SAFETY IN UNCERTAINTY FOR CHRISTIAN LEADERSHIP: AN INNER TEXTURE READING OF HEBREWS 11:23-29

DANIEL ROGERS

This article explores the inner texture of Hebrews 11:23-29 and attempts to decipher the components of Moses' leadership development by faith. The process that Moses goes through as portrayed in this passage is then related with additional passages in Hebrews and its implications for global leadership. This article uses a socio-rhetorical approach to Scripture to focus on the relational aspects of leadership development within both people and organizations. After analyzing the Scripture, this process is compared and contrasted with Winston and Patterson's integrative definition of leadership, an example of its cross-cultural effectiveness is provided, and a recommendation is formulated to help us understand safety in uncertainty.

I. Leadership in the Story of Moses

The story of Moses in the book of Hebrews provides a basis for action by faith. Hebrews 11:23-29 also shows a progression that begins not with Moses, but with his parents. The conclusion of the story is also not about Moses. Instead, it is about the Israelites as a people. It is the middle section that speaks of leadership, yet this leadership does not stand alone. It begins with an inheritance; contains the choice to follow, trust, and lead; and ends with a heritage. It starts with a person and ends with a people. Framed within the larger context of Hebrews, which explains Jesus Christ's role within the history of the Hebrew people, chapter 11 explores the faith of their ancestors. Many of the progressive dynamics of Christian leadership emerge from this discussion of Moses.

Given the divine nature of Scripture, inner texture analysis is a socio-rhetorical criticism method to let the Scripture speak for itself by bringing "both literary and rhetorical techniques together to analyze aspects of words and meaning in the text."[1] Geisler states, "As Christ is God and Man in one Person, so Scripture is, indivisibly, God's Word in human language."[2] Much attention, then, should be given to analyzing the language, its formation, and its use within the Scripture itself.

II. Inner Texture Analysis

The story of Moses in Hebrews 11 has a distinct beginning and ending that become obvious through word repetition/progression. It begins with the narrator speaking in verse 23. He first tells us of Moses who is born. Because Moses is a child, unable to act for himself, his parents act. A pronoun, title, or name for Moses is repeated four times in the first verse, while his parents are mentioned three times. They hid Moses for three months. This action theme is repeated in the passage seven additional times. The parents hid, Moses refused, chose, esteemed, forsook, endured, and kept. The Israelites passed. After describing the parents' actions and the reasons behind them, the narrator returns to a discussion of the principal character, Moses.

The conclusion to the story in verse 29 varies from the beginning because it makes no reference to Moses. The narrator retains control of the dialogue and, instead, tells us the actions of the Israelites as a whole. It also tells of the drowning of the Egyptians. This division of the story becomes readily apparent because Moses takes all of the actions through the rest of the passage.

In the body portion of verses 24-28, Moses performs all of the actions. In the beginning, Moses can now make decisions for himself, since he "came of age." It is then that Moses "refused to be called the son of Pharaoh's daughter." This is the only title he refuses within the passage. This action requires clarification, however. He refused this title to gain another; at this point the people of God are introduced. Yet the people of God are not the source of esteem. Instead, Christ is introduced for the first time as providing the reason to accept and endure affliction over the temporal pleasures of sin. Each potential benefit of the Egyptians is offset by Christ.

Moses is listed as one of the people of God instead of the son of Pharaoh's daughter. Affliction comes in lieu of pleasures, but results in the reproach of Christ. Since reproach has a negative connotation, and affliction is often avoided rather than sought, it is the last section that explains the action. Moses expects to be recompensed for his efforts, while understanding his place. Reproach from Christ infers discipline and correctly positions Moses as Christ's servant. Hence, to be disciplined by Christ implies esteem and potential growth on the part of Moses. However, growth comes by choosing to follow Christ.

This beginning section is the longest, which shows its significance within the passage. Here the concept of choice is introduced for the principal character. The difficulty of the choice is apparent through the repeated titles. Moses is mentioned three

---

[1] Vernon K. Robbins, *Exploring the Texture of Texts: A Guide to Socio-Rhetorical Interpretation* (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 1996), 3.

[2] Norman L. Geisler, "Explaining Herneneutics: A Commentary on The Chicago Statement on Biblical Hermeneuitics Articles of Affirmation and Denial" (2004), http://hermeneutics.kulikovskyonline.net, 1.

times but refuses one of his titles. The Egyptians are mentioned three times, which shows the significance of their presence. Christ is mentioned only once, but wins Moses' devotion, which shows the power of his presence. Overall, it is the choice that has the most effect. The middle and ending sections build upon this choice.

In the middle section, Moses placed his trust in Christ, who is mentioned again in verse 27 as "Him who is invisible." By this trust, Moses, who is mentioned twice, forsakes Egypt, fears not the wrath of the king, and endures. Within this section, Moses follows the Lord's lead and fulfils his role in God's plan. Yet, this passage still does not imply leadership. Again, the single mention of Christ allows Moses, who is mentioned twice, to stand up to Egypt and its king. While Moses acts on behalf of the people, he does not develop them. God does the work; Moses simply serves as God's spokesman.

In the ending section, Moses kept the Passover. Through this action, Moses took his leadership role and the people followed the requirements of the sprinkling of blood. Moses is mentioned once, and the people are mentioned once.

After dividing the story, repeated speech can assist the reader to interpret the meaning. Several other patterns of repetition/progression occur throughout the passage, further dividing the body of the story into a beginning, middle, and end. Table 1 is included to help the reader see the patterns. Moses is mentioned four times in the introduction, three times in the beginning (refusing one of the references), twice in the middle, and once in the end. The text progresses slowly away from Moses. It mentions Christ once in the beginning and once in the middle. Hence, Christ appears for the choice and serves as the recipient of trust. The text mentions God's people once in the beginning, once in the ending, and once in the conclusion. Moses identifies himself with them in the beginning, leads them in the ending, and they take over as the principal actors in the conclusion.

Another pattern is the frequent mention of the antagonists within the story. The Egyptians and what they have to offer are mentioned once in the introduction—"king's command"; three times in the beginning—"pharaoh's daughter, passing pleasures of sin, treasures in Egypt"; once in the middle—"wrath of the king"; and once in the conclusion. The progression discusses the king's command in the introduction and the parents' action, the opportunities the Egyptians offer during Moses' choice, the king's wrath as Moses trusts Christ, and the Egyptians' death as they pursued the Israelites. This shows that something opposite has occurred for the Egyptians than for Moses. There is no apparent progression through the passage on the part of the Egyptians. It is apparent that they trusted in the same opportunities they offered Moses.

There is also a continuation of the themes between the introduction and conclusion. Moses began by receiving an inheritance of faith from his parents in the introduction, while Moses leaves a heritage of faith for the people of Israel. Moses is skillfully removed from the picture in verse 29 by the author of Hebrews. After accepting his leadership role by keeping the Passover, the people do the same in verse 28. Then it is the people that act by faith in verse 29 and cross the Red Sea.

Table 1. Patterns of Repetition/Progression in the Story about Moses in Hebrews 11:23-29

Section	Verse											
Intro	23 By faith		was born	Moses					when		three months	
		by	was hidden	he	his parents						three months	
				he								
			was beautiful	child	they				saw			
										were not afraid		
		of			they					were not afraid	king's command	
Beginning	24 By faith		came of age refused to be	Moses					when		Pharoah's daughter	
		of	called	son							Pharoah's daughter	
	25	with	choosing rather to suffer				people of God					affliction
			than to enjoy								passing pleasures of sin	
	26	of	esteeming the reproach			Christ					treasures in Eqypt	
		to	looked	he							Eqypt	greater riches reward
Middle	27 By faith		forsook	he								
			not fearing								wrath of the king	
			endured	he								
			as seeing			Him who is invisible						
Ending	28 By faith		kept	he		he who destroyed the firstborn	them					the Passover the sprinkling of blood
Conclusion	29 By faith	through as	passed						they			Red Sea by dry land
			to do so					attempted were drowned		Egyptians		

The repetition of the words "by faith" shows another speech pattern. The words "by faith" are used five times in this passage. They are used at the beginning of the introduction (verse 23), the beginning (verses 24-26), the middle (verse 27), the ending (verse 28), and the conclusion (verse 29). In the introduction, the protagonists of faith are the parents acting on Moses' behalf. The principal character through the body is Moses, who also acts by faith in making his choice, forsaking Egypt, and keeping the Passover. In the conclusion, the people of Israel act by faith.

There is a common mood of indicative speech throughout the passage for the parents, Moses, and the people. They are each referenced through the actions they took. Shifting from following his parents to choosing for himself upon coming of age to trust in Christ and then leading on Christ's behalf resulted in a people following God. Moses receives an inheritance of faith from his parents, makes his own choice, trusts in Christ, accepts his call, and leaves a heritage.

III. The Broader Story

Other components of the Hebrews story share several common themes that relate to this passage. First, the passage is located in the latter portion of Hebrews. Wallace proposes the theme of Hebrews as "the absolute supremacy of Christ—a supremacy which allows no challenge, whether from human or angelic beings."[3] While Wallace shows that the first portion of Hebrews focuses on "the theological basis for Christ's superiority (1:1-10:18)," this passage appears in the second portion of Hebrews, which is about "the practical outworking of Christ's superiority (10:19-13:17)."[4] The final portion of Hebrews is "concluding instructions (13:18-25)."[5] The word "faith" is used thirty-one times in Hebrews—twenty-three times in Hebrews 11 alone.

Starting at the beginning of Hebrews 10, Christ provides a new inheritance (10:5-10) that requires a choice (10:26). Chapter 11 lists the examples and historical leaders with a variety of callings that were all driven by faith. The call of every believer is then provided in Hebrews 12:1 to "run with endurance the race that is set before us," which creates a new heritage as described in chapter 12. However, this new heritage is similar to the one set before Moses. Wallace calls this chapter an "exhortation to endure chastening [which is] necessary for sanctification."[6]

The similarities of the larger context of Hebrews 10-12 with the microcosm of Hebrews 11:23-29 are astounding. It is the protagonist that changes. In the larger context, the reader is the protagonist as Christ provides a new inheritance that only requires a choice by the reader. If readers will choose and trust, they will receive a call and a particular race. Accepting this race creates a heritage.

In the microcosm of Moses, an explanation of his inheritance is provided. Moses makes a choice, takes action based on trust, works within his calling, and leaves a heritage to the Israeli people.

Another similarity between Hebrews 11:23-29 and Hebrews 10-12 is the concept of chastening. Hence, Christians can expect chastening based on Christ's love, much

---

[3] Daniel B. Wallace, "Hebrews: Introduction, Argument, and Outline" (2006), www.bible.org, 19.
[4] Ibid.
[5] Ibid.
[6] Ibid.

like Moses favored Christ's reproach.[7] The heritage that is accessible to Christians is not one of easy living, but one of persecution.[8] From unbelievers in a sinful world, Christians receive chastening and reproach from Christ for sanctification and persecution. The question that remains, though, is one of faith.

IV. The Implications for Global Leadership

This Hebrews passage provides several implications for global leadership. By exploring faith, its development, and its progression, the concept of safety in uncertainty can be more fully understood.

Stagich states, "Sophisticated, collaborative employees will demand a clearer understanding of their roles" and "a safe environment is necessary for real learning and development."[9] Clarity of roles and safety must be balanced with the uncertainty generated by globalization. Accomplishing this apparent paradox can only be understood through holistic viewing. As evidenced by the analysis above, Moses serves as an example of one who gave up temporary safety, treasure, and pleasure through obedience. He looked at the larger picture to learn his place in the greater context and fulfill his calling. Understanding the reason behind his action enables others to understand how to access this same motivation, which comes by faith.

Perhaps the key to business, organizational, and cultural complexity lies in its commonality. That commonality rests on people and their motivation. Safety within uncertainty for individuals is based on where they place their faith. Their comfort level within an increasingly complex world derives from their experiences within it. They first receive an inheritance from their family and culture that tells them what to value. As they come of age, they choose themselves with whom to associate. Then they place their trust in the roles they have chosen and take action in keeping with their own view of themselves. Throughout life, their notions—those things in which they place their "faith"—will be challenged. Some will define success by money, by other people, by their employment, by their church, by the power/control they achieve, or by myriad other criteria. Regardless, their faith, derived by experience, will determine the heritage they leave.

In some instances, safety could in fact limit learning. Nitobe states, "if fighting in itself, be it offensive or defensive, is . . . brutal and wrong, we can still say with Lessing 'we know from what failings our virtue springs.'"[10] It is our very sin that causes the need for Christ before deeper learning through discipleship and wisdom can occur.[11] Within the experience of all people, each is left with a choice. They can either refuse to learn and hold onto the faith and safety of their preconceived notions, or they can shift the basis of their faith. This ability and acceptance of change determines a person's flexibility, ability to learn, and potential for knowledge.

---

[7] Ibid., Rev. 3:19.

[8] *The Inspirational Study Bible: New King James Version*, ed. Max Lucado (Dallas: Word Bibles, 1995), 2 Tim. 3:12.

[9] Timothy Stagich, *Collaborative Leadership and Global Transformation* (United States: Global Leadership Resources, 2001), 26, 49.

[10] Inazo Nitobe, trans. Tokuhei Suchi, *Bushido: The Soul of Japan, An Exposition of Japanese Thought* (Tokyo: Bilingual Books, 2004), 39.

[11] *The Inspirational Study Bible*, Ps. 111:10.

Nitobe says, "Knowledge becomes really such only when it is assimilated in the mind of the learner and shows in his character."[12] The book of James provides a similar story, but individual knowledge also requires a decision. Every individual must determine what he will do with it, which introduces the higher calling of leadership.

V. Comparison with Winston and Patterson's Leadership Definition

Winston and Patterson wrote "An Integrative Definition of Leadership."[13] In an attempt to better understand what Moses goes through in Hebrews 11:23-29, that process will be compared with several components of the integrative definition. The first step that Moses goes through is receiving his inheritance of faith. His parents acted "by faith" and secured his life. This sounds similar to Winston and Patterson's statement that a "leader . . . presents the organization to outside audiences in such a manner that the audiences have a clear impression of the organization's purpose and goals and can clearly see the purpose and goals lived out in the life of the leader."[14] The leader from this perspective becomes the author of Hebrews. It is he who is presenting the life of Moses to help the reader understand the concept of faith lived out in Moses' life. Likewise, the author "build[s] credibility and trust" with the readers by relating a story that they would know using indicative language.[15]

Within the passage itself, there are several components that place Moses' parents, Christ, Moses, and the people within the leadership definition. Moses' parents fulfill a portion of the leadership definition in that they "understand and interpret the future into present-time action steps."[16] In hiding Moses, they acted by faith. According to the definition, this makes them followers. We can reasonably consider them followers of God given the context of the passage.

Christ, then, is mentioned in verse 26 as the one who "focuses [Moses] to the . . . mission and objectives causing [Moses] to willingly and enthusiastically expend spiritual, emotional, and physical energy in a concerted coordinated effort to achieve the . . . mission and objectives."[17] Christ achieves this in Moses by "humbly conveying a prophetic vision of the future."[18] This is the concept of faith most clearly defined within the passage. Moses' faith is described as "respect unto the recompense of the reward."[19] Hebrews 11:1 says, "faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen." Access is gained through Christ: "Looking unto Jesus the author and finisher of [our] faith."[20] Combining all of these definitions, faith could be described as substantiated trust in a future reward as evidenced by Jesus Christ to individuals. It is the evidence by Christ who created the prophetic vision for Moses. The result was Moses' choice to "willingly expend . . . energy" to follow Christ's lead.

---

[12] Nitobe, *Bushido: The Soul of Japan, An Exposition of Japanese Thought,* 51.

[13] Bruce E. Winston and Kathleen Patterson, "An Integrative Definition of Leadership," *International Journal of Leadership Studies* 1, no. 2 (2006): 6-66.

[14] Ibid., 8.

[15] Ibid.

[16] Ibid.

[17] Ibid.

[18] Ibid.

[19] *The Inspirational Study Bible*, Heb. 11:26.

[20] Ibid., Heb. 12:2.

Once Moses chose to follow Christ and be listed with the people of God instead of the Egyptians, the next step that the author of Hebrews presents is the role of Moses himself. At this point, there is a change in the mission for Moses. He is no longer just to be listed with the people of God, but to take action to influence the "future state of the organization."[21] In this case, the organization could be defined as the people of Israel, and the future state of the organization could be described as freedom from their slavery in Egypt. Most would agree that this would allow the people of Israel to be "better off."[22] Yet, Christ provides more to Moses at this point by providing him "with what [he] needed within the reason and scope of the organization's resources and accommodations relative to the value of accomplishing the organization's objectives and the growth of the follower."[23] Moses fulfills his role; he continues to follow.

At this point is the first time that the Israelites can be listed as followers. Before this point, Moses chose to be equal with the people of God (verse 25). In verse 28, he assumes the role of leader himself and "achieves unity of common values and directions" with the people of God by keeping the Passover.[24] It is interesting to note that this is the only act of leadership that is listed for Moses in this passage.

In verse 29, there is a difference between Winston and Patterson's integrative leadership definition and the conclusion of the Hebrews passage. Winston and Patterson stated that "the leader and followers together change the organization to best accomplish the organization's objectives," while verse 29 removes Moses from the picture. There is no direct reference to Moses in this verse. Instead, he could be described as only being one of "they" that crossed through the Red Sea. This is an important distinction because it describes the faith heritage that Moses leaves. It is no longer about the leader or followers, but about the objective of the organization and their leader—God. Focusing too heavily on Moses misses the fact that Moses, too, was following. Instead, God's objective was fulfilled, and his people were free. Perhaps another component of leadership is its release and progression.

Looking at the faith progression helps expound this concept. Moses' parents acted by faith but had to release Moses to make his own choice. By faith Moses chose to follow, not lead, by looking to Christ. Moses fulfilled his role by faith in Christ when fulfilling his role before Pharaoh. Moses led the people by keeping the Passover, acting by faith in God's power. At this point, Moses acts with the people. Finally, the people were released from Egypt and acted by faith in crossing the Red Sea. At this point, the people begin to act as a whole according to their faith and not that of Moses. Hence, Moses' leadership contribution to the people was that he developed, strengthened, and bequeathed faith to the Israelites.

VI. Cross-cultural Effectiveness Explored

There are two other components to Winston and Patterson's definition that deserve exploration. The first is the concept of "resonat[ing] with the follower(s) beliefs

---

[21] Winston and Patterson, "An Integrative Definition of Leadership," 8.
[22] Ibid.
[23] Ibid.
[24] Ibid.

and values."[25] The second is the concept of "recognizing the diversity of the follower(s)."[26] Both concepts are extremely important when considering global leadership. Within the passage in Hebrews, these concepts are included within the inheritance piece. Generally, there are two ways to learn: by one's own experience or from others. Every people receive an inheritance. Likewise, every person receives an inheritance. That inheritance does not dictate the choices they make, but it offers them lessons from both a cultural and personal perspective. Hence, an inheritance offers a shortcut to faith while not guaranteeing it. Without a faith inheritance, faith must come "by hearing and hearing by the word of God."[27] Therefore, there is a choice for everyone with a wide range of inheritance provided to each. In an attempt to better explain the cross-cultural effectiveness piece, Japan will be explored.

Nitobe identified a problem over 100 years ago regarding the "failure of mission work" in Japan. He related the cause as follows: "most of the missionaries are entirely ignorant of [Japanese] history and consequently estrange[d] their religion from the habits of thought we and our forefathers have been accustomed to for centuries past."[28] This shows the importance of understanding inheritance for ministry. To understand a person, clues can be gained by looking to their culture. Culture does not dictate personal belief, but offers the same context within which they have been living. Also, since culture does not guarantee the beliefs or values of individuals, the more likely place to find the basis of their thoughts is to look to their personal history. However, this analysis must first generalize according to the prevailing national culture. When entering any culture different than one's own, there are multiple choices that must be made to determine one's "fit" within it.

"In Japan there are two sides to everyone—(their) warm, close, friendly, involved, [high context] side that does not stand on ceremony, and the public, official, status-conscious, ceremonial side, which is what most foreigners see."[29] Japan is a high context culture where "shared background creates meaning.[30] Hence, a lot is conveyed without words. Mobley and McCall warn, "a high context culture that also has a low tolerance for ambiguity is dangerous to a newcomer."[31] Such is often the case in Japan. Therefore, someone must allow you access in a society where "silence speaks loudly and context determines meaning."[32] Yet words that are used have great meaning from the context of Japanese honorifics—the method of politeness in Japanese culture. It consists of three parts: general politeness, elevating the listener by conveying respect, and lowering the speaker through humility. Each of these honorifics is administered through the spoken language. In a sense, there is a lot of extra verbiage in Japanese that conveys the appropriate level of politeness. It is difficult to understand and most

---

[25] Ibid.

[26] Ibid.

[27] *The Inspirational Study Bible*, Rom. 10:17.

[28] Nitobe, *Bushido: The Soul of Japan, An Exposition of Japanese Thought*, 279-281.

[29] Sergio Missana, "The Grip of Culture: Edward T. Hall The Silent Language," www.infoamerica.org/teoria/hall_e3.htm (accessed May 27, 2006), 12.

[30] William H. Mobley and Morgan W. McCall, Jr., *Advances in Global Leadership,* vol. 2 (New York: JAI, 2001), 201.

[31] Ibid., 199.

[32] Robert Rosen, Patricia Digh, Marshall Singer, and Carl Phillips, *Global Literacies: Lessons on Business Leadership and National Cultures* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2000), 229.

native Japanese do not feel they necessarily use it correctly. From a business perspective, maintaining politeness, elevating the speaker, and humbling oneself are all positive characteristics. Of course, more is required: "In Japan, a company has to be integrated into the local institutional framework; in this key market, it is more important for the Japanese businesses to be integrated into the Japanese business environment than to be integrated with other global businesses."[33]

Once trust is gained and high context relationships become the norm for business interactions, the formal aspects of the culture are mostly ceremonial with a great deal of honorifics as the relationship is undergirded by a high context, informal understanding. This is what one works for in Japan. Once this is established, Rosen et al. call the Japanese "contextual harmonizers."[34] Shared meaning and understanding creates an environment that allows the group to achieve high levels of accountability with respect to the quality of their work. They work very hard at maintaining their relationships, are very polite, and determine their own actions based on the group context into which they are placed. They also attempt to set up their speech to ensure agreement between parties. All of this may make more sense considering their country, of which only 20% of the land mass is habitable and more than 120 million people live. That number of people living so closely together probably need to be fairly polite.

Another observation must be made of the Japanese—their source of moral character. Three religions mostly influence Japanese thinking: Shinto, Confucius, and Mencius. Shinto contributes a "know thyself" mentality and drives the Japanese to live according to their own character. Confucius enunciates the five moral relations: master and servant, father and son, husband and wife, older and younger brother, and friend and friend. Mencius contributes "forcible and often quite democratic theories [taken] to sympathetic natures."[35] Combined, these religions, along with feudalism (practiced in Japan until 1870) and the warrior class of samurai, created "bushido" or the moral code, which is still most prevalent in Japan. To understand the Japanese, one must understand their history and realize "bushido" is a large part of their heritage.

With at least a baseline understanding of another culture's heritage and a choice in determining one's fit and role within another society, the potential for leadership emerges. It rests on individual actions. Of course, those actions will build upon the "faith" of the individual pursuing them. Hence, every person must determine who or what he intends to follow before acknowledging where he intends to "lead" others. This decision determines the "prophetic vision of the future" to which every person individually subscribes.[36]

Nitobe offers the solution for Christianity in Japan as well as other cultures: if it can be expressed "in the vocabulary familiar in the moral development of a people, [it] will find easy lodgement in their hearts, irrespective of race or nationality."[37] Paul was adept at this by becoming "all things to all men, that I might by all means save some."[38] Once it is expressed according to the inheritance, the choice can be better understood

---

[33] Jay R. Galbraith, *Designing the Global Corporation (*San Francisco: Jossey Bass, 2000), 162.

[34] Robert Rosen, Patricia Digh, Marshall Singer, and Carl Phillips, *Global Literacies: Lessons on Business Leadership and National Cultures* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2000), 223.

[35] Nitobe, *Bushido: The Soul of Japan, An Exposition of Japanese Thought*, 49.

[36] Winston and Patterson, "An Integrative Definition of Leadership," 8.

[37] Nitobe, *Bushido: The Soul of Japan, An Exposition of Japanese Thought*, 281.

[38] 1 Cor. 9:22.

and faith will be given the opportunity to blossom. Once chosen, roles can be developed, and leadership can result in "lodgement" not just in current but also subsequent generations.

VII. Recommendations

The analysis above may express leadership as very different from the world's view, where "leaders ordinarily hold their followers in subjection and master them by wielding power, often through fear, coercion, or manipulation."[39] The Hebrews account of Moses' faith would not even necessarily be considered a "leadership" passage. However, most would acknowledge that Moses was one of the most famous leaders in Israeli history. It is interesting to note what made him great in the eyes of the author of Hebrews: his faith. By expressing faith as substantiated trust in a future reward as evidenced by Jesus Christ to individuals, Moses is shown as one who saw safety as something to be experienced now by focusing on the future and not the present. Hence, he was both willing to serve God and develop a relationship with God himself. This is an important component of leadership as well. To properly lead, a leader must understand the principles and values held by his master well enough to teach them to others.

Without understanding the authority that grants persons their leadership positions, we cannot fully submit to that authority or fully understand the necessary values and principles. Under Christ, "Christian leaders have no authority in themselves."[40] Instead, "Submission to Christ's authority and leadership is one of the hallmarks of [our own access to] leadership."[41] By choosing to follow, however, Christians are also given access to Christ's strength. Keathley states, "Leadership requires great wisdom and strength and endurance, but the Christian leader can always count on the presence and provision of the Spirit of God along with the abiding presence of the Savior."[42] Even with trust, though, action is still required, and it is within action that leadership begins to take place. This leadership fits the definition that Winston and Patterson present with only one addition; leadership will eventually be lost. Once followers are prepared to lead themselves, releasing them to do so creates a heritage for the leader. In fact, perhaps the most effective leader is one who prepares and creates other leaders. The story of Moses may in fact be a precursor to the concept of discipleship. Moses' parents prepared him for the choice, Christ made him a disciple, and he then made "faith" disciples of the entire Israeli nation.

VIII. Conclusions

Obviously, the analysis performed on this portion of Scripture is incomplete. Just as Ribbons states, "underlying the [socio-rhetorical criticism] method is a presupposition that words themselves work in complex ways to communicate meanings that we only

---

[39] Robert F. Russell, "The Practical Theology of Servant Leadership" (servant leadership roundtable, Regent University, Virginia Beach, VA, 2003), 4.

[40] J. Hampton Keathley, III, "Marks of Maturity: Biblical Characteristics of a Christian Leader, The Distinctives of Christian Maturity and Leadership" (2004), www.bible.org, 3.

[41] Ibid.

[42] Ibid.

partially understand."[43] No analysis of any portion of Scripture is ever complete, and this paper only delves into some of the leadership components present in this passage. Additional study would have to be performed to consider additional intertexture, social and cultural texture, ideological texture, sacred texture, as well as additional inner texture components of this passage.

However, some insights are accomplished to describe Moses' faith progression using this inner texture analysis. Understanding faith helps to clarify the possibilities of "safety in uncertainty" in a globalizing economy. Using Moses as our example, then, there are several actions that must be taken before we can lead with safety in uncertainty. First, we must understand our heritage and its influence on the choices that will confront us in life. Once we understand our biases, we can begin to understand Christ's role in our lives enough to submit our authority to his. Second, we must learn our roles as we attempt to serve others. Third, we must begin to fulfill the role to which we are called while trusting in Christ for our strength. Also, we must acknowledge the fact that the decisions we make will have an impact on the people around us; that impact will determine the heritage we leave. Finally, we must be willing to step back and let others lead once they are ready. We must honestly approach these mandates and pursue their completion in our lives. Only then can we achieve safety in uncertainty.

About the Author

Daniel P. Rogers is a doctor of strategic leadership student at Regent University. His business and leadership competencies are based on practical experience as an active-duty member of the United States Coast Guard and in not-for-profit leadership consulting. He currently serves as an organizational performance consultant in Miami, Florida.
Email: danirog@regent.edu

---

[43] Vernon K. Robbins, *Exploring the Texture of Texts: A Guide to Socio-Rhetorical Interpretation* (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 1996), 4.