

Not katakyrieuein but typos: Domination, pattern, and a new testament criteriology of power for Christian leadership

Paskah Parlaungan Purba¹, Ester Melati²

^{1,2}Sekolah Tinggi Teologi Huperetes Batam

Correspondence:

estermelati30@gmail.com

Article History

Submitted: March 4, 2025

Reviewed: August 4, 2026

Accepted: August 25, 2026

DOI:

<https://doi.org/10.30995/kur.v12i2.1372>

Copyright:

© 2026, Authors

Licensed:



Abstract: Critical leadership studies and postcolonial theology increasingly read servant and stewardship models as benevolent domination. This study asks whether the New Testament itself provides criteria for distinguishing formative authority from domination. Using 1 Peter 5:1–4 as a seed text and corroborating it with Titus 1:7, Mark 10:42–45, Luke 22:25–26, Galatians 3:24–4:7, and Ephesians 4:11–13, it derives a fourfold criteriology. Power becomes counter-formative when it violates its basis, its mode (*katakyrieuein* rather than *typos*), its term (suspending the father's *prothesmia*), or its telos (producing dependents rather than mature heirs). Two findings proved decisive: Galatians 4:1–2 subordinates the dominus to the *oikonomos*, so the colonial charge misidentifies its target; and Luke 22:25 exposes benevolent domination from within the text, since dominating rulers are precisely those called benefactors. A violation does not abolish the norm it violates but presupposes it. The criteriology is a text-derived normative construct; empirical testing in Indonesian church and theological education is the ensuing research agenda, not undertaken here.

Keywords: 1 Peter 5, Christian leadership, *katakyrieuein*, pastoral authority, power, stewardship, *typos*

Introduction

Over the past two decades, service-centered models of leadership have become the official language of Christian leadership and, at the same time, the target of increasingly sharp criticism within critical leadership studies. Since Robert K. Greenleaf formulated servant leadership in 1970, the model has promised a leader who places the needs of followers above his or her own interests.¹ Helena Liu, however, shows that the theory presupposes a view of leadership abstracted from context and untouched by power, so what actually happens is a determination of who is entitled to become a servant-leader and who remains merely a servant.² Dennis Tourish shows how transformational rhetoric supplies a vocabulary for

¹ Robert K. Greenleaf, *The Servant as Leader* (Indianapolis: Robert K. Greenleaf Center, 1970); Greenleaf, *Servant Leadership: A Journey into the Nature of Legitimate Power and Greatness* (New York: Paulist Press, 1977).

² Helena Liu, "Just the Servant: An Intersectional Critique of Servant Leadership," *Journal of Business Ethics* 156, no. 4 (2019): 1099–1112.

leaders' adulation and the abuse of power, while Mats Alvesson dissects the metaphor of the leader as a saint as a form of moral achievement that, in fact, reinforces asymmetry.³ Damian Ruth goes further still, dismantling the metaphor of the leader as a priest as a trope flawed at its root.⁴ Their objection is finally a single one: the gentler the language of leadership, the harder it becomes to contest the power lodged within it. This article argues that the objection strikes its target when aimed at the owner and misses it when aimed at the steward—and that the difference between the two is not a matter of nuance but has already been established by the New Testament itself, since in Galatians 4:1–2 Paul places the *dominus* beneath the *oikonomos*.

That objection has now migrated into theology, and its target is the concept of stewardship. Since Lynn White Jr. linked the ecological crisis to Christian interpretation of the dominion mandate, criticism of stewardship has developed into a structural indictment: the steward is imagined as a manager separated from what he manages, making decisions in the owner's absence and assessing everything by its economic utility. Clare Palmer goes so far as to state that the claim to a biblical pedigree for the idea of stewardship is at best a simplification and may well be mistaken altogether.⁵ The volume “Beyond Stewardship” gathers this current and includes a chapter calling for a move from stewardship to earthkeeping.⁶ At the same time, postcolonial theology reads the vocabulary of discipleship and mission as an imperial instrument, and Willie James Jennings shows how theological education forms the figure of the self-sufficient sovereign male.⁷ Stella Nkomo adds a Global South dimension by reading leadership discourse as a colonial inheritance not yet dismantled.⁸ The conclusion that settles out of all this is simple: stewardship is *dominium* wearing the clothes of a servant.

The historical evidence supporting that indictment is real and must not be minimized. The Dutch Ethical Policy in the Indies, proclaimed in 1901 and lasting until 1942, is read by a number of historians as institutionalized tutelage: a paternalistic turn that justified the suppression of emancipatory demands while preserving colonial structures. Dutch vocabulary itself used *voogdij*, tutelage, and *ontvoogding*, release from tutelage, to name that relationship. Conrad Theodor van Deventer, who framed the idea of a debt of honor, wrote that the Netherlands was obliged to repay its *eereschuld* to Insulinde—and added, quite

³ Dennis Tourish, *The Dark Side of Transformational Leadership: A Critical Perspective* (London: Routledge, 2013); Mats Alvesson, “Leaders as Saints: Leadership through Moral Peak Performance,” in *Metaphors We Lead By: Understanding Leadership in the Real World*, ed. Mats Alvesson and André Spicer (Abingdon: Routledge, 2011).

⁴ Damian Ruth, “Leader as Priest: Plucking the Fruit of a Flawed Metaphor,” *Leadership* 10, no. 2 (2014): 174–190.

⁵ Lynn White Jr., “The Historical Roots of Our Ecologic Crisis,” *Science* 155, no. 3767 (1967): 1203–1207; Clare Palmer, “Stewardship: A Case Study in Environmental Ethics,” in *The Earth Beneath: A Critical Guide to Green Theology*, ed. Ian Ball, Margaret Goodall, Clare Palmer, and John Reader (London: SPCK, 1992), 67–86; reprinted in R. J. Berry, ed., *Environmental Stewardship: Critical Perspectives, Past and Present* (London: T&T Clark, 2006).

⁶ David P. Warners and Matthew Kuperus Heun, eds., *Beyond Stewardship: New Approaches to Creation Care* (Grand Rapids: Calvin College Press, 2019).

⁷ Musa W. Dube, *Postcolonial Feminist Interpretation of the Bible* (St. Louis: Chalice Press, 2000); R. S. Sugirtharajah, *Postcolonial Criticism and Biblical Interpretation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002); Willie James Jennings, *After Whiteness: An Education in Belonging*, Theological Education between the Times (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2020).

⁸ Stella M. Nkomo, “A Postcolonial and Anti-colonial Reading of 'African' Leadership and Management in Organization Studies: Tensions, Contradictions and Possibilities,” *Organization* 18, no. 3 (2011): 365–386.

frankly, that the repayment also served Dutch interests.⁹ Colonial leadership, in other words, never called itself oppression; it called itself nurture. The problem was not that it held power but that it never specified when the nurturing would end. This article, therefore, does not deny that history. What it questions is the ontological conclusion drawn from it: whether the abuse of stewardship warrants the inference that stewardship itself is a mask for domination.

It is here that the gap in the existing literature becomes visible. Responses to that indictment have so far divided into two camps, both of them inadequate. The first reasserts stewardship devotionally without confronting the analysis of power and so reads as apologetics. The second abandons the term and looks for a replacement, thereby surrendering the central question: whether leadership without power is genuinely possible, or whether the refusal of power merely relocates it somewhere unsupervised. A lexical study of the *oikonom* word field is available, and John Reumann's work remains the standard reference, but it was framed to answer questions of *heilsgeschichte* rather than power.¹⁰ The study closest to the concern of this article is John K. Goodrich's monograph, which reads *oikonomos* in 1 Corinthians 4 and 9 against the background of Greco-Roman commercial administration and connects it to the question of apostolic authority; Goodrich's target, however, is the form and limit of Paul's authority, not the derivation of criteria distinguishing formative authority from domination, and the colonial indictment is not his interlocutor.¹¹ To the author's knowledge, no study has yet asked directly whether the New Testament supplies internal criteria for distinguishing authority that forms from domination that binds.

This article argues that such criteria are available and that the colonial indictment has misidentified its target. The figure actually indicted is the *dominus* of Roman property law, the owner who holds *dominium* over what belongs to him, and not the *oikonomos* of the New Testament, who in the Greco-Roman household was frequently a slave and never an owner. More than that, 1 Peter 5:1–4 turns out to contain all four elements of the criteria within a single pericope: the basis of leadership, since the flock belongs to God; its mode, formulated as not *katakyrieuontes* but *typoi ginomenoi*; its term, namely until the Chief Shepherd appears; and its telos, in the form of accountability and a crown. From this seed pericope the article's central thesis is derived: power becomes counter-formative when it violates its basis, its mode, its term, or its telos.

⁹ C. Th. van Deventer, "Een eereschuld," *De Gids* 63 (August 1899): 205–257. For a reading of the Ethical Policy as institutionalized tutelage, see C. Fasseur, "Cornerstone and Stumbling Block: Racial Classification and the Late Colonial State in Indonesia," in *The Late Colonial State in Indonesia: Political and Economic Foundations of the Netherlands Indies, 1880–1942*, ed. R. B. Cribb (Leiden: KITLV Press, 1994), 31–57; the formulation "the Ethical as tutelage" is applied explicitly to Fasseur's chapter by Joost Coté, "Colonising Central Sulawesi: The 'Ethical Policy' and Imperialist Expansion, 1890–1910," *Itinerario* 20, no. 3 (1996): 87–107. See also Elsbeth Locher-Scholten, *Ethiek in fragmenten: Vijf studies over koloniaal denken en doen van Nederlanders in de Indonesische Archipel, 1877–1942* (Utrecht: HES, 1981), and Frances Gouda, *Dutch Culture Overseas: Colonial Practice in the Netherlands Indies, 1900–1942* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 1995), on the vocabulary of *voogdij* and *ontvoogding*.

¹⁰ John H. Reumann, "Stewards of God': Pre-Christian Religious Application of *Oikonomos* in Greek," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 77, no. 4 (1958): 339–349; Reumann, "*Oikonomia* = 'Covenant': Terms for *Heilsgeschichte* in Early Christian Usage," *Novum Testamentum* 3, no. 4 (1959): 282–292; Reumann, "*Oikonomia*-Terms in Paul in Comparison with Lucan *Heilsgeschichte*," *New Testament Studies* 13, no. 2 (1967): 147–167; Reumann, *Stewardship and the Economy of God*, Library of Christian Stewardship (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992).

¹¹ John K. Goodrich, *Paul as an Administrator of God in 1 Corinthians*, Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 152 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012).

The research proceeds in four methodological steps that are reflected directly in the structure of the discussion. First, a lexical-semantic analysis of the *oikonom*-word field across the whole New Testament, read against the socio-historical background of the Greco-Roman household, to establish the manager's social and juridical status. Second, exegesis of 1 Peter 5:1–4 as the seed text, with particular attention to the opposition between *katakryrieuein* and *typos*. Third, corroborate the four criteria through Titus 1:7, Mark 10:42–45, Luke 22:25–26, Galatians 3:24–4:7, and Ephesians 4:11–13 to establish that these criteria form a cross-corpus pattern rather than the product of selective proof-texting. Fourth, the formulation of those criteria as questions that can be operationalized in the practice of Christian leadership. It should be stated at the outset that the fourth step is constructive and normative rather than empirical and that it does not occupy a section of its own: all four sections of the discussion are exegetical, and each treats one criterion, while their operational formulations appear at the close of each section and are gathered in the Conclusion. It should also be stated that critical leadership studies and postcolonial theology function in this article as interlocutors and not as a theoretical framework: the criteria are derived from the text and then tested against their objections.

The discussion runs in four sections, each titled with a phrase drawn from its own text and each treating one criterion. The first, *hos theou oikonomon*, establishes the basis of authority through Titus 1:7 and the *oikonom*- word field. The second, *euergetai kalountai*, addresses the mode of power through Luke 22:25–26, a passage that, surprisingly, already exposes benevolent domination within the text itself without requiring any external theory. The third, *Achri tes prothesmias tou patros*, treats authority and succession as an act of stewardship. The fourth, *Mechri katantesomen hoi pantes*, treats its telos through Ephesians 4:11–13, where the maturity of the congregation becomes the measure of leadership's success. The contribution of this article is that what it offers is not a defense of a term but an operationalizable criteriology: four questions that can be put to any practice of Christian leadership in order to test whether it is forming or colonizing.

Hos Theou oikonomon: The basis of leadership authority

The New Testament never defines the office of congregational leadership as ownership. It defines it as stewardship. Titus 1:7 states this without mediation: *dei gar ton episkopon anenkleton einai hos theou oikonomon*, for an overseer must be beyond reproach, as God's steward. The particle "gar" at the head of the verse ties it to the list of qualifications for elders in the preceding verse so that this formulation is not a rhetorical addition but the reason underlying the entire set of requirements.¹² More interesting still is the word "ankelletos," which derives from *enkaleo*, to bring a charge: the first qualification of an overseer is that he cannot be indicted. The very verse that defines leadership as stewardship installs a forensic test at the heart of its own definition. This section argues that from that definition flows the first criterion of formative power, namely that authority is held as a trust and not as a possession, and that it is precisely at this point that the colonial indictment misidentifies its target.

¹² I. Howard Marshall, *The Pastoral Epistles*, International Critical Commentary (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1999), on Titus 1:7; George W. Knight III, *The Pastoral Epistles*, New International Greek Testament Commentary (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992), on Titus 1:7.

The lexical evidence is consistent. The word "oikonomos" occurs ten times in the New Testament: six times in a household or general administrative sense, namely Luke 12:42; 16:1, 3, 8; Romans 16:23; and Galatians 4:2, and four times in theological application, namely 1 Corinthians 4:1–2; Titus 1:7; and 1 Peter 4:10.¹³ What is decisive is not the number of occurrences but the social status attached to the term. In Luke 12:42–43 the same figure is called *oikonomos pistos kai phronimos* in one verse and *doulos* in the next; that is, blessed is that slave. Comparison with Matthew 24:45, which uses *doulos* in the same position, shows that Luke has in fact substituted manager for slave without feeling any need to alter his status.¹⁴ In the Evangelist's linguistic consciousness, *oikonomos* and *doulos* are interchangeable. A manager is a slave entrusted with responsibility, not a master granted an office.

The socio-historical background confirms this. In the Greco-Roman household, the management of the *oikos* was entrusted to a capable slave or freedman rather than to the owner himself, a pattern long discussed from Xenophon and Aristotle onward.¹⁵ The parable in Luke 16:1–8 exposes the fragility of that position with unusual clarity: the manager can be dismissed on the spot, *ou gar dyne eti oiknomein*, and has nothing to fall back on for protection, immediately envisioning the two fates awaiting him: digging or begging. That is not the anxiety of an owner. Honesty requires that one exception be recorded: Erastus in Romans 16:23 is called *ho oikonomos tes poleos*, a public office that appears to have carried a certain honor and whose social status remains debated among scholars.¹⁶ That exception does not weaken the argument but sharpens it, since a city treasurer administers the city's property and not his own. The honor of an office never converted into a title of ownership.

The culmination lies in Galatians 4:1–2, and it is here that the colonial indictment collapses at the level of the text. Paul writes: *eph hoson chronon ho kleronomos nepios estin, ouden diapherei doulou kyrios panton on*, that is, as long as the heir is a minor, he is no different from a slave, though he is lord of all. The Vulgate renders that final phrase as *cum sit dominus omnium*.¹⁷ Verse 2 then states that he is *hypo epitropous kai oikonomous*. Within a single Pauline sentence, therefore, the *dominus* is placed beneath the *oikonomos*. Two terms that the colonial critique treats as synonyms turn out to be set in opposition by the text itself and in precisely the reverse order from the one presupposed. The charge that stewardship is domination in disguise is therefore not a misreading of nuance but a misidentification of the figure.

The same verse contributes a second element, to be developed in the third section of this article, namely the phrase *achri tes prothesmias tou patros*, until the time set by the father. The

¹³ The ten occurrences: Luke 12:42; 16:1, 3, 8; Rom 16:23; Gal 4:2; 1 Cor 4:1, 2; Titus 1:7; 1 Pet 4:10. See BDAG, s.v. οἰκονόμος; Otto Michel, "οἶκος, οἰκία, κτλ.," in *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, ed. Gerhard Friedrich, trans. Geoffrey W. Bromiley, vol. 5 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1967), 119–58, esp. 149.

¹⁴ Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke X–XXIV: Introduction, Translation, and Notes*, Anchor Bible 28A (New York: Doubleday, 1985), on Luke 12:42.

¹⁵ Xenophon, *Oeconomicus*; Aristotle, *Politica* I; Pseudo-Aristotle, *Oeconomica*. See Carolyn Osiek and David L. Balch, *Families in the New Testament World: Households and House Churches* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1997), chaps. 1–2.

¹⁶ John K. Goodrich, "Erastus, Quaestor of Corinth: The Administrative Rank of ὁ οἰκονόμος τῆς πόλεως (Rom 16.23) in an Achaean Colony," *New Testament Studies* 56, no. 1 (2010): 90–115, which defends the identification of Erastus as a municipal *quaestor*; contested by Alexander Weiss, "Keine Quästoren in Korinth: Zu Goodrichs (und Theißens) These über das Amt des Erastos (Röm 16.23)," *New Testament Studies* 56, no. 4 (2010): 576–81. The debate remains unresolved, and this article does not rest its argument on its resolution.

¹⁷ Vulgate, Gal 4:1: *nihil differt a servo, cum sit dominus omnium*. Text according to Robert Weber and Roger Gryson, eds., *Biblia Sacra iuxta Vulgatam Versionem*, 5th ed. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2007).

word *prothesmia* is a *hapax legomenon* in the New Testament and comes from the vocabulary of Attic law, denoting a deadline or a date fixed officially.¹⁸ This lexical choice matters methodologically, since Paul is not speaking with vague piety but borrowing the precision of property law. The manager's authority is real, but it carries an expiry date set by someone else. Basis and term thus emerge from one and the same pericope.

Paul affirms the structure of accountability with respect to himself in 1 Corinthians 4:1–7. He calls himself and his colleagues *hyperetas Christou kai oikonomous mysterion theou*, servants of Christ and stewards of God's mysteries. The word "hyperetes" is etymologically connected with the rower on a ship's lower bench, though the semantic force of that origin appears to have faded by the Koine period and should not be overpressed.¹⁹ What has not faded is the demand in verse 2, *hina pistos tis heurethe*, that one be found faithful, in the passive, so that the assessment comes from outside. Paul then goes further by refusing even his own assessment of himself in verses 3 to 4 and closes with the question in verse 7 that shuts down all boasting: *ti de echeis ho ouk elabes*, what do you have that you did not receive? Accountability here is not an ethical supplement to the office; it is the way the office is defined.

Two further formulations complete this basis. In 1 Corinthians 9:17 Paul writes *oikonomian pepisteumai*, a stewardship has been entrusted to me, in the perfect passive of *pisteuo*, cognate with *pistis*. Stewardship and faith share the same lexical root, since both are relations of reception and not of ownership. The context is sharper still, for in the preceding verse Paul states that a necessity has been laid upon him, and in verse 19 that he has enslaved himself. Meanwhile, 1 Peter 4:10 calls believers *hos kaloi oikonomoi poikiles charitos theou*, good stewards of God's varied grace. The object of stewardship here is not property but grace, and grace by its own definition cannot be owned. Colossians 1:25 closes the pattern with *kata ten oikonomian tou theou ten dotheisan moi*, the stewardship given to me.

It should be noted that this word field also refers to God's own governance, as appears in Ephesians 1:10; 3:2, 9; and Colossians 1:25, and it is on this sense that John Reumann centered his classic study, concluding that *oikonomia* in early Christian usage denotes God's plan of salvation. More recent scholarship has restored weight to the administrative and domestic sense prominent in 1 Corinthians 4 and 9, and the present study rests on both: the two senses are not competing but nested, since the human manager works within the divine *oikonomia*, so that his authority is always derived authority.²⁰ Its contrast with Roman *dominium* is therefore structural and not rhetorical. Full ownership in Roman law is commonly systematized as the power to use, to enjoy the fruits, and to dispose of or destroy, and it is this last power that an *oikonomos* never possesses.²¹ Colonization, accordingly, is not stewardship carried to excess; it

¹⁸ BDAG, s.v. προθεσμία.

¹⁹ BDAG, s.v. ὑπηρέτης. The derivation "under-rower" is etymological; its semantic force in the Koine period is disputed and is not made load-bearing here.

²⁰ Reumann's emphasis on *oikonomia* as the plan of salvation has been balanced by scholarship restoring weight to the administrative and domestic sense, especially Goodrich, *Paul as an Administrator of God*, which reads *oikonomos* in 1 Cor 4 and 9 against the background of private commercial administration in Roman Corinth; cf. Adam G. White, "Servants, Not Intellectual Clients: The Significance of Paul's Role as an *Oikonomos* in 1 Cor 4:1 and 9:17," *Australian Biblical Review* 62 (2014): 44–57. This article reads the two senses as nested rather than competing.

²¹ Barry Nicholas, *An Introduction to Roman Law* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962), the chapter on *dominium*. The formulation of the three powers (*uti, frui, abuti*) is a later systematization of classical Roman law and not the formulation of a classical jurist.

is *dominium* that has appropriated the vocabulary of stewardship. The first criterion therefore takes the form of a question that can be put to any practice: on what basis is this authority held, and to whom does it belong? Yet establishing the right basis is not enough, for a manager who knows that he is not the owner may still rule like one. The second criterion therefore concerns the mode.

Euergetai kalountai: The mode of authority and domination cloaked in benevolence

Establishing the right basis is not sufficient. A manager fully aware that he is not the owner may still govern exactly like an owner, and with a legitimacy harder to contest, since he can point to his own awareness as evidence of humility. The question of mode therefore cannot be dissolved into the question of basis. The New Testament appears to be aware of this, since its sharpest formulation concerning deviant power does not focus on the claim of ownership but on self-naming. Luke 22:25 reads, "hoi basileis ton ethnon kyrieuousin auton kai hoi exousiazontes auton euergetai kalountai," the kings of the nations lord it over them, and those who exercise authority over them are called benefactors. This section argues that the verse contains a diagnosis of benevolent domination that anticipates and rivals the diagnosis offered by critical leadership studies and that from this diagnosis the second criterion is derived, namely the mode of power.

The force of the verse lies in the fact that *euergetes* is not a figure of speech but an actual title of honor. In the Hellenistic world it was borne by rulers such as Ptolemy III and Ptolemy VIII and conferred on civic benefactors through official inscriptions as part of the system of euergetism that served as the ideological adhesive of Greco-Roman civic life.²² Jesus, in other words, is pointing to an institution of naming and not to individual hypocrisy. More decisive still is the passive form *kalountai*; they are called benefactors. The naming is performed by the system, by inscriptions, by protocol, and often by the dominated themselves. The verse therefore does not accuse the rulers of lying. It describes an order in which domination is named service publicly, officially, and perhaps with complete sincerity on all sides.

It is precisely here that an unexpected convergence with critical leadership studies appears. When Liu shows that servant leadership theory presupposes a leadership untouched by power and that it is the wider structure of power that determines who is entitled to become a servant-leader, she is repeating the form of Luke 22:25's observation in twenty-first-century vocabulary.²³ The same holds for Alvesson's analysis of the leader-as-saint metaphor and for the historiography of the *mission civilisatrice*. The implication for this article is decisive: criticism of benevolent domination is not an alien theory imported into the text but the text's own diagnosis, and the text directs it at *hoi basileis ton ethnon* and not at the *oikonomos*. The colonial indictment, when aimed accurately, is the New Testament's own indictment; what is mistaken is not the charge but its target.

²² Frederick W. Danker, *Benefactor: Epigraphic Study of a Graeco-Roman and New Testament Semantic Field* (St. Louis: Clayton Publishing House, 1982); Paul Veyne, *Bread and Circuses: Historical Sociology and Political Pluralism*, trans. Brian Pearce (London: Penguin, 1990). The title *Euergetes* was borne by, among others, Ptolemy III (246–222 BCE) and Ptolemy VIII.

²³ Liu, "Just the Servant"; cf. Alvesson, "Leaders as Saints."

The Markan parallel sharpens the lexical precision. Mark 10:42 uses intensified forms, *katakyrieuousin* and *katexousiazousin*, both carrying the prefix *kata-* with its sense of pressing downward, whereas Luke uses the simple forms *kyrieuousin* and *exousiazontes*. Mark also adds a subtle irony through *hoi dokountes archein*, those who are supposed to rule. One lexical observation deserves to be recorded with care: the verb *katakyrieuo* occurs in the Septuagint at Genesis 1:28, *katakyrieusate autes*, the mandate to subdue the earth that became the principal target of Lynn White's critique and of the entire anti-stewardship case that followed.²⁴ Methodological caution requires that this not be claimed as a deliberate allusion, since there is no citation marker in the Markan text. The lexical fact nonetheless stands, and it is significant: the verb that some interpreters have taken to legitimate human domination over creation is the very verb Jesus expressly forbids among his disciples. The case against the logic of domination therefore finds its answer inside the canon rather than outside it.

What is not forbidden matters as much as what is, and it is at this point that anti-power readings fail. Mark 10:43 reads *ouch houtos de estin en hymin*, it shall not be so among you. The sentence that follows is not a prohibition against anyone being greatest among them but *hos an thele megas genesthai en hymin estai hymon diakonos*, "Whoever wishes to become great among you shall be your servant," followed by *hos an thele en hymin einai protos estai panton doulos*. The categories of great and first are retained; the desire to attain them is not extinguished but redirected. What changes is the currency in which they are measured.²⁵ The Lukan version takes a slightly different but parallel route, since the greatest becomes like the youngest and the leader like one who serves in Luke 22:26, so that the structure of leadership remains and only its form is inverted. Mark's closing verse confirms this christologically, since the Son of Man came to serve and to give his life as a *lytron anti pollon*, an act that presupposes the very power to give.

The positive form that replaces it is formulated in 1 Peter 5:3: *med hos katakyrieuontes ton kleron alla typoi ginomenoi tou poimniou*. Three things deserve notice. First, the prohibited verb is identical to that of Mark 10:42, so that the two texts share one and the same criterion. Second, the flock is called *hoi kleroi*, the portions allotted, which is once again the language of assignment and not of ownership, so that the criterion of mode ties back to the criterion of basis. Third, its replacement is *typos*. Etymologically the word derives from *typto*, to strike, and so denotes the mark left by a blow, then a mold, then a pattern or example; this etymological force must not be overpressed, but its semantic direction is clear.²⁶ Both *katakyrieuein* and *typos* involve pressure, and what distinguishes them is its direction and mechanism. A ruler presses downward and remains the only one of his kind, whereas a *typos* works by being reproduced in others, so that its success is measured by the multiplication of its form in those who are not itself. It should also be noted that the participle *episkopountes* in verse 2 is textually disputed,

²⁴ Gen 1:28 LXX: *katakyrieusate autes*; text according to Alfred Rahlfs and Robert Hanhart, eds., *Septuaginta*, rev. ed. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2006). Cf. White, "The Historical Roots of Our Ecologic Crisis," 1203–7. This observation is lexical; the article does not claim a deliberate allusion in Mark 10:42.

²⁵ R. T. France, *The Gospel of Mark*, New International Greek Testament Commentary (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002), on Mark 10:42–45; Joel Marcus, *Mark 8–16*, Anchor Yale Bible (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009), on Mark 10:42–45.

²⁶ BDAG, s.v. τύπος. The derivation from *typto* is etymological and is not made load-bearing for the argument.

though the pastoral imagery of *poimnate* presupposes oversight regardless of how that textual question is decided.²⁷

Paul carries this criterion into the territory most perilous for a religious leader. In 2 Corinthians 1:24 he writes *ouch hoti kyrieuomen hymon tes pisteos alla synergoi esmen tes charas hymon*, not that we lord it over your faith, but we are coworkers for your joy. The same verb is denied in precisely the one domain where an apostle's power would be most total. The reason given is sharper still, *te gar pistei hestekate*, for you stand by faith, so that the congregation's standing is not derived from Paul and therefore cannot be withdrawn by him.²⁸ The parallel formulation appears in 2 Corinthians 4:5, *heautous de doulous hymon dia Iesoun*, ourselves as your slaves for Jesus' sake. The final phrase guards the formulation against misunderstanding, since what is meant is not enslavement to the congregation's will but service channeled through Christ, so that the leader becomes neither a master nor a slave of opinion.

The most serious objection to this entire construction must be answered here, since it concerns the mode. Nietzsche argued that the priest's self-denial is the subtlest form of the will to power, so that humility is not the abolition of domination but its perfection. Foucault goes further: through his analysis of pastoral power, he shows that the shepherd who claims to sacrifice himself for the flock is in fact exercising a power that individualizes, that demands exhaustive knowledge of each person's interior, and that operates through confession and the direction of conscience—a power that does not weaken but is perfected precisely when it appears to serve.²⁹ This objection cannot be answered by asserting sincerity, since sincerity is precisely its mode. Beyond that, a Foucauldian could turn this article's answer back upon itself: if the criterion of mode is formulated as signs inspectable from outside, is that very inspectability not simply the latest form of disguise, a power that presents itself as transparency while its ordering of souls proceeds far more deeply?

This article's answer rests on three things, and the first is acknowledgment. Foucault's genealogy is a historical description of what has actually happened to Christian pastoral practice, and that description is largely accurate; this article claims immunity for no ecclesial practice whatever. Yet a description of deviation is not an annulment of the norm, and it is precisely here that this article's logic applies to itself: if Foucault is right about how pastoral care operates, then this criteriology names its failure with precision, since a pastoral practice that produces souls forever guided and never made heirs has failed the criterion of telos. Second, the criterion of mode in the New Testament never consists in the rhetoric of service or in a leader's testimony about his own interior. Luke 22:25 has already closed that route, since those who dominate are precisely the ones called benefactors, and 1 Corinthians 4:3–5 closes

²⁷ The participle ἐπισκοποῦντες at 1 Pet 5:2 is absent from some important textual witnesses. See Bruce M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, 2nd ed. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1994), on 1 Pet 5:2.

²⁸ Margaret E. Thrall, *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, International Critical Commentary, vol. 1 (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994), on 2 Cor 1:24.

²⁹ Friedrich Nietzsche, *Zur Genealogie der Moral* (1887), third essay; Michel Foucault, *Sécurité, territoire, population: Cours au Collège de France, 1977–1978*, ed. Michel Senellart (Paris: Gallimard/Seuil, 2004), lectures of 8 and 15 February 1978; English translation by Graham Burchell, *Security, Territory, Population: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1977–78* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007). Cf. Foucault, "Omnes et Singulatim: Toward a Critique of Political Reason," in *Power, Essential Works of Foucault 1954–1984*, vol. 3, ed. James D. Faubion, trans. Robert Hurley et al. (New York: New Press, 2000).

it again from the opposite side when Paul refuses even his own assessment of himself, *oud emauton anakrino*. Third, and this is what distinguishes it structurally from Foucauldian pastoral power, the direction of legibility is reversed. In the pastorate Foucault analyzes, it is the flock that is made legible while the shepherd remains dark; he knows without being known. In the New Testament, the end date of the office is set by another, as with *tou patros* in Galatians 4:2; the verdict is passed by another, as with *ho anakrinson me kyrios estin* in 1 Corinthians 4:4; and accountability is demanded of the leader and not of the led, as with *hos logon apodosontes* in Hebrews 13:17. The three marks of the criterion of mode therefore ask about no one's interior state: whether the form of that leadership is reproduced in others, as *typoi ginomenoi* requires; whether the community can stand without the leader, as *te pistei hestekate* states; and whether the leader can be judged by someone other than himself. All three are answered by observing the community, not by investigating the leader. What these criteria cannot promise should be stated honestly: they do not guarantee that a given leadership escapes the Foucauldian capture, but they make its failure detectable. That is precisely the function of a criteriology. Its claim is at once modest and contestable: not that Christian authority is innocent, but that Christian authority carries within its own canon the formulation of the charge against itself.

Its application to the colonial legacy becomes direct. The ethical framing of colonial policy is the title *euergetes* in modern dress, an order that named domination a benefaction, complete with the rhetoric of a debt of honor and welfare programs that were genuinely carried out. Yet Luke 22:25 does not license the conclusion that all authority is domination, since the following verse immediately redirects greatness rather than abolishing it. The second criterion accordingly takes the form of a question: in what manner is this authority exercised, and can its form be transferred to others? To this point, the criteria of basis and of mode are in place. Both remain insufficient, since a leader may hold his authority as a trust, take the form of a *typos* in earnest, and still refuse to stop. This is precisely what colonial tutelage did historically. A third criterion is therefore required, concerning the term.

Achri tes prothesmias tou patros: The term of authority and succession as stewardship

A leader may satisfy the criteria of basis and mode at once and still fail. He may be genuinely aware that his office is a trust, may genuinely exercise it as a *typos* and not as a *katakryrieuon*, and still never relinquish it. A failure of this kind is undetectable by the first two criteria, since it consists neither in a claim of ownership nor of violence of mode but in postponement. The New Testament provides a third criterion for precisely this case and formulates it with surprising legal precision: *achri tes prothesmias tou patros*, until the time set by the father, as written in Galatians 4:2. This section argues that legitimate authority in the New Testament is always time-bounded authority, that succession is therefore an act of stewardship and not an administrative addendum, and that it is here that the colonial indictment finds its accurate target—not stewardship, but stewardship that has erased its own handover date.

Galatians 4:1–7 assembles that structure completely. The heir who is still *nepios* is no different from a slave, although he is *kyrios panton*, since he stands *hypo epitropous kai oikonomous* until the father's *prothesmia*. The word "prothesmia" comes from legal vocabulary and denotes a deadline fixed officially. This lexical choice is decisive, since Paul is not describing maturity as a natural process that ripens of itself but as a date set by a third party.

It should be noted that the legal background of this analogy is disputed: some interpreters judge that its details do not correspond exactly to any single legal system, while John K. Goodrich defends the traditional reading by showing that the use of *epitropoi* and *oikonomoi* as guardians of a minor accords with Roman legal practice.³⁰ Whatever its resolution, the point Paul borrows remains the same, namely the principle that guardianship has an end not determined by the guardian.

That principle had been prepared several verses earlier. The Law, Paul writes, became *paidagogos hemon eis Christon*, but *elthouses de tes pisteos ouketi hypo paidagoga esmen*, as written in Galatians 3:24–25. A *paidagogos* in the ancient household was a slave who escorted and disciplined the child; he was not a teacher, since the teacher was the *didaskalos*, and the older rendering as "schoolmaster" has misled readings for centuries.³¹ That function ended of itself when the child came of age. What matters for the third criterion is not the debate over whether the image of the *paidagogos* here carries a positive or a negative tone, on which interpreters are divided, but that the office was designed to stop.³² An authority whose success is measured by its own obsolescence is a form of power structurally different from domination, and the difference lies on the axis of time and not on the axis of intensity.

What is striking is that 1 Peter 5 attaches the same clause to congregational leadership. Having forbidden *katakyrieuein* and established *typos* in its place, the writer continues in verse 4: *kai phanerothentos tou archipoimenos komieisthe ton amarantinon tes doxes stephanon*. The genitive absolute *phanerothentos tou archipoimenos* establishes the horizon of the elders' office, since they are under-shepherds and their term ends when the Chief Shepherd appears. The word "archipoimen" is itself rare, and it is precisely its rarity that makes the hierarchical relation stand out.³³ All four criteria are thus present within a single pericope: the flock belongs to God as a basis, not *katakyrieuontes* but *typoi* as a mode, until the Chief Shepherd appears as a term, with a crown and accountability as *telos*.

Honesty requires that one objection be acknowledged and answered, since it touches the most vulnerable point in the third criterion. The term in 1 Peter 5:4 is eschatological, whereas the term in Galatians 4:2 is legal and institutional and, in principle, knowable and schedulable. If this criteriology is used to criticize a colonial tutelage that failed to set a date of succession, does that critical force not in fact derive from Galatians rather than from 1 Peter, so that the two are joined merely by a shared word? The answer is that both share one and the same formal structure, and that it is this structure, not the vocabulary, that makes them a single criterion. In both texts, what is decisive is not that a date exists but that the date does not belong to the officeholder. In Galatians 4:2 the deadline is *tou patros*, the father's, not the guardian's; in 1 Peter 5:4 the horizon is the appearing of the Chief Shepherd, not a decision by

³⁰ The debate over the legal background of Gal 4:1–2 remains unresolved; see J. Louis Martyn, *Galatians*, Anchor Bible 33A (New York: Doubleday, 1997), on Gal 4:1–2; Richard N. Longenecker, *Galatians*, Word Biblical Commentary 41 (Dallas: Word, 1990), on Gal 4:1–2. A defense of the Roman legal background and of the use of *epitropoi* and *oikonomoi* as guardians is offered by John K. Goodrich, "Guardians, not Taskmasters: The Cultural Resonances of Paul's Metaphor in Galatians 4.1–2," *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 32, no. 3 (2010): 251–284.

³¹ Norman H. Young, "Paidagogos: The Social Setting of a Pauline Metaphor," *Novum Testamentum* 29, no. 2 (1987): 150–176, esp. 168–169 on the temporary character of the office.

³² Some interpreters read *paidagogos* as an image of restraint with a negative tone, others as a neutral protective escort. This article does not depend on the resolution of that debate.

³³ ἀρχιποίμην is a *hapax legomenon* in the New Testament. BDAG, s.v. ἀρχιποίμην.

the elders. The formulation of the third criterion is therefore not “there is an end date” but “the date is not yours.”

From that formulation it becomes apparent that the two kinds of term in fact correct each other and that both are necessary. An institutional term alone is insufficient, since a deadline set by the guardian can be extended by the guardian; this is precisely how colonial tutelage worked, which did not lack a schedule but held that schedule in its own hands, so that development toward self-government was always framed as development proceeding under the control of the party exercising tutelage. The eschatological horizon in 1 Peter severs that possibility, since it declares that the final verdict on a term of office never lies in the grasp of the one who holds it. Conversely, an eschatological horizon alone is likewise insufficient, since it can become a warrant for an office without end—a pathology real and observable in church life, when a term is declared to end only at Christ's coming and therefore never ends within history. Galatians severs this second possibility by establishing that guardianship has an end within time. Combined, the two yield one integral criterion: every authority has an end, that end lies within history, and the one who sets it is not the officeholder. It is no accident that 1 Peter does not stop at the eschatological horizon, since letters within the same corpus supply its historical implementation, and the following discussion turns there.

Its historical application in Paul's ministry is institutional. In Acts 20:32, at the farewell in Miletus, Paul says to the Ephesian elders, “Kai ta nyn paratithemai hymas to theo kai to logo tes charitos autou,” and now I commit you to God and to the word of his grace. The verb “paratithemi” is a technical term for depositing something valuable with another party, and the object deposited here is the congregation itself.³⁴ What follows is more decisive than the verb, since the party with whom the deposit is left is not a human successor but God and his word. The same pattern appears in Acts 14:23, when Paul and Barnabas appoint elders in every congregation and then *parethento autous to kyrio*. The Miletus farewell is thus not merely a valedictory address but an act of stewardship that closes a term of office within history precisely because its final verdict lies outside history, and it is made possible because Paul never regarded that congregation as his own.

2 Timothy 2:2 completes it with a generational dimension. *Ha ekousas par emou dia pollon martyron, tauta parathou pistois anthropois, hoitines hikanoi esontai kai heterous didaxai*, what you have heard from me entrust to faithful people who will be competent to teach others as well. The verb is again *paratithemi*, now in the imperative, so that the handing over is no longer an event but a mandate. It should be noted that this verse is often read as a model of multiplication in the popular leadership literature; that reading is not mistaken, but it misses the sharper point. Its ultimate target is not the second-generation recipient but the third generation, called *heterous*, so that Timothy's success is measured at a level he can no longer control. The same criterion appears in the same vocabulary, *pistois*, from the root that yields *pepisteumai* in 1 Corinthians 9:17. Stewardship is passed on in the same manner in which it was received.

It is from here that the formulation concerning colonization acquires its precision. Colonial policy that framed itself as tutelage did not violate the criterion of basis openly, since it claimed to act in the interest of those held under tutelage; it did not even always violate the criterion of mode, since welfare, irrigation, and education programs were genuinely carried out. What

³⁴ BDAG, s.v. παρατίθημι. Cf. the similar usage at 1 Tim 1:18 and 2 Tim 2:2.

it violated was the third criterion. Development toward self-government was framed as development proceeding under the control of the party exercising tutelage, and the educated elite expected to emerge from it was imagined as a party that would acknowledge its debt with gratitude.³⁵ That structure, in the vocabulary of Galatians, is a *paidagogos* who refuses Galatians 3:25 and a guardian who holds his own *prothesmia*. Colonialism is thus not stewardship carried to excess but stewardship that has lost its end date, and precisely for that reason it cannot be made evidence that stewardship in itself is a mask for domination. A violation does not abolish the norm it violates; it presupposes it.

The third criterion therefore yields questions that can be put to any leadership practice, including within the church and within theological institutions: when does this office end, who sets that date, and is that date known to anyone besides the officeholder? A leadership that cannot answer all three has failed structurally, however pure its motives and however real the fruit of its ministry. Yet even this criterion is insufficient. An office may end on time and still produce nothing; a handover may proceed in good order and yet hand over a community that has remained a child. A measure of outcome is required, and the New Testament locates it not in institutional growth but in the maturity of persons. It is there that the fourth criterion points.

Mechri katantesomen hoi pantes: The telos of authority and the measure of maturity

All three preceding criteria can still be satisfied in full by a leadership that produces nothing. An office may be held as a trust, exercised as a *typos*, and handed over exactly on time, and yet what is handed over turns out to be a community that has not grown an inch during that term. The three preceding criteria are procedural, and without a measure of outcome, all three can become empty formal compliance. The New Testament establishes that measure, and what is striking is that it locates it not in institutional growth, the number of followers, or the preservation of doctrine, but in the maturity of persons. Ephesians 4:13 formulates it: *mechri katantesomen hoi pantes eis andra teleion, eis metron helikias tou pleromatos tou Christou*, until we all attain to full maturity, to the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ.

The structure of Ephesians 4:11–13 rehearses the three preceding criteria before adding the fourth. Verse 11 opens with *autos edoken*; he himself gave the apostles, prophets, evangelists, shepherds, and teachers. The offices themselves are gifts, so that the criterion of basis is established from the very first verb. Verse 12 establishes their direction: *pros ton katartismos ton hagion eis ergon diakonias, eis oikodomen tou somatos tou Christou*. The word *katartismos* relates to mending and completing, and its verb is used for putting nets in order in Mark 1:19, so leadership is defined as work that prepares others to work.³⁶ The relation among the three prepositional phrases in verse 12 is syntactically disputed: whether the ministry is performed by the leaders for the congregation or by the congregation equipped by the leaders.³⁷ This article does not rest its argument on resolving that debate, since the telos clause

³⁵ See n. 9; especially van Deventer, “Een eereschuld,” and Coté, “Colonising Central Sulawesi,” 87–107.

³⁶ BDAG, s.v. καταρτισμός and καταρτίζω; cf. Mark 1:19.

³⁷ The syntactic debate over Eph 4:12 concerns whether the three prepositional phrases are sequential or parallel. See Andrew T. Lincoln, *Ephesians*, Word Biblical Commentary 42 (Dallas: Word, 1990), on Eph 4:12; Ernest Best, *Ephesians*, International Critical Commentary (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998), on Eph 4:12.

in verse 13 holds for either reading: whatever the division of labor, the aim is that all attain maturity.

The lexical link with the third criterion confirms that the four criteria form a single structure. Verse 14 continues with *hina meketi omen nepioi* so that we may no longer be *nepioi*, minors. That is precisely the word used in Galatians 4:1 for the heir who is not yet of age and who is therefore no different from a slave. Two distinct criteria thus meet in a single term: a term exists because the minority must end, and the telos is the condition that follows its ending. Colossians 1:28 voices the same thing in another Pauline vocabulary, *hina parastesomen panta anthropon teleion en Christo*, with the same adjective as *andra teleion* in Ephesians 4:13. One important note: the phrases "hoi pantes" and "andra teleion" are collective, referring to the maturity of the body and not merely to individual attainment.³⁸ That collective character does not soften the measure but makes it more demanding, since what is measured is not the maturity of a few outstanding disciples but of the whole community.

The fourth criterion acquires its most testable form in 2 Corinthians 10:8. Paul writes that he will not be ashamed even if he boasts somewhat excessively about *tes exousias hemon hes edoken ho kyrios eis oikodomen kai ouk eis kathairesin*, our authority, which the Lord gave for building up and not for tearing down. Two things deserve notice. First, the verb "edoken" recurs as in Ephesians 4:11, so that the criteria of basis and of telos are bound by the same word. Second, and this is decisive for the whole argument of this article, Paul does not deny his power. He asserts it, even admitting that he is boasting about it, and then limits it not by reducing its degree but by fixing its direction. The formulation is repeated in 2 Corinthians 13:10 in a harsher key, in the context of a threat of disciplinary action, so that *oikodome* here is plainly a purpose and not a gentleness. The pairing of building and tearing down may echo the language of the prophet's commissioning in Jeremiah 1:10 LXX, though there is no citation marker, so that the resemblance is better stated as a possibility than as an allusion.³⁹

Accountability closes the circle. Hebrews 13:17 commands the congregation to obey its leaders but in the same sentence installs the reason: *autoi gar agrypnousin hyper ton psychon hymon hos logon apodosontes*, for they keep watch over your souls as those who will give an account. This verse has a troubled history of use and is frequently quoted in part in order to demand compliance without reading its second clause. Yet it is precisely that second clause which alters its meaning, since the authority to be obeyed is an authority standing under judgment, and the character of its oversight is not possession but a watching that will be accounted for. The same pattern has already appeared in 1 Corinthians 4:3–5, when Paul refuses both the congregation's assessment and his own assessment of himself, and in 1 Peter 5:4, when the crown is received from the Chief Shepherd. In all three texts, the party who judges always stands outside the relation between the leader and the led.

At its deepest layer, the criterion of telos discloses something about the criterion of basis that was not previously visible. Titus 2:11 states that the grace of God has appeared, *paideuousa hemas*, training us. The subject of the training here is not a human leader but grace itself. Hebrews 12:5–11 goes further by making *paideia* a marker of the status of a child, since *hos*

³⁸ On the disputed authorship of Ephesians: this article reads the letter within a canonical framework and does not rest its argument on the resolution of that question.

³⁹ Jer 1:10 LXX contains the pair *kathairein* and *anoikodomein* (Rahlfs–Hanhart). There is no citation marker at 2 Cor 10:8 or 13:10, so the resemblance is stated as a possible echo and not as a deliberate allusion.

huiois hymin prosperetai ho theos, and without *paideia* one is in fact *nothoi kai ouch huioi*. Both texts speak of God's action and are not manuals of leadership, so their application must be made with care.⁴⁰ Their implication for leadership is nonetheless unavoidable: if the true agent of formation is grace, then the Christian leader is a manager of a *paideia* that is not his own, a formulation that returns the discussion precisely to 1 Corinthians 4:1, *oikonomos mysterion theou*. The measure of his success is therefore not how deeply he has implanted himself in others but how far others have grown toward a maturity that does not originate with him.

It is here that the colonial indictment receives its final answer, and the answer is empirical. An order of leadership that produces permanent dependency fails the fourth criterion, and that failure can be examined without guessing at anyone's motives. Colonial tutelage meets the conditions of that failure decisively, since the educated elite it hoped for was an elite that would remain in debt rather than one that had become heir. Note, however, the form of the argument. The criterion that condemns colonization is not a criterion imported from twentieth-century postcolonial theory; it is a criterion already written in the very letters accused of legitimating that colonization. The four criteria also close one another's gaps: the criterion of basis catches the seizure of title, the criterion of mode catches domination that names itself benevolence, the criterion of term catches tutelage without end, and the criterion of telos catches leadership that is procedurally orderly yet formatively sterile.

Returning to the verse that opened the first section of this article, something can now be seen that was hidden at the outset. The first qualification of a *theou oikonomos* in Titus 1:7 is that he be an *enkaleto*, not liable to indictment, from *enkaleo*, to bring a charge. That qualification does not mean that he is shielded from a charge but that he is able to stand when a charge is brought. Stewardship, by its own definition, is a form of authority willing to be examined. To bring stewardship before the colonial charge is therefore not an act hostile to it but an act that it requires. Conversely, a stewardship that refuses to stand before that charge has already failed the first criterion long before the others could be applied.

Conclusion

The colonial indictment of stewardship has misidentified its target: the figure indicted is the dominus of Roman property law, not the *oikonomos* of the New Testament, who is socially a slave and who in Galatians 4:1–2 is in fact placed above the dominus. From 1 Peter 5:1–4 as seed pericope, and through cross-corpus corroboration in Titus 1:7, Luke 22:25–26, Mark 10:42–45, Galatians 3:24–4:7, and Ephesians 4:11–13, a fourfold criteriology is derived: power becomes counter-formative when it violates its basis, its mode, its term, or its telos. Colonialism violated all four, but that violation presupposes the very norm it violated, and that norm is written in the same corpus. The contribution of this article is therefore not a defense of a term but four questions that can be put to any practice of Christian leadership: on what basis is this authority held, how is it exercised, when does it end, and who sets that date, and are those who are led growing into heirs or remaining children? Its limit must be stated, namely that this criteriology is normative and has not been tested empirically in the practice of church leadership or of theological institutions in Indonesia, and that such testing is the

⁴⁰ Titus 2:11–12 and Heb 12:5–11 speak of God's action toward his people and not of the task of a human leader. Their application here is inferential: if the agent of formation is grace, then the formative authority held by human beings is derivative.

most urgent agenda for further research. Even in its present form, however, it shifts the debate from the question of whether Christian leadership may hold power—a question that cannot be answered, since no order operates without power—to a question that can be answered, namely in what manner that power is held and for how long.

Acknowledgements

Competing interests

The author declares no financial or personal relationships that may have inappropriately influenced this article.

Credit authorship contribution

The authors state that each made an equal contribution, from the initial draft to the final manuscript ready for submission. Melati provided the draft concept; Purba reviewed the text, added several discussion sections, and refined the final version.

AI disclosure

The authors state that the use of AI can be justified from an academic perspective. They employ AI tools, such as Gemini and ChatGPT, to develop their initial ideas and locate references relevant to their discussion.

Ethical considerations

This article followed all ethical standards for research without direct contact with human or animal subjects.

Funding information

The authors received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Disclaimer

The views and opinions expressed in this article are those of the authors and are the product of professional research. They do not necessarily reflect the official policy or position of any affiliated institution, funder, agency, or that of the publisher. The authors are responsible for this article's results, findings, and content.

Bibilography

- Alvesson, Mats. "Leaders as Saints: Leadership through Moral Peak Performance." In *Metaphors We Lead By: Understanding Leadership in the Real World*, edited by Mats Alvesson and André Spicer. Abingdon: Routledge, 2011.
- Bauer, Walter. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* [BDAG]. 3rd ed. Revised and edited by Frederick William Danker. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.
- Berry, R. J., ed. *Environmental Stewardship: Critical Perspectives, Past and Present*. London: T&T Clark, 2006.
- Best, Ernest. *Ephesians*. International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998.
- Coté, Joost. "Colonising Central Sulawesi: The 'Ethical Policy' and Imperialist Expansion, 1890–1910." *Itinerario* 20, no. 3 (1996): 87–107.

- Danker, Frederick W. *Benefactor: Epigraphic Study of a Graeco-Roman and New Testament Semantic Field*. St. Louis: Clayton Publishing House, 1982.
- Deventer, C. Th. van. "Een eereschuld." *De Gids* 63 (August 1899): 205–57.
- Dube, Musa W. *Postcolonial Feminist Interpretation of the Bible*. St. Louis: Chalice Press, 2000.
- Fasseur, C. "Cornerstone and Stumbling Block: Racial Classification and the Late Colonial State in Indonesia." In *The Late Colonial State in Indonesia: Political and Economic Foundations of the Netherlands Indies, 1880–1942*, edited by R. B. Cribb, 31–57. Leiden: KITLV Press, 1994.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. *The Gospel According to Luke X–XXIV: Introduction, Translation, and Notes*. Anchor Bible 28A. New York: Doubleday, 1985.
- Foucault, Michel. "Omnes et Singulatim: Toward a Critique of Political Reason." In *Power, Essential Works of Foucault 1954–1984*, vol. 3, edited by James D. Faubion, translated by Robert Hurley et al. New York: New Press, 2000.
- . *Security, Territory, Population: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1977–78*. Translated by Graham Burchell. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007. Originally published as *Sécurité, territoire, population: Cours au Collège de France, 1977–1978*, edited by Michel Senellart (Paris: Gallimard/Seuil, 2004).
- France, R. T. *The Gospel of Mark*. New International Greek Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002.
- Goodrich, John K. "Erastus, Quaestor of Corinth: The Administrative Rank of ὁ οἰκονόμος τῆς πόλεως (Rom 16.23) in an Achaean Colony." *New Testament Studies* 56, no. 1 (2010): 90–115.
- . "Guardians, not Taskmasters: The Cultural Resonances of Paul's Metaphor in Galatians 4.1–2." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 32, no. 3 (2010): 251–84.
- . *Paul as an Administrator of God in 1 Corinthians*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 152. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- Gouda, Frances. *Dutch Culture Overseas: Colonial Practice in the Netherlands Indies, 1900–1942*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 1995.
- Greenleaf, Robert K. *The Servant as Leader*. Indianapolis: Robert K. Greenleaf Center, 1970.
- . *Servant Leadership: A Journey into the Nature of Legitimate Power and Greatness*. New York: Paulist Press, 1977.
- Jennings, Willie James. *After Whiteness: An Education in Belonging*. Theological Education between the Times. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2020.
- Knight, George W., III. *The Pastoral Epistles*. New International Greek Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992.
- Lincoln, Andrew T. *Ephesians*. Word Biblical Commentary 42. Dallas: Word, 1990.
- Liu, Helena. "Just the Servant: An Intersectional Critique of Servant Leadership." *Journal of Business Ethics* 156, no. 4 (2019): 1099–1112.
- Locher-Scholten, Elsbeth. *Ethiek in fragmenten: Vijf studies over koloniaal denken en doen van Nederlanders in de Indonesische Archipel, 1877–1942*. Utrecht: HES, 1981.
- Longenecker, Richard N. *Galatians*. Word Biblical Commentary 41. Dallas: Word, 1990.
- Marcus, Joel. *Mark 8–16*. Anchor Yale Bible. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009.
- Marshall, I. Howard. *The Pastoral Epistles*. International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1999.
- Martyn, J. Louis. *Galatians*. Anchor Bible 33A. New York: Doubleday, 1997.
- Metzger, Bruce M. *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*. 2nd ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1994.

- Michel, Otto. "οἶκος, οἰκία, κτλ." In *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, edited by Gerhard Friedrich, translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley, 5:119–58. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1967.
- Nicholas, Barry. *An Introduction to Roman Law*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. *Zur Genealogie der Moral*. Leipzig: Naumann, 1887.
- Nkomo, Stella M. "A Postcolonial and Anti-colonial Reading of 'African' Leadership and Management in Organization Studies: Tensions, Contradictions and Possibilities." *Organization* 18, no. 3 (2011): 365–86.
- Osiek, Carolyn, and David L. Balch. *Families in the New Testament World: Households and House Churches*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1997.
- Palmer, Clare. "Stewardship: A Case Study in Environmental Ethics." In *The Earth Beneath: A Critical Guide to Green Theology*, edited by Ian Ball, Margaret Goodall, Clare Palmer, and John Reader, 67–86. London: SPCK, 1992.
- Rahlf's, Alfred, and Robert Hanhart, eds. *Septuaginta*. Rev. ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2006.
- Reumann, John H. "'Stewards of God': Pre-Christian Religious Application of *Oikonomos* in Greek." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 77, no. 4 (1958): 339–49.
- — —. "Oikonomia = 'Covenant': Terms for *Heilsgeschichte* in Early Christian Usage." *Novum Testamentum* 3, no. 4 (1959): 282–92.
- — —. "Oikonomia-Terms in Paul in Comparison with Lucan *Heilsgeschichte*." *New Testament Studies* 13, no. 2 (1967): 147–67.
- — —. *Stewardship and the Economy of God*. Library of Christian Stewardship. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992.
- Ruth, Damian. "Leader as Priest: Plucking the Fruit of a Flawed Metaphor." *Leadership* 10, no. 2 (2014): 174–90.
- Sugirtharajah, R. S. *Postcolonial Criticism and Biblical Interpretation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Thrall, Margaret E. *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians*. International Critical Commentary. Vol. 1. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994.
- Tourish, Dennis. *The Dark Side of Transformational Leadership: A Critical Perspective*. London: Routledge, 2013.
- Veyne, Paul. *Bread and Circuses: Historical Sociology and Political Pluralism*. Translated by Brian Pearce. London: Penguin, 1990.
- Warners, David P., and Matthew Kuperus Heun, eds. *Beyond Stewardship: New Approaches to Creation Care*. Grand Rapids: Calvin College Press, 2019.
- Weber, Robert, and Roger Gryson, eds. *Biblia Sacra iuxta Vulgatam Versionem*. 5th ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2007.
- Weiss, Alexander. "Keine Quästoren in Korinth: Zu Goodrichs (und Theißens) These über das Amt des Erastos (Röm 16.23)." *New Testament Studies* 56, no. 4 (2010): 576–81.
- White, Adam G. "Servants, Not Intellectual Clients: The Significance of Paul's Role as an *Oikonomos* in 1 Cor 4:1 and 9:17." *Australian Biblical Review* 62 (2014): 44–57.
- White, Lynn, Jr. "The Historical Roots of Our Ecologic Crisis." *Science* 155, no. 3767 (1967): 1203–7.
- Young, Norman H. "Paidagogos: The Social Setting of a Pauline Metaphor." *Novum Testamentum* 29, no. 2 (1987): 150–76.