoted above (Hebrews 12:14).[64]

As the seventh Beatitude reads: "Blessed are the peacemakers, for they will be called children of God" (v.9). The Greek word translated as Peace here is the word *εἰρήνη* (*eirēnē*)[65] which means a state of national tranquillity, exemption from the rage and havoc of war.

This refers to peace between individuals, i.e. harmony, concord, security, safety, prosperity, felicity, (because peace and harmony make and keep things safe and prosperous). Of Christianity, the tranquil state of a soul assured of its salvation through

[64] Paraphrased as make every effort to live in peace with everyone and to be holy.
[65] This word or concept also appears in these following texts: Mat.10:13; Mar.5:34; Luk.1:79; Luk.2:14; Luk.2:29; Luk.7:50; Jam.3:18; 1 Pe1:2.

Christ, and so fearing nothing from God and content with its earthly lot, of whatsoever sort that is, the blessed state of devout and upright men after death.

In the context of the sermon which this Beatitude occurs in, there is an implication that the idea reflected in this text is that of reconciliation. Reconciliation between God and man and man towards another man. The word *eirene* has two interesting usages. Firstly, it used of the tranquillity and serenity which a country enjoys under the just and beneficent government. Secondly it stands for the Hebrew word shalom, which speaks of the tranquil serenity of heart, when there is peace in the heart knowing that God is in control.

Hence, Philippians 4: 6 - 7 says: “Do not be anxious about anything, but in everything, by prayer and petition, with thanksgiving, present your requests to God. And the peace of God, which transcends all understanding, will guard your hearts and your minds in Christ Jesus.”

Furthermore, the mention of peace in Paul’s letters (apart from its use in standard salutations) most often occurs in community or relational settings. Paul, in echoing Jesus, says that Christ is our peace and it is that peace that has made the Jew and Gentile one people; for Ephesians 2: 14 - 17 says: “For he himself is our peace, who has made the two one and has destroyed the barrier, the dividing wall of hostility, by abolishing in his flesh the law with its commandments and regulations. His purpose was to create in himself one new man out of the two, thus making peace, and in this one body to reconcile both to God through the cross, by which he puts to death their hostility. He came and preached peace to you who were far away and peace to those who were near.”

Therefore, peace has primarily to do with the cessation of hostilities; thus, it is the Spirit alone that can produce such peace in our midst. Thus, the blessing of this peace is being children of God. Knowing that we are children of God produces in us the patience to be steadfast in the midst of difficult times. Thus, every leader must be characterized by patience.

4.8 A Leader’s Patience

In introducing this virtue, Jesus says: “Blessed are those who are persecuted because of righteousness, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven.” The people referred to here are those exercising patience in the midst of trials and persecution and those who show

the virtue of patience as outlined in Galatians 5: 22. This is showing the fruit of patience; as those having been persecuted, on account of righteousness.

The δεδιωγμένοι (having been persecuted) perfect tense. In this Beatitude it is unclear as to whether the righteousness is the cause or occasion of the persecution. Both in English and in the Greek. Yet it appears more favourable to understand that the suffering will come to believers due to their commitment to God.

The message of John 16: 33 prepares the believer for suffering and persecution for the sake of Christ and the Gospel. Yet believers can find comfort in knowing that Jesus has overcome the world. Hence, blessed are you when they insult you and shall persecute you ὀνειδίσωσιν (they shall insult) διώξωσιν (shall persecute).

Rejoice (χαίρετε) and exult (ἀγαλλιᾶσθε) are present imperatives. In light of the persecution and insults, Jesus commands the disciples to rejoice and exult. Present imperative indicating a continuity of action. So, it is required of the disciples to respond differently to insults and persecution.

The Greek word translated as patience here is the word *μακροθυμία* (makrothumia) which denotes endurance, constancy, steadfastness, perseverance, forbearance, longsuffering, slowness in avenging wrongs.[66] This virtue connotes the ability of putting up with others, even when one is severely tried. We all know that at times there are some people who will push us to the limit, even in the church; but Paul says, be patient.

Chrysostom, one of the church fathers in the early church said that this quality of patience is the grace of the man who could revenge himself but does not, of the man who is slow to wrath. So, we need to be patient with others because God is also patient with us. A leader must be able to be exemplary in standing (Ephesians 6: 10 - 18) firm in the promises of God even in the midst of persecution. These practical virtues are introduced in opposition to the accepted virtues of Greek and Jewish provenance. One only needs to recall the Old Testament unswerving insistence on observance and obedience to realize how different Jesus' stance on this matter is.

The contrast between the new Christian virtues and both the self-assertiveness of Hellenistic hybrid (presumptuousness, vanity) and the shallow righteousness of

[66] To see the different uses of this concept in the New Testament see: Rom.2:4; Rom.9:22; 2Co.6:6; Gal.5:22; Eph.4:2; Col.3:11-12; 1 Ti.1:16; 2 Ti.3:10; 2 Ti.4:2; 1 Pe.3:20; 2 Pe.3:15; Heb.6:12; Jam.5:10.

Pharisaic hypocrisy (religious observance without practical human content) is so stark that the very stating of the new values must have been perceived as a manifesto of a radical moral revolution.

To these practical virtues, conceived by Jesus as the basis of moral character, Paul will later add the so called 'theological' virtues: faith, hope and love (1 Corinthians 13: 13). Jesus' moral reform is not self-serving. It has a higher goal - to revive the old promise of salvation and to cast it in a more universal mould. This is the message that the disciples need to embrace and live by. Thus, every leader must uphold these virtues at all times. Falling short of the above virtues can undercut the mission entailed by the idea of salvation. Hence the necessity of appropriating these virtues as a new code of conduct in leadership.

CHAPTER 5. ANALOGIES OR METAPHORS

The four analogies presented here are the outworking of the virtues – which are an internal work. The Sermon on the Mount also introduces to us the four analogies ("proportions") to establish a strict parallelism between the function of these virtues and the moral mission of Jesus' disciples; and these virtues are expressed as follows:

5.1 A leader as Salt

It may be an anomalous or peculiar analogy, but Jesus likened believers to salt for a reason. Different writers and commentators suggest a diversity of interpretations as to what Christ meant by this metaphor. France (2007: 174) posits that the exact descriptive nature of the salt-symbolism as used by Jesus in this instance may not be pinned down to an inevitable certainty, but could be used in wide-ranging terms to denote the beneficial influence his disciples should have on humanity. Garlington (2011: 716) sees salt as a symbol of permanence and covenant in that salt is commensurate with the twofold concept of covenant stability and covenant fidelity.

Others look at Leviticus 2:13 with its threefold repetition of the word salt, “season all your grain offerings with salt. Do not leave the salt of the covenant of your God out of your grain offerings; add salt to all your offerings” and conclude that the operative nature of its usage signifies the symbolic eloquence of wisdom and covenant as it is called “the salt of the covenant of your God”. For others, Jesus was talking about the purity of heart that is needed to add the flavour of salt to the corrupt and dying world.

Stott (1992) however discusses salt as having three purposes in that apart from it being a nutritional dietary mineral, salt preserves, purifies and adds flavour. As salt is to food in bringing flavour or to a community in preserving purity, so the disciples must be to mankind. In a world that is perishing and given to destruction largely because of sin, the believers are to be the preservers while at the same time they are to add flavour. The metaphorical use of salt provides a powerful description of how church leaders should give flavour to their followers and prevent corrupt practices in church and society. Christian leaders who lose their saltiness become harmful and detrimental to the church and society at large because they would have lost their flavouring, seasoning and preserving character.

One such example of leaders losing their saltiness was the one where in 2014, the Evangelical Fellowship of Zimbabwe (EFZ) raised concern over reports that a certain

section of their leadership lost their saltiness and were involved in unethical and immoral acts including allegations of rape, and this brought the whole church fraternity into disrepute. Hence the question, “if salt loses its saltiness, how can it be made salty again?” except that it is now deemed to be good for nothing, and the report about the misbehaviour of church leaders as mentioned above is a classic example of what happens when church leaders act out of sync with the flavouring behaviour of salt.

5.2 A leader as Light

We learn is Scripture that God is not only portrayed as the source of light but is himself light. Jesus declared that “I am the light of the world” Jn 8: 12. Furthermore, in 1 John 1: 8 “God is light and him there is no darkness”. It is in light of this understanding that as light is to the world so the disciples must be to mankind. When Jesus used the descriptive and expressive pronouncement ‘you are the light of the world’ in reference to his disciples, He was saying they must radiate the characters of light as His disciples and not darkness. Looking at the whole concept of light, Anthony (2015) posits that “in biblical tradition, light has always been seen as a symbol of orderliness and the absence of confusion, hence the first recorded speech of God in the bible is the command that there should 'be light' (Gen 1: 3). Prior to that was disorder, corruption and confusion (Gen 1: 1 - 2.)”. Anthony further argues that light symbolises happiness (Job 22: 28; Psalm 97: 11), protection (Job 29: 3; Isa 58: 8), orderliness (Gen 1: 3; Amos 5: 20), exemplary behaviour (Matt 5: 14a; Luke 2: 32), salvation (Psalm 27: 1; Matt 4: 16; Luke 1: 79), prosperity, joy and good fortune (Esther 8:16; Isa 60:20).

For Jesus to describe His disciples as light means that they must leads others out of darkness, show them the way in their exemplary lives as those who will soon be commissioned to share in His ministry of proclamation and deliverance (France 2007: 175). In simple terms, the light which Jesus brings should also be provided by His disciples to the world that is in darkness. In the same way, believers are to collectively be the light of the world, a task which they must be united for as they project the God who is Himself the light of the world. The plural suggests that Jesus was talking to them as a group that they together were the light of the world, yet they were also individually lights of the world as they project Christ.

Christian leaders are all equally called to be lights as individuals, but certainly shine brighter in their leadership role as they represent Christ who is the light of the world. Leaders must realise that in and of themselves, they cannot claim to be the light apart

from Christ because nothing inherent in them makes them the light. But it is as they submit themselves to Christ that they are made the light, or more correctly, project the light. Him who lives in us is projected through us. That is what makes the difference. It is therefore the responsibility of leaders to shine the light of Christ through their actions and lives to their followers so that no one is left in darkness because of their careless behaviour.

“Let your light so shine before men that they may see your good deeds and glorify your father who is in heaven.” The Beatitudes have spelled out some of those good works. In humility and submission to God, we work for right relations, for merciful actions, and for peace. When we live as people of blessing, we are salt and light — in the workplace, in our homes, and in our nation.

5.3 A leader as a City on the Hill

The “city on a hill” is one line that Jesus used as looked out at the people gathered on the hillside to hear Him speak. As Jesus drew from a rich history of metaphor about the city of Jerusalem, He says as a city on the hill is to observers, so the disciples must be to mankind. If salt loses its taste it becomes worthless as spice. If light is hidden, it cannot shine before people. If a city does not rise over the landscape, it cannot be seen. Therefore, if the disciples lack the necessary virtues of standing out in their faith, they will be as ineffective as the salt that has lost its taste or like a hidden city that cannot be seen. Jesus was challenging His disciples to spread His glory throughout the earth and not hide.

Was it merely about what the disciples needed to do to be seen as shining people? I think Jesus wanted to show the disciples the importance of why they do what they were doing and how they also need to shine for Jesus in this dark world which will literally make their course of following him remarkable — people will talk about them. In noting a remarkable missionary historical data, Craig Keener (2013) notes that the material in Acts 11: 19 - 30 most likely reflects this city on the hill shinning idea in that___ “it was in Antioch that the disciples were first called “*Christians”* (verse 26) because of their exemplary lives of following Christ.

Richard Pervo (2014) agrees that (8: 4) – says “now those who were scattered went from place to place, proclaiming the word” as some would praise them, and others slander them. But it was their doing and proclamations that set them apart as shining

examples for Jesus Christ. And I guess it was what Jesus implied when He said that a city on a hill cannot be hidden and that His disciples needed to be a shining and outstanding example of this gospel and that would draw people to Him. In the same way, Christian leaders should be shining examples in their humble, word-and-deed love and care for God's people as that will warm the hearts of believers and expose those who are selfish and reckless in their leadership roles and behaviour.

5.4 A leader as a Lamp on the Stand

As a lamp is on the stand to the house so the disciples must be to mankind. If a lamp is put under the bowl it cannot light up the house. Exodus 25: 37 - 38 says "You shall make seven lamps for it, and they shall arrange its lamps so that they give light in front of it. And its wick-trimmers and their trays shall be of pure gold". The picture painted in this text is twofold: that the Lampstand (vs. 37) helps in giving light 'in front of it' and that their light will reflect forward. The disciples were to let the light of God shine forth from their lampstand's position into the darkness of this world. Jesus who was the light of the world, was letting His followers know that they are to be the light of the world. Even as Christ's life was the light of men (John 1: 4), the disciples' lives were set forth in preparation to give light to mankind. Jesus' preparation of His disciples as lampstands is better reflected by Bill Scheidler as he looks at Exodus 25: 31 - 40 and brings out six characteristics of the lampstand that would make it well prepared for what it was meant to be. I will look at three of these characteristics as observed by Scheidler that:

- **The Lampstand was to be made of pure gold (vs. 31).**
  Gold is a symbol that speaks of the divine nature. This gold was to be clarified until it was pure. This speaks of the fact that the lampstand was to be all of one metal with no impurities or mixture. When we became Christians, we were dug out of the earth as unrefined gold. In Christ we became partakers of the divine nature. We are now the building materials that God is using to build the church, His lampstand. As Scheidler puts it, my view is that Christ was urging his disciples to be lampstands are pure and refined as they carry the message of the gospel to the world as shining lights without mixing it.
- **The Lampstand was to be made of one piece of gold (vs. 31, 36**).
  Its shaft, its branches, its bowls, its ornamental knobs, and flowers shall be of one piece. This lampstand was to have perfect unity. Even though it had many

branches and even more ornaments (66 in all), it was completely one—perfectly joined together (I Cor. 1:10). Jesus wanted the disciples to work in perfect unity as lampstands even though they came from different backgrounds with various gift sets so that they can shine forth the bright light the world that is darkness.

- **The Lampstand was to be made as a hammered work (vs. 31).**
  According Scheidler, this is interesting because the one piece of gold that was to become this beautiful light-bearer for the Lord would be made with hammers. Scheidler argues that God called skilled workmen who were led and directed by the Holy Spirit to pound on this lump of gold until it took the proper shape (Ex. 31:1-6; 36:1). This kind of work is not possible with cast iron. If you pound on cast iron it will break. This is only possible because gold is a pliable metal. As the disciples remain pliable before the Lord as he uses the hammer of His word on the mount to mould and shape them into the image that He has in His mind. I believe that Jesus was equipping his disciples with skills on the mount so that they will be prepared for the work that lies ahead.

Leaders in the same way should seek to be lampstands that carry the brightly burning light of the Lord Jesus Christ as they lead His people.

In the final analysis, these virtues as observed in the Beatitudes, perhaps, exist as the new law for those who want to follow God in Jesus Christ. Jesus was not impressed with the morality of great deeds and personal excellence. The pagan morality praises virtues as personal accomplishment but instead of building a good character out of them, as it professes to do in numerous philosophical treatises, it creates the appearance of vanity and arrogance in its great personalities from Achilles to Alcibiades and Alexander, or from Brutus and Caesar to Nero.

Contrary to the pagan ambition of attaining perfection and immortality in the court of public opinion, Jesus introduces the idea of moral modesty that is always sensitive to potential defects (vices) and failures (sins) that will be judged in the court of Heaven. The vices should be counterbalanced by virtues that do not stem from external actions but emerge from the good heart and will (these latter are new moral categories) (Boardman 2008: 74-89).

Jesus questions the tradition surrounding the Ten Commandments according to which the only way to satisfy God was to strictly observe His Law. Contrary to the Pharisees, Jesus taught that God could be satisfied only when men enter "the kingdom of heaven"

which is possible only if they change qualitatively, in their hearts. But in order to be able to accomplish that goal they need to display more than learning and observance. Man needs to shape his inwardness according to the highest standards of the Gospel morality.

Neither different levels of excellence nor the extent of external observance will decide the outcome of human striving for salvation. No one is excluded from the promise of salvation, no matter how poor or rich, ugly or attractive, impaired or strong, of low or high birth. What matters is charity and love. Therefore, Jesus' message is very inclusive. Jesus not only tries to persuade the strong and rich to be benevolent and charitable; He asks the weak and poor for more patience and forgiveness.

McKnight (2013:3) claims that the Sermon on the Mount "remains the greatest moral document of all time", connoting that Jesus proclaimed the Sermon on the Mount as the ethical and spiritual foundation for life commitment to the kingdom of God. Kuhn (2001:67) also suggests that Jesus imbued his disciples with the vision of the kingdom through the Sermon on the Mount and that his leadership style was transforming, liberating, redemptive, prophetic, and salvific.

In an attempt to address the descriptive-empirical task of Osmer (2008: 34), the 'what is going on' of the unethical behaviour of church leaders, this research sought to apply a practical theological interpretation on the Sermon on the Mount grounded in the Driver's (2007: 22) suggested "Divine command theory" which holds that moral norms depend upon God's will, thus leaders in the church should aspire to the highest standards of moral ethical behaviour. As a continuing matter of attending to what is going on in the lives of church leaders and how we might respond, the research will move to suggest that we look at the virtues found in the Beatitudes as a possible framework for mentoring.

Buttler (2006:178) suggest that the word mentoring can be used to describe the biblical concepts of discipleship, teaching, nurturing, training, equipping and as part of learning that is seen as a recurring theme in Biblical narratives and also as it was the case with Jesus and his disciples. Kopp (2003:137) posits that mentoring can protect Christian leaders from stumbling or help them back onto their feet if they fall, hence we want to look at mentoring from a biblical perspective informed by the virtues found in the Beatitudes.

CHAPTER 6. THE VIRTUES AS THE FRAMEWORK FOR MENTORSHIP

Leighton Ford (2011: 13 - 16) relates this story: A father and a son took a sentimental trip to the father's boyhood hometown. As they drove around the neighbourhood, they saw the houses where he grew up, the store where his parents worked, the schools he attended and the park where he played. They went to the civic auditorium, but it was closed during summer; so, the father persuaded the janitor to open for them. The father led the son to the stage and said to the son: "This is where we had our youth rallies. Hundreds of our friends would come, and I loved the opportunity to Emcee the meetings. During our meetings we saw many kids touched by Christ.[67]"

As he shared the memories with the son, he became reflective; and continued to say: "But I remember the night we had a very famous evangelist come. We were sure that most of our friends would accept Christ. However, even though the place was packed that night, I was disappointed because only one person came forward." Then the father pointed to the wings at the side of the stage and noted: "I went over and stood there, very discouraged. I remember that the evangelist came over, put his arm around me, gave me a hug, and encouraged me. He said he would pray for me and believed that God would use me if I stayed humble." The father paused and looked his son in the eyes and said: "I have never forgotten that arm around my shoulder."

Ford concludes the story by noting that "the father was me and the evangelist was Billy Graham. I have often thought back to that arm around the shoulder and the fact that Billy Graham spoke to the crowd but took time for one young man. I have reflected that the doors to leadership were opened by mentors who cared for those who were coming after them." This story reflects what Zachary (2005:3) describes as a self-directed learning relationship that is driven by the learning needs of the mentee, hence he sees mentorship in the context of relationship. Ford and Graham's relationship is a good example of the "imitative" character so prevalent in the Christian literature which is critical in the area of mentorship and effective leadership development. Jesus in The Sermon on the Mount begins His mentorship program with His disciples; it is significant to notice that He begins this process by drawing His disciples or mentees in this context to a life of virtues as He outlines the 8 virtues outlined above in this research.

[67]Evangelist Leighton Ford's Charlotte, North Carolina, crusade this spring was noteworthy not only because 866 people registered decisions for Christ, but because it was Ford's first crusade in his home town. https://www.christianitytoday.com/ct/1983/june-17/at-leighton-fords-crusade-face-in-crowd-was-his-fathers.html

If Jesus began His mentorship program with the virtues, we should also begin where He started.[68] The word mentor is ambiguous: it is both a noun & a verb. As a noun it refers to an experienced adviser and supporter: somebody, usually older and more experienced, who advises and guides a younger, less experienced person; as a verb it is to mentor somebody: to act as a mentor to somebody, especially a junior colleague. The master in the title here refers to Jesus; so, in other words, the model for effective mentoring is Jesus Christ. Jesus's disciples would have had a great time listening to their mentor delivering such a powerful Sermon on the Mount filled with nuggets for ethical and moral leadership acumen.

Mentoring is a personal relationship between a mentor and a mentee. According to Shea (2002:8) a mentor is one who offers knowledge, insight, perspective or wisdom that is especially useful to the mentee. A mentor is usually a person with the most experience, has the expertise in the field or an area which he or she is mentoring and Jesus in the Sermon on the Mount, showed exactly those qualities of mentor with His mentees. The disciples as mentees were in an intense, personal and enduring period as they listened to their mentor. During His time with the disciples, communication played a very important role so that none of Jesus' mentees would miss an opportunity to learn from Him. I believe that this mentoring process facilitated the sharing of information, transferring of ideas and giving instructions and feedback. At some stage, Jesus sent His disciples in pairs to go and do the work and they come back to give feedback. The Jesus approach on mentorship provides us with tremendous opportunities to mentor one another as His followers.

The mentoring relationship among believers can be initiated by either the mentor or the mentee. Once a desire to mentor or be mentored is expressed both parties will after a careful consideration come to an agreement of engaging in the journey of mentorship. In the mentoring relationship the mentor assumes the role of the facilitator and the mentee becomes the active learner. The virtues outlined above create a good foundation for the most effective, enduring, and effective mentorship. Both the mentor and the mentee are active participants in the mentoring relationship and the mentoring processes. Mentoring is an effective strategic tool for personal and spiritual development and empowerment. The ultimate goal of mentorship is to produce an independent individual who is effective and excellent in the specific area of mentoring.

[68] I am using the term mentorship as synonymous with discipleship and I will be using these words interchangeably.

Within the church mentoring primarily aims to help the mentee to grow in the knowledge and likeness of Christ. The mentor and the mentee should have a common set of principles and values. The mentorship relationship must be centred on Christian principles and values. Jesus Christ embodies all the essential traits of effective mentorship. It is sad to notice that most research of leadership development in the church has not started with Jesus but secular leadership strategies; unfortunately, too much of what has been promoted as Christian leadership has simply meant taking secular management and leadership concepts and attaching a few Scripture verses to the concept. However, in this talk I am going to take a far more radical approach: which starts with Jesus as the mentor and lets Him shape us into His model.

It has been said that the final test of a leader is that he leaves behind others who have the conviction and the will to carry on. It is also said that success without succession is a failure. Mentoring leaders are the teachers who make disciples, training others who will someday continue the work they began. These leaders believe their work will be better accomplished if several people are trained to lead rather than relying on only one person to do all the work. Hence Jesus saw it as necessary to mentor others who will continue with the work He began. While vast crowds followed Jesus throughout much of His public ministry, Jesus chose to devote most of His time and energy in the training of the twelve.

Mark 3 tells us of this key decision that Jesus made when the crowds were growing. Jesus strategically withdrew into the hills and spent the entire night in prayer; as Luke 6: 12 - 13 confirms: “One of those days Jesus went out to a mountainside to pray and spent the night praying to God. When morning came, he called his disciples to him and chose twelve of them, whom he also designated apostles.” Effective mentorship begins with prayer; a mentor must continually pray for the mentee, as we see Jesus modelling that here.

CHAPTER 7 THE PRAGMATIC TASK

Now that we have explored how the normative task will work out in this particular context of creating the normative approach towards ethical leadership in the church, as guided by the Beatitudes, and having drawn insights from Jesus' teachings on how to live ethically, we move to the pragmatic task of this research. I chose to put this task at the end to assist us to transform our church leadership so that it reflects that of the beatitudes, which informed the basis of our ethical theory. As it was evident that normative theological perspectives provide interpretive guides in helping to determine what they ought to do such as to explain how to move particular episodes, situations, and contexts toward desired ends, the task of pragmatic theological interpretation as Osmer (2008:173) alludes: How might we respond? Therefore, the pragmatic task answers the question by forming an action plan and undertaking specific responses that seek to shape the episode, situation, or context in desirable directions. This task is about leadership formation and direction.

According to Osmer (177 - 178) there are three forms of leadership within the pragmatic task. The first is the Task of Competence, which focuses on the effective performance towards the leadership tasks of a role in an organization. The second leadership form is Transactional Leadership, which focuses on leaders influencing others through a process of trade-offs. The third form of leadership is Transformational Leadership, where leaders focus on leading an organization through a process of "deep change" in its identity, mission, culture, and operating procedures. However, it is significant to notice that the most effective form of leadership is the correlation of all these three forms, all working in a dialectical process. Therefore,

> All three forms of leadership are needed in congregations. Pastors, teachers, committee chairs, and caregivers must be competent in carrying out their respective tasks. Congregations also need transactional leaders who are responsive to the needs that bring people to congregations and are willing to enter the political fray of competing agendas to enable different groups to work together. But today, especially in mainline congregations, it is transforming leadership that is most needed, leadership that can guide a congregation through a process of deep change (Osmer 2008:178).

All these three forms, working together effectively, are encapsulated by a leadership approach known as Servant leadership[69] . "The great leader is seen as servant first…" – this short quotation, a fragment of a sentence from an essay written in 1970, by Robert K. Greenleaf, captures the essence of servant-leadership theory" (Smith 2005: 3). Servant Leadership, as the encapsulation of the three forms of leadership, engenders a type of theological interpretation in practice. The epitome of this approach of servant leadership is Christ Jesus; as he not only taught his disciples about the ethical virtues in the beatitudes, he also demonstrated them throughout.

Hence, the perfect embodiment of servant leadership; as Osmer (2008: 184) remarks that "Christ redefines the nature of power and authority by taking the form of a servant. He teaches his followers that servanthood is fundamental to the mission of the community of disciples and leadership within this community".

Philippians 2: 6 - 7 demonstrates this through noting that "[Jesus] Who, being in very nature God, did not consider equality with God something to be used to his own advantage; rather, he made himself nothing by taking the very nature of a servant, being made in human likeness. Paul notes that Jesus emptied himself – made himself nothing, taking the very nature of a servant (v.7). The word used for servant is the word *δούλου* and it means: a slave; metaphorically, it means one who gives himself up to another's will, like the service of Christ in extending and advancing His cause among men; devoted to another to the disregard of one's own interests.[70]

A servant is an attendant; one who is called to be a steward. The word serve/servant is found some 1,452 times in some English Bibles; thus, it is one of the largest topics in Bible. Jesus was a servant to everybody who came across His path: the rich and the poor, the healthy and the sick, believers and unbelievers. Foster (1998: 162) writes that, "True service is indiscriminate in its ministry."

[69]The very notion of a servant as leader, or "servant-leadership" as it has come to be known, is purposefully oxymoronic and arresting in nature. The theory's originator, Robert K. Greenleaf, intentionally sought a descriptor that would give people pause for thought, and challenge any long-standing assumptions that might be held about the relationship between leaders and followers in an organization. See https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/26a7/0b3e105bc74c25bf5f7011bf257b706a9641.pdf

[70] There are two different Greek words Paul used in his epistles, which are translated: servant in our English translations. The first one is transliterated as ***doulos*** which means a slave or bond-servant (as used in Phil. 2:7), the second one is transliterated as ***diakonoi*** which means a menial worker or a waiter, the word Paul used in 1 Cor.3:5.

We see Jesus demonstrating this kind of service in John 13: 5 - 15, where He washes the disciples' feet; when He finishes washing their feet He instructs them: "If I then, the Lord and the Teacher, washed your feet, you also ought to wash one another's feet. For I gave you an example that you also should do as I did to you" (v.14-15). Now, Paul may have been aware of this incident and, perhaps, makes an allusion to it in writing of the example of Christ, that all must comply with this command, as Jesus Himself said that He gave us an example to follow.

It is interesting to notice that Paul uses two types of verbs in this passage: principal verbs and participle verbs. Principal verbs are the verbs considered first in rank or importance; in this instance they are: 'did not regard'; 'emptied himself'; 'humbled himself'. Whereas participle verbs are the words formed from the verb, like going or gone; in this case they are: 'taking' and 'becoming'. Therefore, the actions indicated by the participle verbs are dependent or serve those actions indicated by the principal verbs. So, Jesus had to 'empty himself' before 'taking the form of a servant'. This also proves true for human beings, because one must forget about their rights to be a true servant; one must learn to let go of their status to be a real servant.

You cannot serve effectively if all that you are concerned about is your status. Jesus voluntarily gave up His divine status to come and serve the world, as Paul notes that although He existed in the form of God, He did not regard equality with God a thing to be grasped (2:6). Therefore, this was possible because He "emptied" Himself. Brown (1998: 130) notes that the term emptied could be understood only in the sense of total surrender and self-sacrifice; for the word form' is not something external to content. What is internal is also external, and what is external is also internal. Therefore, for this reason, the figure has to create for himself a substantial new existence in the self-giving. It is the form of a servant. Service is an investment that pays in more than monetary ways. It pays in character development. An old saying is true: "The way to the throne room is through the servant's quarters." Matthew 23: 11 says, "But he who is greatest among you shall be your servant", and Matthew 20: 26 says, "…whoever desires to become great, let him be your servant".[71]

[71] The notes on servanthood on this page are from Maqoma, W.P., 2020, '*Imago Dei* identity as embodied in the incarnation: Kenosis as a catalyst towards identity formation', *Verbum et Ecclesia* 41(1), a1992. https://doi.org/10.4102/ve.v41i1.1992

Therefore, Christ becomes the model every church leader must imitate. So, we draw insights on how to imitate Him from the biblical text. Thus, even this pragmatic task is dependent on a thorough theological interpretation of the biblical text. Therefore, the biblical text has within its narrative ethical principles, which form the moral framework we should live within. So, the two terms are intricately related. Thus, when we discuss leadership ethics, we are also reflecting on the moral framework from which we must do leadership. As Clinton (1998: 57) remarked: "Apart from character, ministry is only religious activity or even worse, religious business". One observes, through the Gospels, that Jesus in all his teachings was teaching his followers a particular 'philosophy', or a 'way of living'. He was providing them a certain vantage point from which they could define and describe reality; so "Jesus' teaching was intended as a way of life only for those people who subjected their lives to God's rule" (Drane 2001: 163). This whole teaching was encapsulated in a theme of the Kingdom of God and explained through different teachings. For instance, Stott (1988: 19) in his commentary on The Sermon on the Mount stated that:

> The most complete delineation anywhere in the New Testament of the Christian counterculture. Here is a Christian value-system, ethical standard, religious devotion, attitude to money, ambition, lifestyle, and network of relationships – all of which are totally at variance with those of the non-Christian world. And this Christian counterculture is the life of the kingdom of God, a fully human life indeed but lived out under the divine rule.

Stott (1988: 9) also comments that The Sermon on the Mount, "seems to present the quintessence of the teaching of Jesus." Thus, Noebel (2001: 111) adds that, "The apex of Christ's ethical teaching is encapsulated in the Sermon on the Mount, found most comprehensively in Matthew 5-7." This connection between the *Kerygma* and *Didache* is seen throughout the New Testament and underpins the theology of the New Testament, which connects theology and ethics. *Kerygma* was essentially a declaration of what God had accomplished through the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus and *Didache* was the term used for moral teaching or advice.[72]

Wherefore, as the adage says, that the greatest challenge of leaders is themselves; so effective leadership demands virtue ethics. For instance, the apostle Paul in various letters to the individuals he mentored (Timothy, Titus, etc.) outlined a framework for leadership ethics as follow:

[72] Kerygma determined the identity of the followers of Christ and this presupposed the Didachē which they followed which determined their ethics; hence, ethics is the outgrowth of one's identity.

In his first letter to Timothy (3:1-7), Paul discusses the qualifications of an overseer by introducing this passage with the phrase: “Here is a trustworthy saying” to present a unique formula he uses several times. On each occasion the saying is acute, almost proverbial; it is perhaps a familiar quotation from an early hymn or creed, and Paul is giving it his own apostolic endorsement.

Five times in the Pastoral Epistles, the little phrase “Here is a trustworthy saying” appears (1 Tim 1v. 15; 3: 1; 4: 9; 2 Tim 2: 11; Titus 3: 8). Two of those five uses have added to them the second statement: “that deserves full acceptance” (1 Tim 1:15; 4:9). In some cases, the identifying label comes before the saying (1 Tim 1 v. 15; 3:1; 2 Tim 2:11), in others after it (1 Tim 4: 9; Titus 3: 8). Here we can begin to see more clearly the content of the “sound teaching,” by appeal to which the writer hoped to head off false teaching. This phrase indicates a familiar recognized statement or saying that had already developed in the early church. It is not something that Paul is saying for the first time, but something he is quoting that he knew everyone knew as a trustworthy saying. Paul reminds the readers of this epistle that the content of the gospel is true and trustworthy, in distinction to the speculative nonsense of the false teachers who promote religious cults and the lies of secular propaganda. This phrase Paul uses to begin this passage – “*Here is a trustworthy saying*” – is used here to enthuse attention; it suggests that what is going to be said is of utmost importance, therefore, it is without any controversy and unquestionably true.

Paul, by invoking the phrase *“Here is a trustworthy saying”*, is calling on his readers to pay attention to what he is about to say, because it is particularly important. This passage addresses an overseer who was recognized as a leader in the early church, and the qualities Paul outlines for an overseer fit the qualities expected for every potential leader. Considering that this research will discuss the virtues from the Beatitudes extensively, here we will give an overview and a brief explanation of the positive qualities in contrast to the negative qualities outlined in 1 Timothy 3. This is done with a view that the cultivation of the positive qualities eliminates the existence of negative qualities.

It is interesting to notice that Paul outlines ten (10) positive qualities alongside five (5) negative qualities.

POSITIVE QUALITIES	NEGATIVE QUALITIES
1) Be Above Reproach	1) Not Given to Drunkenness
2) Faithful to his Wife	2) Not Violent
3) Temperate	3) Not Quarrelsome
4) Self-controlled	4) Not a Lover of Money
5) Respectable	5) Not be a Recent Convert
6) Hospitable	
7) Able to Teach	
8) Gentle	
9) Manage his Own Family well	
10) Have a good reputation with Outsiders	

Moreover, to show that these qualities are important and are to be cultivated by every leader, Paul mentions most of these qualities in his letter to his other spiritual son Titus in Titus 1: 5 - 9,[73] when Titus was facing problems at the church in Crete.[74] Timothy at this stage is looking after the church in Ephesus, a church which had become troubled by men who taught error and in some cases lived immorally.

Thus, Christians, especially women, were harassed and in need of help; like it is happening in our society today, where the scourge of women abuse is on the increase, and where there are fewer men protecting women in society. However, God is in the

[73] "5 The reason I left you in Crete was that you might put in order what was left unfinished and appoint elders in every town, as I directed you. 6 An elder must be blameless, faithful to his wife, a man whose children believe and are not open to the charge of being wild and disobedient. 7 Since an overseer manages God's household, he must be blameless—not overbearing, not quick-tempered, not given to drunkenness, not violent, not pursuing dishonest gain. 8 Rather, he must be hospitable, one who loves what is good, who is self-controlled, upright, holy and disciplined. 9 He must hold firmly to the trustworthy message as it has been taught, so that he can encourage others by sound doctrine and refute those who oppose it."
[74] It is interesting to notice that even here the items/qualities listed are fifteen as in the list given to Timothy.

process of restoring His original plan and He begins this restoration by addressing leaders in His church.

Although 1 Timothy 3 may be written to address a few mature men who aspired to be in a senior position of leadership in the church, the text is nonetheless helpful for all who seek to assume the role of leadership in any organization or context. The criteria in this text also shows us what qualities every person who aspires to lead like Jesus should possess. The word overseer means “to look upon” or “to care for”; so, a leader is entrusted with a responsibility to look upon and take care for those placed under them.

Therefore, all leaders who are called to serve in the church need to aspire to be mature to serve effectively in all areas of their lives, whether at home, or in the church, or in the marketplace. For all these qualities Paul gives here, fit all these areas, some concern moral character, others domestic affairs, others economic affairs, etc. So, these qualities are applicable to all leaders in the church. To illustrate: The first quality that Paul mentions, which must be emphasized is: “Now the overseer must be above reproach.”

- **BE ABOVE REPROACH**

In verse 2 Paul begins by saying *“Now the overseer must be above reproach”*, that a mature leader must have a good reputation. The phrase: Above reproach is one word in the Greek: *anepilemptos*, which literally means “not to be laid hold of; one against whom it is impossible to bring any charge of wrongdoing such as could stand impartial examination”. The word used here does not mean that he should be “perfect”, for maturity is not synonymous with perfection; but the leader should be a person who is not charged of committing immorality, or of holding a false doctrine. This quality is very significant, hence Paul places it on head of the list because the following qualities would represent a leader who is above reproach, or a leader who is characterized by integrity. This is not a new idea in the New Testament, for when you read in Acts chapter 6, when the church faced its first organizational problems in Jerusalem, the apostles recommended that “seven men of good reputation” be chosen to help with the functions of the church.

The apostles knew that they would only make the problem worse if they delegated this task to leaders who were not respected in the Christian community; because people would not trust them, and so doubt whatever they do.

- **FAITHFUL TO HIS WIFE**

This quality is a call to moral purity for both the husband and wife. Paul says that this man must be, *"the husband of but one wife".* This quality is so important, as most of us will confirm that one does not need to be sitting in front of the TV for a long time before one starts feeling the heat of the oppressive sensuality of our day; even most of the adverts they show have some form of sexual perversion. Most advertisers say, "sex sells."

Even, sadly so, some professors encourage this; as Professor David Richard of New York University Law School advocated that there should be freedom for hardcore pornography, because it is good for the body. You don't need to go very far to see that this is a disaster, because many leaders in most of our communities are involved in illicit sexual activities.

For instance, adult world shops have become a favorite place for most men to hang-out during weekend nights. Indeed, the church has not escaped, for many in today's church have wilted under the heat. A leadership magazine commissioned a poll of a thousand pastors. The survey indicated that 12 percent of the pastors had committed adultery while in the ministry; so that is one out of eight pastors; and 23 percent admitted having done something that is sexually inappropriate. Moreover, the Christianity Today magazine surveyed men in general – supposedly Christian men – and found out the figure to be nearly double, which is 70 percent of Christians conducting themselves in a sexually inappropriate manner.

Therefore, it is concluded that one in four Christian men are unfaithful, and about two in four men have done something that is sexually inappropriate. If we are going to be leaders of moral purity, we need to be vigilant and sober, as Peter instructs in 1 Peter 5: 8 "Be self-controlled and alert. Your enemy the devil prowls around like a roaring lion looking for someone to devour."

- **TEMPERATE**

A leader must be sober; that is the impression given by this quality. A leader who is temperate is recognized by his self-control, which is the fourth quality introduced in the outline.

- **SELF-CONTROLLED**

To be self-controlled is to have a sound mind; the implication here is that a leader does not quickly react with anger or jealousy or resentment or bitterness or other emotions that may cause harm in the life of the other through using aggression and being hostile towards another. Self-control in church leadership is born from the concept of the fruit of the Spirit as outlined by Paul in the book of Galatians (Gibbons, 2009: nn). The sentiments of Paul in Galatians have been identified and shared by many scholars studying spiritual leadership (Bezy, 2011; Fry, 2003; Houston & Sokolow, 2006) as beneficial ingredients associated with character-based leadership including ethicality and organizational citizenship behaviour (Wang and Hackett 2016). Notwithstanding our best intentions and aspirations as church leaders, we often struggle to become the best version of who God intended us to be, hence character traits identified as common to leadership in the church would include concepts such as self-control.

- **RESPECTABLE**

So here the word translated respectable or good behavior is the Greek word *kosmios*, and that is where we get our English word cosmetics; in essence, he is saying this man must live a well-ordered life, so that when the outsiders look at his life, they will be attracted to the gospel. For example, our cosmetics of the gospel of Jesus Christ are reflected in our speech, conduct, manner, etc. A leader must be respectable, and this has to do with his reputation to the outsiders. The word used here connotes that the leader must make the gospel attractive to the outsiders. A leader must be known to be orderly.

- **HOSPITABLE**

The word translated as hospitable here means “to love strangers.” In an interconnected and diverse world, Christians are called to hospitality. Yet this is no easy matter, for welcoming the stranger requires becoming vulnerable and demands sacrificial generosity.

In the Near Eastern world of the biblical traditions, hospitality emerged as a way of tending to sojourners, travellers requiring shelter, nourishment, and protection. Such persons were conspicuous in their strangeness and difference, indicating that they hailed from outside established social and kinship frameworks, from beyond the tribe. Made vulnerable by this "lack of place," the stranger was regarded as a person in need, on par with the marginalized in the community (for example, orphans and widows).

Accordingly, the moral obligation of gracious hosting became paramount. Especially in a nomadic context, anyone could find herself or himself a stranger in one circumstance or another. This ethic of exchange insinuates that human beings share a baseline dignity that is vulnerable and can be imperilled when exposed, fostering a dependence upon the generosity of others. Justice requires an economy of compassionate reciprocity that welcomes the vulnerable stranger. For the Israelites, this notion is given religious justification. Indeed, the Israelites are exhorted by God not to oppress or harm the stranger, for they too endured similar circumstances in the land of Egypt (Exod. 22: 21). Even more, God commands the Israelites to provide for and attend to the stranger as a native among them, loving him or her equally as one of their own (Lev 19: 33 - 34). The resounding message is this: As the covenanted people of God were themselves aliens, and remain vulnerable sojourners with God, provided for and loved by God (Lev 25: 23), so too they should love others. The memory of being an outsider and subsequently being welcomed thus provides impetus to empathize with other outsiders.[75]

- **ABLE TO TEACH & TEACHABLE**

A leader must continually develop their knowledge base, especially of the word of God so that they may be able to teach, but moreover, their teaching must be an outcome of prayerful meditation on the Word of God and the practical application of its truth to oneself. Thus, a leader who is able to teach is humble enough to be teachable. In Acts 18: 24 – 28 Luke introduces us to one of the key leaders in the Early Church who was teachable.

[75] To read more on the significance of hospitality within the Christian Tradition see: Vosloo (2004); Reynolds (2006); Kessler (2012); Park (2013); and Carter (2013).

Apollos was a native of Alexandria, an educated man, and possessed a thorough knowledge of the Jewish Scriptures. Somewhere and somehow he had received instruction about Jesus, to a point that it is said he knew the gospel accurately; however, although he was well learned, he was still humble enough to sit before the elders of the church; as v.26 says: “When Priscilla and Aquila heard him, they invited him to their home and explained to him the way of God more adequately.”

This is an important lesson to learn if we want to remain effective in ministry. We have to remain teachable. “Teachability” is an essential characteristic for us to be all that God wants us to be and do as leaders. Matt Keller in his book: *The Key to Everything* (2015), where he extensively teaches on this important characteristic of teachability; here he mourns over the fact that this characteristic is missing in many leaders. He notes that we live in a world that lacks the one thing it needs in order to be successful. We live in a world that has failed to add teachability to its lexicon. Therein lies the problem, not just with our world in general, but with so many of the people who are striving to succeed within it. Because teachability truly is the Key to Everything! (2015: xvi). We should be teachable like Apollos.

Apollos was teachable, so should we. It does not matter how learned we think we are; we should always have the humility to sit before the elders and glean from the wisdom they have gained through their life experience. Apollos was willing to be taught by Priscilla and Aquila when they invited him to their home. This is a characteristic of a true student of God’s Word and a leader of His people. The learned and eloquent Apollos, who already had “a thorough knowledge of the Scriptures,” had still more to learn.

- **NOT GIVEN TO DRUNKENNESS**

These four words represent one word in Greek: *paroinos*, which literally means “beside wine”. The use of this term suggests that it meant being “tipsy” Or “rowdy”. Supposedly, Paul was mindful that leaders given to drunkenness have a tendency to be violent, hence, immediately after mentioning this quality, he states that a leader must not be violent.

- **NOT VIOLENT**

Not violent means not being a striker or using physical form to harm or hurt someone; and I think this may also include using words to be emotionally abusive. A leader must not be violent in any form.

- **GENTLE**

It is interesting to notice that v.3 mentions 5 qualities but four are negative items and one item is positive, and that quality is gentleness. To be gentle means to be gracious, kind, forbearing, considerate, magnanimous, and genial (which is to be friendly and cheerful). Leaders are to be known by their gentleness as they serve others! Proverbs 15:1 says: “A gentle answer turns away wrath, but a harsh word stirs up anger.”

- **NOT QUARRELSOME**

The word used here (*amachos*) literally means “abstaining from fighting” or “noncombatant”. Here this word is used in the metaphorical sense of being “not contentious”. A contentious leader is a sad feature in any church.

- **NOT A LOVER OF MONEY**

The love of money is one of the greatest dangers confronting every Christian worker. One who tends to pursue money is likely to be diverted from an effective ministry because money becomes their primary concern not people.

- **MANAGE HIS OWN FAMILY WELL**

Verses two (2) and three (3) list a dozen of qualifications for leaders (most of them expressed in a single adjective in the Greek), but the last three qualities or items are stated at a greater length. The first of these covers two verses. In v.5 Paul makes the logical point, in the form of a question: “If anyone does not know how to manage his own family, how can he take care of God’s church?” This is an argument from the lesser to the greater; if you are able to manage the small family, you are then ready to manage the larger church-group. Thus, the case here is incontrovertible, and not able to be denied or disputed.

- **NOT BE A RECENT CONVERT**

The Greek adjective (*neophytos*) literally means “Newly Planted”; this word is related to its root word: *typhos* meaning smoke. So, this, could mean one who is wrapped up in smoke. Therefore, this word is used here metaphorically, as a substantive, for a new convert, who is called a novice. The reason for this prohibition is spelled out in the rest of the verse which reads: “or he may become conceited and fall under the same judgment as the devil.” There is danger that such a person may become conceited. So, this word is used here in the passive and connotes that the novice may be puffed up with pride.

- **HAVE A GOOD REPUTATION WITH OUTSIDERS**

Moreover, leaders must not only have a good reputation only in the church (as in v.2), but even outside, as Paul later in the same passage in verse 7, writes that “He must also have a good reputation with outsiders”. So, leaders must be known to be people of a good reputation both inside and outside the church. They practice what they preach, and live well-ordered lives. The first challenge we get here then is: what are people saying about us as leaders? When they look at our lives, can they conclude that we are godly leaders? Therefore, the leader’s conduct should be irreproachable; leaders must be people of integrity that when others want to criticize them, they will find no reason to do so. Leaders should be people of irreproachable character for truth, honesty, chastity, and general uprightness.

Paul’s careful concern for the right choice of leaders in the church, and the extensive qualifications listed above, should serve as guidelines for those who are charged with the responsibility of leadership today. As leaders in the church we must stand and uphold the beauty of the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ because we understand that church leaders play an important role in society. Church leaders need to reclaim their authority to lead and guide in these difficult times. Society needs church leaders who are going to be examples in whatever context they find themselves. The effectiveness of the church witness is dependent on the framework of leadership ethics the church upholds. As Gibbons (2009: nn) would say that “core spiritual values are not only desirable in themselves, they also create greater personal competence and organizational effectiveness”.

The pastors mentioned earlier in this research failed to reflect either directly or indirectly the fruit of the Beatitudes, which should be an imprint of God's presence in their lives as church leaders, yet they ignored these ethical virtues so easily. Church members from both Pastor Omotoso and Prophet Bushiri travelled the most difficult path in their Christian journey because these two leaders failed to lead according to the ethical virtues of the Beatitudes and the appreciation of serving others as God would have them do and thus compromising the lives of those they were called to lead. For the purpose of this study I will conclude my research by highlighting the need for ministerial ethics code of conduct as a response to moral failure in church leadership and how that could be avoided in the future.

Chapter 8: MINISTERIAL ETHICS AS A RESPONSE TO MORAL FAILURE IN CHURCH LEADERSHIP.

8.1 Defining Ministerial Ethics.

The term Ministerial Ethics covers a wide range of relationships and deals with a multitude of problems and challenges which arise in the course of a minister's experience in the line of his or her duties like we saw in the case of Pastor Omotoso and Prophet Bushiri. Springer (1951) states that "Christian ethics consists of the study and practice of moral conduct, positively and negatively, as set forth in the Bible and in nature and reason". According to Trull & Carter (2004), Ethics in ministry includes personal lifestyle, financial decisions, family commitments, pastoral responsibilities, congregational relationships, community involvement and much more. Making a well-considered note about ethics, Maxey (1987) says "although proper ethical living does not and cannot ever bring salvation to any human being, no matter how moral he may be, nevertheless it is of greatest value to the individual who has been saved by God's grace through repentance toward God and faith in the Lord Jesus Christ".

It is therefore safe to say that in its simplest definition, ministerial or pastoral ethics involves the Biblical concept of a set of moral principles or values, application and the practices of right and wrong in light of the Minister's behaviour and professional conduct. In the final analysis, from the Ten Commandments to the Sermon on the Mount, the Bible is fundamentally an ethical manual that offers the wisdom of the Lord for guiding Ministers, Pastors and all the believers worldwide. For this reason, I will use the words Minister[76] and Pastor[77] interchangeably throughout this research.

[76] Minister of Religion, Pastor, or a Rector. https://www.definitions.net/definition/Minister
[77] A Pastor is the Minister in charge of a Christian church or congregation. https://www.christiancourier.com/articles/1178-what-is-a-pastor

8.2 Ministerial Skills in Moral Discernment and Ethical Behaviour

Snow (1988:106-109) emphasizes that pastoral ethics demands discernment particularly in areas of complex moral and ethical nature. Since the task of moral discernment can be a complicated process, the minister of the gospel has to be self-aware and careful that his involvement with society at large seeks to represent his faith very well. For a pastor or minister, moral discernment also involves a desire to act in agreement with skilful behaviour, the centre of which is his deep faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. Engaging in a process of skilful moral discernment and proper ethical behaviour implies, therefore that:

- **The Minister must see Scripture as an essential source for moral discernment**.

Turning to Scripture for wisdom[78] on moral and ethical issues as the inspired witness to the life and meaning of Jesus Christ, the living Word of God, is the first point of contact for the minister of the gospel. Scripture invites us into the long and ongoing history of God's creative, reconciling, and redemptive work with humanity and all of creation[79]. Through it we come to know, love, and serve God and His people whom He has called and redeemed by the blood of His son Jesus Christ. Scripture's authority and normative status reside in its Spirit-given capacity to form, instruct, challenge and shape Ministers of the gospel so that they can lead the people of God with divine authority that is demonstrated in their personal lives. When Pastors encounter the living Word of God as reflected in 2 Timothy 3: 16 - 17 "All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: That the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works", they live lives that are worthy of their calling.

- **Faith is the Sources for Moral Discernment**.

The spiritual gift of discernment is also known as the gift of "discernment of spirits" or "distinguishing between spirits." The Greek word for the gift of discernment is *diakrisis*[80]. The word describes being able to distinguish, discern, judge, or appraise a person, statement, situation, or environment.

---

[78] James 1:5 "If any of you lacks wisdom, let him ask God, who gives generously to all without reproach, and it will be given him". https://www.openbible.info/topics/wisdom

[79] Interpreting Scripture in Moral Discernment. We receive Scripture as a gift from God, mediated to us by our forebears in the faith. https://download.elca.org/ELCA%20Resource%20Repository/Scripture_and_Moral_Discernment_Report.pdf

[80] Lexicon: Strong's G1253 - *diakrisis* distinguishing, discerning, judging. The Gift of Discernment. https://spiritualgiftstest.com/spiritual-gifts/

In the New Testament it describes the ability to distinguish between spirits as in 1 Corinthians 12: 10, and to discern good and evil as in Hebrews 5: 14. Faith should be the source and channel through which Ministers of the gospel access the ultimate truth and authority which is of God as revealed in Jesus Christ through the Holy Spirit. This kind of faith is not to be confused with saving faith as in Ephesians 2: 8 - 9, but for a Pastor or Minister of the gospel, this faith carries the notion of confidence, certainty, trust, and assurance in the object of faith. Pastors with this kind of faith have a trust and confidence in God that allows them to live boldly for Him and manifest that faith in their moral discernment and spiritual judgement's mighty ways.

- **Guidance of the Holy Spirit for Moral Discernment.**

The Holy Spirit's guidance begins with, originates from, and is the very nature and character of God the Father. John 16: 13 "When, however, the Spirit comes, who reveals the truth about God, he will lead you into all the truth. He will not speak on his own authority, but he will speak of what he hears and will tell you of things to come". The basic understanding for every Pastor or Minister of the gospel should be that when the Holy Spirit speaks, He speaks instructions and guidance from Jesus[81], thus the nature of His guidance will reflect the character and wisdom of God. In some church circles, it is understood that the Holy Spirit might "inspire" a particular individual leader or Pastor wisdom, to which the rest of the church community needs to listen to and in some churches, the Holy Spirit is best discerned and encountered in the gathering of all the saints and manifestations of different gifts come into play.

Whatever the case may be, the Holy Spirit should be a source of assistance to Pastors and Ministers in helping them to discern, develop and possibly even reconsider moral and ethical evaluations on certain issues. The Holy Spirit's guidance will always be in agreement with Scriptures and this is key for discerning guidance from the Holy Spirit as it makes it of paramount importance to hear His voice.

8.3 Ministerial Concern for Integrity, Character and Conduct

Ministers of the gospel who are viewed as leaders in the community are expected to set a positive example[82] because with leadership comes the obligation of integrity in

[81] The Holy Spirit speaks to us and reveals the heart of the father. He speaks to us what the wishes to convey. https://books.google.co.za/books?=he+will+not+speak+his+own+things&source

[82] 1 Timothy 4:12 "……but set an example for the believers in speech, in conduct, in love, in faith and in purity".

conduct and character[83]. If Church leaders exercise poor judgment, it can negatively affect many people who are under their care and also reflect poorly on their churches. To help reduce these risks, this research suggest that pastors can benefit from guidance in the form of a code of pastoral ethics of integrity, good conduct, and sound character. In general terms, ministerial ethics are grounded in principles of honesty, transparency, deep convictions of faith in Scriptures, and a desire to be led and guided by the Holy Spirit. This section of research on Ministerial ethics, outlines the aspirational beliefs, values and behaviours expected of church leaders as follows:

8.3.1 Ministerial Concern in Pursue of Integrity- Proverbs 11: 3 “The integrity of the upright guides them, but the unfaithful are destroyed by their duplicity”. 1 Peter 3:16 “Keeping a clear conscience, so that those who speak maliciously against your good behaviour in Christ may be ashamed of their slander”. Adherence to moral and ethical principles; soundness of moral character and honesty, should characterize those who serve as leaders in the house God. Maxey (1987) reminds leaders that their task is to bring dignity to ministry. Dignity, by biblical definition[84], is tied to the biblical concepts of blamelessness, worthiness, nobility, respect, and actions that are consistent with what the person says in words. the state of being whole, entire, or undiminished: to preserve the integrity of the empire. Although we live in a world where integrity has largely been lost, it is still the task of the Pastor to inspire confidence in those who look up to him to show respect for the ministry of his office as a spiritual leader.

Lack of integrity will undermine a Pastor who is tremendously gifted with intellectual skills, passionate about the work of ministry and highly acclaimed in oratory skills in the pulpit. Hence David in Psalm 25: 21 prays, "May integrity and uprightness protect me; because my hope, Lord is in you."

The previous verses interlace together a tapestry of intimate trust, humble repentance, and holy desire. In Psalm 26: 1 - 3 David catalogues the ways he has displayed his integrity, but he starts at the root of it: his heart relationship to God. "Judge [vindicate] me, O LORD; for I have walked in mine integrity: I have trusted also in the LORD; therefore, I shall not slide. Examine me, O LORD, and prove me; try my reins and my heart. For thy lovingkindness is before mine eyes: and I have walked in thy truth." Integrity must reside in the heart of Pastors, Ministers of the gospel and aspiring

[83]People with integrity aspire to the highest ethical standards and expect the same behaviour of others. https://www.michaelleestallard.com/leading-with-character-integrity

[84] Dignity, by biblical definition, is tied to the biblical concept of glory. https://www.ligonier.org/learn/qas/what-biblical-basis-human-dignity/

leaders in the church in general. Writing in their book titled: *15 Characteristics of Effective Pastors* (2007), Mannoia and Walkemeyer considered three types of integrity in which leaders always engage in as follows:

- **Behavioural Integrity**.

This is the most basic level of integrity, and we have already begun to examine it. Simply put, behavioural integrity is continuity between who you are and what you do. You do not put on a façade or try to portray an image of something or someone that you're not. The confidence of the people in your church will be shaken if they sense a lack of behavioural integrity through odd behaviour or mixed signals. This will undermine your effectiveness because they assume you have something to hide or an ulterior motive. On the other hand, when you guard your heart and pursue integrity, your people will grow in their respect and support as they discern a life that is consistent. This is one of the most important tributes given to pastors: “She is authentic to who she is.” Remember that when you speak or make a decision, you represent the office of pastor and, in a mysterious way, carry the trust of every pastor with you. Carry this responsibility with appropriate seriousness, because if you fail to practice performance integrity, every pastor suffers as the trust, confidence and respect of your people is diminished and they view all pastors with doubt and suspicion.

- **Performance Integrity**.

Though almost everyone is aware of performance integrity to a certain extent, it is particularly important for leaders — especially Christian leaders. Performance integrity is the relationship between what you do and the people who are affected by your actions. As a leader, you must be cognizant of the impact you have and do what you say you will do by following through your promises or commitments. Performance integrity also mean that you cannot mislead or manipulate people, but deal with them in a manner that affirms and builds their dignity. (Of course, if performance integrity is the primary motivator for you, it can become an unhealthy focus on people pleasing). Remember that when you speak or decide on something, you represent the office of the pastor and, in a mysterious way, carry the trust of every pastor with you. Performance integrity demands that you carry this responsibility with appropriate seriousness and failure to do so, will inadvertently affect your fellow pastors resulting in lack of trust, confidence, and respect from people.

- **Internal Integrity.**

This is perhaps the most difficult type to describe because it is integrity of the interior life. The pursuit of spiritual formation is largely an effort to bring consistency to the

inner dimensions of your life, which is vital to a healthy and vibrant life and call. There is always a temptation to compartmentalize your internal life so that your spiritual life is kept separate from your psychological makeup, personality, talents and will.

A life that is internally compartmentalized always winds up manifesting that fragmentation in behaviours that are likewise disconnected and segmented - remember that who we are always finds expression in what we do. If you do not allow the spiritual dimension of your inner life to affect your emotions, your personality and even your physical body, you will behave in a spiritual way during spiritual habitually overeat. We have been created as integrated beings, and cultivating internal integration leads to abundance and wholeness. Leadership Journal's editor-at-large, Gordon MacDonald, wrote this about a pastor of integrity: “This is a person who takes seriously the insights and principles of Scripture and has sought to organize all of life around them. What you see in public is what you might see in private. There is no discontinuity in the whole of this person's life.”

8.3.2 Ministerial Concern for Godly Character[85]

A large number of scholars and writers throughout history have spoken, written, and illustrated at length the importance of having an upright character, especially for those who serve in any type of leadership capacity. A modest search on the subject of character and leadership produces tons and tons of books, speeches, and quotes. Character is so important to us that we even recognize it as one of the principal requirements of trust, and trust is the essential prerequisite for all meaningful relationships. Character counts because a person’s character is who they really are.

I assume that like all of us, Pastors are not perfect people, but they should be men and women of noble character, who take seriously God’s command to “be holy, as I am holy[86].” When we speak of the need for Pastors or leaders to build Godly characters, we are speaking of the process of growing ever closer to God and relying on Him to assist us in our efforts to resist and avoid those things that would cause us to stumble. We mean strengthening ourselves, with God's help, against the evil influences that would lead us to fail in our responsibilities as moral and ethical leaders.

[85] How to build Godly Character? https://www.cgi.org/how-to-build-godly-character
[86] Leviticus 11:45 “For I am Yahweh, who brought you up from the land of Egypt to be your God, so you must be holy because I am holy”.

James urges us to "lay aside all filthiness and overflow of wickedness, and receive with meekness the implanted word, which is able to save your souls. But be doers of the word, and not hearers only, deceiving yourselves" (James 1: 21 - 22, NKJV). Ministers of the gospel who are leaders must be committed to living God's way and should continually renew their minds so that they can know the full and perfect will of God (Romans 12: 1 - 2). They need to have a pure conscience and a good reputation with the world outside the church. Since character is the aggregate of a person's ethical and moral qualities, Pastors should demonstrate their ethical moral standards through the choices they make.

This means they are honest and faithful in business, their marriages, their singleness, their sexuality, and every other facet of life. 1 Timothy 3 sets the qualifications out clearly for us in personal character. Church leaders should Exalt Christ, not themselves. Be honest, not exaggerating or overpromising; peace-loving, not contentious; patient, not volatile; diligent, not slothful. Pastors must avoid and, when necessary, report conflicts of interest and seek counsel. Ministers must care for the spiritual, mental, emotional, and physical dimensions of their persons, for "your bodies are temples of the Holy Spirit" (1 Corinthians 6: 19).

8.3.3 Ministerial Concern for Godly Conduct

Paul urges Timothy[87] to set an example in "Conduct" because improper conduct is generally regarded as behaviour that is inappropriate or incorrect. This improper or inappropriate conduct can impede a Pastor's ability to discharge his duties, obligations, or responsibilities, hence Paul had to warn Timothy about it.

It must be remembered that in life, there are some things that all of us ought to do, or some rules that apply to everybody, and when we can identify what those rules are, we know that they apply to us, too. Consistency[88] in the moral life of a Pastor comes from following the Biblical 'rules', principles, values and commands and doing their duty without compromising themselves morally, even when it is difficult to do it. When Ministers do the right thing in that way, their conduct is deemed reliable from case to case, and because they are following these Biblical commands, their choices in life

[87] 1 Timothy 4:12 "……but set an example for the believers in speech, in conduct, in love, in faith and in purity". https://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=1+Timothy+4%3A12-16&version=NIV

[88] Ministerial Code of Conduct for Credentialed Ministers. https://static1.squarespace.com/static/Ministerial+Code+of+Conduct+-+2010-05-10.pdf

are consistent with those of other people who are trying to emulate them in doing the right thing too. Following are some of the guidelines designed to identify areas of caution for Pastors if they are to conduct themselves in a Godly way.

8.3.3.1. Be an honest Leader- A Minister or Pastor must be a person who keeps his word. People will refuse to listen to a Pastor that they do not trust because of their conduct. Honesty & Truthfulness (Psalm 15: 2; 25: 5; John 16: 6; 17; 2 Cor. 8: 21; Ephesians 4: 15, 25; Philippians. 4: 8) means being straight and honest with others and doing what is right. Therefore, a Minister must make sure that they have all the facts before they speak. This trait will allow the Pastor to earn trust by being accurate with facts and situations. A key piece of advice was given by the Apostle Paul "Speak the truth in love"[89]. Both aspects are important - being truthful and being loving because dishonesty and lying are the opposites of the above.

8.3.3.2. Resist moral failure- Leaders do not fall overnight, it is often a long and slow journey and moral failure is probably the most difficult mistake for any Pastor to overcome. The consequences of such a failure is the loss of the right to lead and the need to regroup and put your life back together again. God will certainly forgive you, but the trust lost before people you served is hard to regain. Paul's advice to the young preacher Timothy, was to "flee youthful lust"[90]. It is a grave mistake to believe you are above temptation. Satan can design a trap just for you. Integrity is defined by who you are when no one is looking. Actually, the One who really counts is always looking. So, avoid situations that will compromise you morally.

8.3.3.3. Guard against ruining your good reputation- 1 Timothy 3: 1 - 2 “This is a trustworthy saying: “If someone aspires to be a church leader, he desires an honourable position.” 2 So a church leader must be a man whose life is above reproach. He must be faithful to his wife. He must exercise self-control, live wisely, and have a good ‘REPUTATION’. He must enjoy having guests in his home, and he must be able to teach”. A good reputation can be lost by what may be innocent but appears questionable. Everybody watches the Minister. It is part of the territory of ministry. A Minister would be wise to never get into a situation where his motives or

[89] 1 Timothy 1:5 "The goal of our instruction is love from a pure heart and a good conscience and a sincere faith"
[90] 2 Timothy 2:22 “Flee also youthful lusts; but pursue righteousness, faith, love, peace with those who call on the Lord out of a pure heart”.

actions are ever questioned. Something that helps prevent temptation and removes doubts about his actions is to make it clear to everyone that he loves his wife.

CHAPTER 9. CONCLUSION

According to Walter Lippman (as cited by Borek et al. 2005: 219) “The final test of a leader is that he leaves behind in others the conviction and will to carry on.” According to Jesus, as this research has focused on developing virtues of integrity, the foundation and effective leadership is dependent on the ethics of the leaders. Thus, He begins His Sermon on the Mount by addressing the leadership virtues which create this ethical framework for both ethical leadership and mentorship. Jesus already showed that there are blessings that accompany these virtues; so there is a great benefit to appropriating and applying these virtues.

The mentoring ministry of Jesus suggests a model by which leaders can be developed today. This mentoring process begins with appropriating the virtues of humility, compassion, obedience, gentleness, mercy, purity, peace, patience as espoused in the BEATITUDES in the Sermon on the Mount. As we transform inside into the image of Christ outwardly we are transforming as we serve others by being the salt of the earth, the light of the world, a city on a hill, and a lamp that brings the light of Christ in the world. Indeed, as disciples of Christ it is only logical that Christian leaders would follow His practice in mentoring new leaders today. When you begin developing leaders in your ministry, the following five steps will guide you through that process toward success.

- Once leadership candidates have been identified, begin spending quality time with them so they can recognize the leadership incarnate in your life. Some pastors establish a formal schedule of meeting with those they are mentoring and develop a mentoring curriculum to be covered in those sessions. While this is effective in many cases, some potential leaders are better equipped through conversations in fishing boats or over a meal together.
- As you meet individually or corporately with your mentees, challenge them to a high degree of personal commitment to you as their mentor and the cause to which you are committed. When students asked a wise teacher what they could expect to get out of their course, the teacher responded, “You will get out of this whatever you put into it.” The mentoring process works best when both teachers and students – or mentor and mentee – are highly committed to the process.

- Pour your life into those you are training. Share your knowledge, experience, and wisdom as a foundation on which they can build. Take time to show your leadership trainees how to lead by leading them. Model the principles of leadership so they can see how they work in practice. View time spent in this mentoring process as important because it is the most important investment leaders will ever make.

- While your mentees will learn some from what you teach them, the more involved they become in the learning process, the better they will learn the lessons you are trying to teach them and the more effective they will be when they assume their leadership responsibilities. Help them build their personal confidence by delegating limited responsibilities and authority, as they are able to assume it. As you supervise the assigned work of your trainees, assist them as necessary and use those experiences as part of their training to become all the leader they can be.

- Always remember that you are training leaders who will produce themselves in the lives of other potential leaders. Remind your mentees of this responsibility often, that they have a responsibility of training other effective leaders; as Paul said to Timothy, “And the things you have heard me say in the presence of many witnesses entrust to reliable men who will also be qualified to teach others.” Therefore:

In this context, the practical theological paradigm of reflective practice has a great deal of plausibility. The church needs leaders who can look closely at their own context and ask what is going on, as well as engage the social sciences to understand why certain events and patterns are occurring. It needs leaders who, firstly, can help a community develop norms and a vision appropriate to its own time and place and, secondly, who have the pragmatic skills to help it better embody these ideals (Osmer 2011: 2).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adams, R.M. 1999. *Finite and Infinite Goods: A Framework for Ethics*. New York: Oxford UP, Print.

Anthony, E. 2015. If all Christians were Salt and Light (matt 5: 13-16): Corruption would have been eradicated from the world. *International Journal of Arts & Sciences,* ISSN: 1944-6934 :08(07):265–278 (2015).

Augustine, 1958. *The City of God*. Ed. Bourke, V. New York: Image Books.

Balda, Janis B. & Balda, Wesley D. 2013. *Handbook for Battered Leaders*. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press.

Bancroft, E. 1976. *Christian Theology*. Grand Rapids: Academie.

Banks, P. 2018. *Leadership Development*. Available online: *www.twrwomenofhope.org/blog*. Accessed on 14.02.2020.

Barna, G. 1998. *The Second Coming of the Church*. Nashville: Word Publishing,

Beauchamp, Tom 2001. *Philosophical Ethics: An Introduction to Moral Philosophy*. New York: McGraw Hill.

Bekker, C. 2002. *Redemptive Realities*. Randburg: R.B.T.C.

Berkouwer, G. 1971. *Sin: Studies in Dogmatics*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Bezy, K. G. 2011. *An Operational Definition of Spiritual Leadership.* Blacksburg: Polytechnic Institute and State University.

Bhengu, C. 2019. Five pastors who have made headlines for all the wrong reasons. https://www.timeslive.co.za/news/south-africa/2019-02-28-five-pastors-who-have-made-headlines-for-all-the-wrong-reasons/# (accessed 14 April 2020).

Boardman, G. D. 2008. *The Kingdom: The Emerging Rule of Christ Among Men*. Shippensburg: Destiny Image.

Boice, J.M 1972. *The Sermon on the Mount*. Baker: Grand Rapids.

Boone, B. 2017. Ethics 101. Massachusetts. Adams Media.

Borek, J. & Lovett, D. & Towns, E. 2005. *The Good Book on Leadership*. Nashville: Broadman & Holman.

Bretzke, James 2004. *A Morally Complex World: Engaging Contemporary Moral Theology*. Collegeville: Liturgical Press.

Brown, J. K. 2013. Gospel of Matthew. In Green, J. B. (Ed.) *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels*. Downers Grove: IVP Academic.

Brown, C. 1998. "Ernst Lohmeyer's *Kyrios* Jesus." In *Where Christology Began*. Eds. R. Martin & B. Dodd. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press.

Browning, D. S. 1996. *A Fundamental Practical Theology: descriptive and Strategic Proposals*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

Burke, W.W 1995. Leadership as empowering others. In Atkinson, D. J. (Ed.) *New Dictionary of Christian Ethics & Pastoral Theology*. Nottingham: Inter-Varsity Press.

Carson, D. A. & Douglas, J. M. 2005. *An Introduction to the New Testament*. Nottingham: Apollos.

Carson, D. A. 1994. *The Sermon on the Mount*. Carlisle: Paternoster.

Carter, C. 2013. Hospitality: A Dynamic Tension. *The Living Pulpit Journal, Vol.22, No.2, 14–17*. Available Online: https://www.pulpit.org/2013/05/

Clauson, M.A. 2015. *Human Nature and the Christian*. Cedarville University: History and Government Faculty Publications.

Clinton, R. J. 1998. *The Making of a Leader*. Colorado Springs: Navpress.

Davies & Allison 1988. *The International Critical Commentary: Matthew.* (Vol 1). Edinburgh : T & T Clark.

Drane, J. W. 2001. *Introducing the New Testament*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

Driver, J. 2007. *Ethics: The Fundamentals*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Du Toit, A. B. (ed.) 2009a. New Testament Exegesis in Theory and Practice. In "*Focusing on the Message"*. Ed. Du Toit, A. B. Pretoria: Protea.

Enegho, F.E., 2011. Integrity in leadership and the challenges facing Africa: A Christian response', *African Ecclesial Review* 53(3/4), 522-537.

Elwell, W. A. & Yarbrough, R. W. 2013. *Encountering the New Testament: A Historical and Theological Survey.* Grand Rapids: Baker Academic.

Erickson, M. 1998. *Systematic Theology*. Grand Rapids: Baker.

Farrar, S. 2000. *Finishing Strong*. Colorado Springs: Multnomah.

Ford, L. 2011. *The Mentoring Community*. North Carolina: Westmoreland.

Foster, R. 1998. *Celebration of Discipline*. New York: HarperCollins.

France, R. T. 2007. *The Gospel of Matthew*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Fry, L. W. 2003. *Toward a theory of Spiritual Leadership*. Stephenville: Tarleton State University.

Garlington, D.B. 2011. The Salt of the Earth in Covenantal Perspective. *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 54, no. 4: 715–48.

Garrett, J. 1990. *Systematic Theology*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Gaster, T. 1988. “Secular Humanism and the Bible.” In *Biblical v. Secular Ethics: The Conflict*. Eds. Hoffmann, R. J. & Larue, G. A. New York: Prometheus Books.

Gibbons, S. 2009. Patience: The fourth in a series of nine leadership devotionals based upon the Fruit of the Spirit. *Inner Resources for Leaders*, 2(1), 1 – 8.

Green, J. B. (Ed.) 2013. *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels*. Downers Grove: IVP Academic.

Green, J. B. and Lapsley, J. E. 2013. *The Old Testament Ethics*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic.

Greenlee, J. H. 1964. *Introduction to New Testament Textual Criticism*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Grenz, S. 1994. *Theology for the Community of God*. Carliste: Paternoster Press.

Gundry, R. 1982. *Matthew: A Commentary on his Literary and Theological Art*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.

Guthrie, D. 1990. *New Testament Introduction*. Leicester: Apollos.
_____ 1981. *New Testament Theology*. Leicester: IVP.

Hagner, D. A. 1993. WBC. *Matthew* 1-13. Dallas: Word Books.

Hare, D. R. 1993. *Interpretation: Matthew* Louisville: John Knox.

Harney, K. G. 2018. Responding to Moral Failure in Church Leaders. Available online: *https://www.christianitytoday.com/edstetzer/2018/may/responding-to-moral-failure-in-church-leaders.html* Accessed 26-02-2020

Hauerwas, Stanley 2006. *Brazos Theological commentary on the Bible. Matthew.* Grand Rapids: Brazos Press.

Hendrickson, William 1973. *New Testament Commentary: Matthew*. Grand Rapids: Baker.

Houser, R. E. 1995. "Plato: The Human Person as Spirit." In *Images of the Human*. Eds. Brown, H. *et al.* Chicago: Loyola Press.

Houston, P. & Sokolow, S. 2006. *The Spiritual Dimension of Leadership*. Thousand Oaks: Corwin.

Jacques, T. 1998. "Charismatic Theology". In Maimela, S. & Konig, A. (Eds.) *Initiation into Theology*. Pretoria: JL Van Schaik.

Jeffress, R. 2002. *The Solomon Secrets*. Colorado Springs: WaterBrook Press.

Jordaan, G. J. 2009. "Textual Criticism as Basis for New Testament Exegesis." In *Focusing on the Message*. Ed. Du Toit, A. B. Pretoria: Protea.

Joubert, R., De Waal, E. and Rossouw, J.P. 2004. Discipline: Impact on access to equal educational opportunities. Perspectives in Education, 22(3):77-87.

Kant, I. 2007. "God as a Postulate of practical Reason." In *Exploring the Philosophy of Religion*. Ed. Stewart, D. Upper Saddle River: Prentice Hall.

Kalline, T. 2019. Revealing the secrets of others (on youtube): New and Old
in the public representations of Ghanaian traditional religion. *suomen antropologi* volume 44 issue 1 spring 2019.

Kallaway, P. 2009. No time to fiddle as education is burning. Stop using band-aid solutions in schools. *Naptosa Insight*, 3(2):2-4.

Keller, M. 2015. *The Key to Everything*. Nashville: Thomas Nelson.

Kelly, W. & Tallon, A. 1967. *Readings in the Philosophy of Man*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Keener, C.S. 2013. Acts: *An exegetical Commentary*: Volume 2 1831. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.

Kessler, D. C. 2012. Receive One Another: Honoring the Relationship Between Hospitality and Christian Unity. *Journal of Ecumenical Studies*, Vol.47, No.3, 376–384

Kgatle, M.S. 2019. Reimagining the practice of Pentecostal prophecy in Southern Africa: A critical engagement. *Herv. teol. stud. [online].* 2019, vol.75,n.4, http://dx.doi.org/10.4102/hts.v75i4.5183

Kuhn, H. 2001. *Biblical Leadership*. Sisters: Multnomah Publishers.

Lloyd-Jones, M. 1976. *Studies in The Sermon on the Mount*. Nottingham: IVP.

Louw, J. P & Nida E. B. 1988. *Greek-English Lexicon. Vol 1&2.* Broadway: United Bible Societies.

Mabona, S. 2017. MEC Lesufi welcomes Expulsion of Learners at Norkem Park High School. Media release Issued by the Gauteng Provincial Government Education Department. www.education.gpg.gov.za (18.08.2017.)

MacArthur, J. 2004. *The book on Leadership.* Nashville: Thomas Nelson.

Maimela, S. & Konig, A. (Eds.) 1998. *Initiation Into Theology*. Pretoria: JL Van Schaik.

Malina, B. J. 2002. "Social-Scientific Methods in Historical Jesus Research." In *The Social Setting of Jesus and the Gospels*. Eds. Stegemann, W., Malina, B. J., & Theissen, G. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

_____ 1993. *The New Testament World, Revised Edition: Insights from Cultural Anthropology*. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press.

Maphanga, C. 2019. This is about justice. Chery Zondi prepare to testify over and over again. https://www.news24.com/news24/SouthAfrica/News/omotoso-trial-this-is about-justice-cheryl-zondi-prepared-to-testify-over-and-over-again-201903. (accessed 25 April 2020)

Mapumulo, Z. 2017. Commission slates churches' abuse of faithful. https://www.news24.com/SouthAfrica/News/commission-slates-churches-abuse-of-faithful-20170715

Mcelroy, S. E., Rice, K. G., Davis, D. E., & Hill, P. C. 2014. Intellectual humility: Scale development and theoretical elaborations in the context of religious leadership. In *Journal of Psychology and Theology, 42(1), 19–31*. Available Online: https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/009164711404200103

McKnight, S. 2013. *The Story of God Bible Commentary: Sermon On The Mount*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.

Merkle, B.L & Schreiner T. R. 2014. *Shepherding God's Flock.* Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications.

Miller, S. 2003. *C.H Spurgeon on Spiritual Leadership.* Chicago: Moody Publishers.

Mitole, E. 2019. Demystifying the Prosperity Gospel: The South African Case Study. https://www.academia.edu/38873374/Demystifying_the_Prosperity_Gospel_The_South_African_Case_Study

Mnyaka, N.M. 2006. Exploring the Promotion of Safe Schools in the Eastern Cape: *A Whole School Development Approach*. Pretoria: University of South Africa.

Murray, A. 2016. *Humility: The Beauty of Holiness*: Gideon House Books.

National Assembly, 2017. CRL Rights Commission Report: *Commercialisation of Religion & Abuse of People's Belief Systems Day 2 hearing & Commission response* https://pmg.org.za/committee-meeting/25278/

Naugle, D. K. 2002. *Worldview: The History of a Concept*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Ncube, V. and Harber, C. 2013. The Dynamics of Violence in Schools in South Africa. Pretoria: Unisa Press.

Ndoga, S. 2015. *Equipping the Youth Worker*. Randburg: BTC.

Nel, M. 2014. A critical evaluation of theological distinctives of Pentecostal theology. *Studia Historiae Ecclesiastice, 40 (1), 291309*. http://www.scielo.org.za/pdf/she/v40n1/17.pdf

Nicolaides, G. 2016. South Africa needs Ethical Leaders. *Eyewitness News,* Johannesburg,11April. Available at: https://ewn.co.za/2016/04/11/Time-to-embrace-ethical-leadership-is-now# (Accessed: 12/09/ 2019).

Noebel, D. 2001. *The Battle for Truth: Defending the Christian Worldview in the Marketplace of Ideas*. Eugene: Harvest House.

Oosthuizen, I.J., Roux, J.M. & Van der Walt, J.L 2003. A classical approach to the restoration of discipline in South African schools. Koers, 68(4):373-390.

Orr, J. 1910. *Sin as A Problem of To-Day*. London: Hodder & Stoughton.

Osmer, R. 2008, *Practical theology: An introduction*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans.

Osmer, R. 2011 Practical theology: A current international perspective', *HTS Teologiese Studies/Theological Studies* 67(2), #Art. 1058, 7 pages. http://dx.doi.org/10.4102/hts.v67i2.1058

Packer, J. I. 2009. *Rediscovering Holiness*. Grand Rapids: Baker.

Park, A. 2013. A wedding In Cana. *The Living Pulpit Journal, Vol.22, No.2, 26–29*. Available Online: https://www.pulpit.org/2013/05/

Pervo, R. I. 2014. *The Acts of Paul: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Eugen OR: Wipf and Stock Publishers.

Pohlman, M. 2006. *Soteriology*. Randburg: B.T.C.

Rapcan, 2008. *A Teacher's Guide to Positive Discipline*. Cape Town: Rapcan Publishers.

Ramantswana, H. 2019. Prophets praying for or preying on people's faith: A reflection on prophetic ministry in the South African context. *In die Skriflig* 53(4), a2495. https://doi.org/10.4102/ids.v53i4.2495

Reynolds, T. E. 2006. Welcoming Without Reserve: A Case in Christian Hospitality. *Theology Today Journal, Vol.63, 191–202*. Available Online: https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/004057360606300205

Richards, L. O. & Hoeldtke. C. 1980. *A Theology of Church Leadership.* Grand Rapids: Zondervan Corporation.

Rushdoony, J. 1973. *The Institutes of Biblical Law*. Phillipsburg: Presbyterian & Reformed Publishing.

Sanders, O.J. 1994. *Spiritual Leadership*. Chicago: Moody Publisher

Sanders, O.J. 2007. *Spiritual Leadership*. Chicago: Moody Publisher

Scheidler, B. *Church Leadership Resources*. http://www.churchleadershipresources.com/Sermons/The_Lampstand_Church/The_Lampstand_Church_US.pdf (accessed on 25/04/2020).

Smith, C. 2005. *Leadership Theory of Robert K. Greenleaf*. UK.

Shea, G.F. 2002. *The Mentoring Organization*. Menlo Park, CA: Crisp Publication.

Smith, J. K. A. 2014. *Who's Afraid of Relativism? Community, Contingency, and Creaturehood*. Grand Rapids: Baker.

Sproul, R. C. 2000. *The Holiness of God*. Cambridge: Tyndale House.

Stevenson, L. & Haberman, D. 2004. *Ten Theories of Human Nature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Stewart, D. 2007. *Exploring the Philosophy of Religion*. Upper Saddle River: Prentice Hall.

Steyn, G.M. 2009. Using reflexive photography to study a principal's experiences of the impact of professional development on a school: *a case study. Koers,* 74(3):437-465. Available at http://www.scielo.org.za/pdf/koers/v74n3/04.pdf. Accessed 9 June 2020.

Stott, J. 1992. *The Message of The Sermon on the Mount*. Leicester: IVP.

_____ 1979. *The Message of The Sermon on the Mount.* Nottingham: Inter-Varsity Press.

Stout, Jeffrey 2001. *Ethics After Babel: The Ethics of Morals and their Discontents.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Strauch, A. 1995.*Biblical Eldership. 'An Urgent Call to Restore Church Leadership'.* Littleton: Lewis & Roth Publishers.

Tenny, M. C. 1985. *New Testament Survey*. Grand Rapids: IVP.

Van Wyk, I. 2019. Why money gospel followers aren't simply credulous dupes. https://theconversation.com/why-money-gospel-followers-arent-simply-credulous-dupes-111838 (Accessed 10 May 2020).

Vosloo, R. 2004. Identity, Otherness, and the Triune God: Theological Groundwork for a Christian Ethic of Hospitality. *Journal of Theology for South Africa, Vol.119*, 69–89

Wang, G., & Hackett, R. D. 2016. Conceptualization and Measurement of virtuous leadership: Doing well by doing good. *Journal of Business Ethics, 137(2), 321–345*. Available Online: https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10551-015-2560-1

Wepener, C.J., Dreyer, Y. & Meylahn, J.A. 2017. 'The tradition of Practical Theology at the University of Pretoria', in 'Theology at the University of Pretoria - 100 years: (1917-2017) Past, present and future', *Verbum et Ecclesia*, suppl. 2, 38(4), a1677. https://doi.org/10.4102/ve.v38i4.1677

Williams, P. 2003. *How to Be Like Jesus*. Deerfield Beach: Faith Communications.

Witmer, T.M 2010. *The Shepherd Leader.* New Jersey: P&R Publishing Company.

Yang, S. A. 2013. Sermon on the Mount/Plain. In Green, J. B. (Ed.) *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels.* Downers Grove: IVP Academic.

Zacharias, R. 2000. *Jesus Among Other Gods*. Nashville: W Publishing Group.

Zachary, L.J. 2005. *The Mentor's Guide. Facilitating Effective Learning Relationships*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Zulu, B.M., Urbani, G., Van der Merwe, A. and Van der Walt, J.L. 2004. Violence as an impediment to a culture of teaching and learning in some South African schools. *South African Journal of Education*, 24:170-175.