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# **Part 1: Research Paper Proposal and Thesis Development**

# **1.1 Title**

The title of this research paper will be as follows:

Servant Leadership in Christian, Jewish, and Secular Worldviews: A Comparative Study in the Context of the Ancient Roman Empire (1st–4th Centuries CE)

# **1.2 General Topic**

The general topic of this research paper is the Christian worldview, which encompasses the foundational beliefs, values, and ethical frameworks derived from Christian teachings. This worldview emphasizes principles such as love, humility, sacrifice, and service to others, as exemplified in the life and teachings of Jesus Christ. By examining the Christian worldview in a historical and comparative context, the paper aims to explore how these principles manifest in leadership practices and interact with other prevailing worldviews.

# **1.3 Research Topic**

The specific research topic is "Servant Leadership in Christian, Jewish, and Secular Worldviews: A Comparative Study in the Context of the Ancient Roman Empire (1st–4th centuries)." This topic focuses on analyzing servant leadership—a model that prioritizes humility, empathy, community service, and ethical responsibility—across three distinct worldviews during a pivotal historical period. The ancient Roman Empire serves as the case study because it was a multicultural hub where Christianity emerged, Judaism persisted under Roman rule, and the secular Roman worldview dominated governance and society. This comparative approach will highlight similarities, contrasts, and mutual influences in leadership conceptualization and practice, drawing on historical events like persecutions, revolts, and cultural exchanges.

# **1.4 Background and Significance**

The ancient Roman Empire (1st–4th centuries CE) was a time of profound religious, cultural, and political transformation. Christianity, originating from Jewish roots, spread rapidly despite persecution, eventually becoming the state religion under Constantine in 313 CE. Judaism, post the destruction of the Second Temple in 70 CE, adapted through rabbinic leadership and Diaspora communities, while the secular Roman worldview emphasized pragmatic pluralism, imperial patronage, and hierarchical authority to maintain order in a vast empire. Servant leadership, though a modern term coined by Robert Greenleaf in 1970, has ancient parallels: in Christianity through Jesus' model of washing disciples' feet (John 13:1–17); in Judaism via covenantal figures like Moses, described as humble and serving the community (Numbers 12:3); and in Roman secularism through Stoic influences on duty and benevolence, albeit within a top-down structure.

This topic is significant because it addresses contemporary relevance: understanding historical leadership models can inform modern ethical leadership in diverse societies, such as in business, politics, or interfaith dialogues. By comparing worldviews, the research illuminates how monotheistic ethics challenged and reshaped imperial norms, contributing to the empire's social evolution. It also fills a gap in scholarship by integrating servant leadership theory with historical analysis, moving beyond isolated studies of early Christianity or Roman governance.

# **1.5 Research Question**

The research question is as follows:

How did the Christian, Jewish, and secular worldviews in the ancient Roman Empire conceptualize and practice servant leadership, and how did their approaches influence their interactions with each other and the broader imperial society?

This question guides the inquiry by prompting an examination of leadership definitions, practices, and outcomes. It focuses on conceptualization (e.g., theological or philosophical foundations), practice (e.g., through key figures and events), and influence (e.g., conflicts like the Bar Kokhba Revolt or Christian martyrdoms, and synergies like cultural adaptations).

# **1.6 Thesis Statement**

The thesis statement is as follows:

In the ancient Roman Empire, the Christian worldview’s emphasis on servant leadership, rooted in Jesus’ teachings of humility and sacrifice, contrasted with the Jewish worldview’s covenantal leadership model, which prioritized communal responsibility and adherence to divine law, and the secular Roman worldview’s hierarchical, patronage-based leadership, yet their interactions fostered a redefinition of leadership that challenged imperial norms and influenced the empire’s social and ethical landscape.

The thesis argues for contrast and convergence, positing that while differences led to tensions (e.g., persecutions under Nero or Trajan), interactions promoted ethical shifts, such as greater emphasis on communal welfare in late Roman society.

# **1.7 Methodology**

The research will employ a qualitative, comparative historical analysis, drawing on primary and secondary sources to interpret leadership through the lens of servant leadership theory (e.g., Greenleaf's principles of humility, empathy, and community-building). Key methods include:

* **Textual Analysis**: Examining primary texts like the New Testament (e.g., Mark 10:42–45 for Christian servant leadership), Josephus' *Jewish Antiquities* for Jewish-Roman interactions, and Pliny the Younger's letters for Roman administrative practices.
* **Comparative Framework**: Structuring the paper around themes—conceptualization, practice, and influence—using case studies such as the Jewish Revolt (66–70 CE), Christian persecutions (e.g., under Trajan, c. 112 CE), and Stoic influences on Roman emperors like Marcus Aurelius.
* **Source Evaluation**: Critically assessing biases (e.g., Josephus' pro-Roman leanings) and integrating interdisciplinary perspectives from history, theology, and leadership studies.
* **Ethical Considerations**: Ensuring balanced representation of worldviews, avoiding anachronistic applications of modern concepts.

The paper will be approximately 15–20 pages, using APA style for citations.

# **1.8 Preliminary Literature Review**

A review of existing scholarship reveals robust sources on individual worldviews but fewer comparative studies on servant leadership. For Christianity, works like Johnston (2006) and Leahy (2010) detail early church structures emphasizing service. Jewish leadership is covered in Goodblatt (2012) and Noam (2024), focusing on covenantal adaptations post-Temple destruction. Roman secularism is analyzed in Wallace-Hadrill (1989) and Verboven (2018), highlighting patronage hierarchies. Comparative texts like Dohrmann and Reed (2013) and Berthelot (2023) explore interactions, supporting the thesis. An annotated bibliography of 20 sources (attached) confirms access to scholarly materials, with primary sources providing authenticity and secondary ones offering interpretive depth.

# **1.9 Expected Outcomes and Implications**

The research anticipates finding that Christian servant leadership's universalism influenced Jewish communal models and softened Roman hierarchies, contributing to Christianity's rise and ethical legacies in Western thought. Implications include insights for modern leadership training, interfaith understanding, and historical reinterpretations of empire-building. Potential challenges, such as source scarcity for early periods, will be mitigated through cross-referencing. This proposal outlines a focused, feasible study contributing to worldview and leadership scholarship.

# **Part 2: Annotated Bibliography**

This annotated bibliography compiles 20 (only 10 were required) scholarly sources relevant to the research topic of servant leadership within Christian, Jewish, and secular worldviews during the ancient Roman Empire (1st–4th centuries CE). The entries include a mix of primary sources (e.g., ancient texts like Josephus and Pliny the Younger), secondary books and edited volumes, book chapters, journal articles, book reviews, and reference entries, selected for their focus on leadership models, worldview interactions, and historical contexts. Sources were chosen based on academic rigor, relevance to the research question—how these worldviews conceptualized and practiced servant leadership and influenced imperial society—and their ability to support the thesis that Christian humility-based leadership contrasted with Jewish covenantal and Roman hierarchical models, fostering redefinitions amid tensions. Annotations summarize each source's content, evaluate its strengths and weaknesses, and highlight its contribution to the comparative analysis, excluding textbooks and the Bible as per assignment guidelines. The annotated bibliography is organized by source type and numbered for clarity, though a standard APA reference list follows without divisions.

# **2.1 Primary Sources**

1. **Josephus, F. (1987). *The works of Josephus* (W. Whiston, Trans.). Hendrickson Publishers. (Original work published ca. 93–94 CE)**

Josephus' comprehensive works, including *Jewish Antiquities* and *The Jewish War*, serve as primary eyewitness accounts of Jewish history, leadership, and Roman interactions from the Hellenistic period through the first century CE, with *The Jewish War* detailing the 66–70 CE revolt against Rome and *Antiquities* covering broader Jewish history up to the revolt (Josephus, 1987). Key arguments portray Jewish leaders like Herod and rabbinic figures negotiating covenantal identity amid Roman dominance, often through mediation or resistance, as Josephus, a former rebel who defected to Rome, aimed to explain Jewish customs to Romans while defending his people. Examples include descriptions of the Temple's destruction, messianic expectations clashing with imperial authority, and post-70 CE adaptations like Yochanan ben Zakkai's negotiations for Yavneh, illustrating communal responsibility over personal power. In the Roman context, Josephus contrasts Jewish theocratic leadership with Roman patronage and military hierarchies, highlighting tensions in governance and ethics. Strengths as a primary source include detailed, firsthand narratives and insights into worldview clashes, making it indispensable for historical authenticity. Weaknesses stem from Josephus' pro-Roman bias and apologetic tone, which may downplay Jewish resistance or exaggerate accommodations. For the research paper, its scholarly value is immense for analyzing Jewish covenantal leadership as a form of service to community and God, providing contrasts with Christian universalism and Roman secular pragmatism, though critical evaluation for bias is essential.

1. **Pliny the Younger. (1969). *Letters* (B. Radice, Trans.). Harvard University Press. (Original work published ca. 112 CE)**

Pliny's letters to Trajan (Epistulae X.96–97) detail his administrative trials of Christians in Bithynia, describing them as a "superstition" and seeking guidance on procedures, reflecting Roman pragmatic leadership prioritizing imperial loyalty over religious tolerance (Pliny the Younger, 1969). Key examples include anonymous accusations, executions for refusal to curse Christ, and reports of Christian practices like oaths and hymns, contrasting with Roman civic duties. Trajan's reply advises against hunting Christians but punishing proven cases, illustrating hierarchical patronage. Strengths as a primary source lie in firsthand insights into Roman-Christian clashes. Weaknesses include limited provincial scope and potential bias. Value for the paper is in exemplifying secular Roman authority's contrast with Christian servant ethics, aiding worldview comparisons.

# **2.2 Books**

1. **Goodblatt, D. (2012). *Jewish leadership in Roman Palestine from 70 C.E. to 135 C.E.* Brill.** [**https://brill.com/display/title/14217**](https://brill.com/display/title/14217)

Goodblatt's book reconstructs Jewish socio-political leadership in Roman Palestine between the two major revolts (70-135 CE), arguing that biblical-modeled and non-biblical leadership forms co-existed as viable options before the full emergence of rabbinic dominance, with a focus on pre-70 CE ideas persisting amid Roman oversight. Chapters analyze ideals and realizations of leadership, models of local control in the Roman world, and specific Roman control of Judaea, drawing on textual, archaeological, and historical evidence to show adaptive communal structures (Goodblatt, 2012). For instance, post-Temple destruction, Jewish leaders balanced theocratic traditions with pragmatic negotiations, emphasizing communal responsibility through figures like sages who prioritized collective survival over individual power. The book highlights interactions such as revolts triggered by Roman policies, illustrating covenantal leadership's resilience. Strengths include a robust evidential base from diverse sources, offering nuanced historical reconstruction. Weaknesses encompass a narrow timeframe, limiting coverage of later centuries. Scholarly value for the paper is substantial, as it details Jewish covenantal leadership's communal focus, providing contrasts with Christian humility-based servant models and Roman hierarchical patronage in empire-wide interactions.

1. **Berthelot, K. (2023). *Jews and their Roman rivals: Pagan Rome's challenge to Israel*. Princeton University Press. (Reviewed in *Comparative Civilizations Review, 89*, 89–92).** [**https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2268&context=ccr**](https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2268&context=ccr)

Berthelot's book analyzes the unique 600-year rivalry between Jews and Romans as a clash of divinely elected peoples, with Rome seeking to eradicate Jewish religion through policies like the Fiscus Iudaicus and refounding Jerusalem as Aelia Capitolina, framed rabbinically as Jacob versus Esau. Cultural borrowings are central, with Jews subtly absorbing Roman legal concepts like citizenship and adoption for integrating converts, while influencing Roman perceptions through resistance; post-70 CE, rabbis codified law as a portable sanctuary, evolving leadership toward merit-based Torah study amid the 212 CE Constitutio Antoniniana (Berthelot, 2023). Leadership challenges involved ambivalence toward Roman military power, critiqued as oppressive yet sometimes admired, shifting Jewish authority from lineage to learning. The reviewer praises its "magisterial" scope, meticulous document analysis, and extensive bibliography, highlighting strengths in comparative rigor and worldview impacts on Western civilization. Weaknesses may include assumed prior knowledge. For the paper, this source provides excellent value by detailing Jewish leadership adaptations under Roman secular challenge, contrasting with Christian servant humility and supporting thesis on ethical redefinitions.

# **2.3 Edited Books**

1. **Dohrmann, N. B., & Reed, A. Y. (Eds.). (2013). *Jews, Christians, and the Roman Empire: The poetics of power in late antiquity*. University of Pennsylvania Press.** [**https://www.pennpress.org/9780812245332/jews-christians-and-the-roman-empire/**](https://www.pennpress.org/9780812245332/jews-christians-and-the-roman-empire/)

This edited volume explores power dynamics among Jews, Christians, and the Roman Empire in late antiquity, examining cultural, religious, and political intersections through essays that address Romanization, Christianization, and Jewish responses, with themes of identity formation and worldview tensions. While specific chapters are not detailed, the focus on poetics of power implies analyses of leadership roles, such as rabbinic adaptations to imperial authority and Christian subversions of Roman norms (Dohrmann & Reed, 2013). The book integrates Jewish perspectives into broader debates, highlighting clashes like ideological rivalries and mutual influences in law and theology. Its interdisciplinary approach, part of the "Jewish Culture and Contexts" series, combines history, theology, and cultural studies for comprehensive insights. Strengths lie in fostering diverse scholarly voices and contextual depth. Weaknesses include a later antiquity emphasis, potentially extending beyond the 1st-4th centuries. Scholarly value for the paper is high, as it aids understanding of interactions reshaping leadership worldviews, supporting comparisons of servant models across the three groups.

# **2.4 Book Chapters**

1. **Linder, A., & Katz, S. T. (2006). The legal status of the Jews in the Roman Empire. In W. D. Davies, L. Finkelstein, W. Horbury, J. Sturdy, & S. T. Katz (Eds.), *The Cambridge history of Judaism: Volume 4, The late Roman-Rabbinic period* (pp. 128–167). Cambridge University Press.** [**https://doi.org/10.1017/CHOL9780521772488.006**](https://doi.org/10.1017/CHOL9780521772488.006)

This chapter examines the Bar Kochba Revolt (132–135 CE) as a lens for Jewish legal status under Rome, arguing that fragmented sources—literary, epigraphic, numismatic, and archaeological—reveal an ambiguous position balancing integration and isolation, with revolts triggered by administrative changes, economic shifts, and policies like Hadrian's circumcision ban (Linder & Katz, 2006). Leadership negotiations are inferred from papyri showing Bar Kochba's administration and communal observance, while Roman policies emphasized military presence and pragmatic order, leading to strong responses like settlement destruction. Strengths include multidisciplinary synthesis of evidence, providing nuanced insights into Jewish-Roman dynamics post-70 CE. Weaknesses lie in unresolved debates due to source scarcity, with limited detail on negotiations. For the paper, its value is in illustrating Jewish leadership's communal focus under oppression, contrasting with Christian and Roman models, aiding comparative analysis of servant leadership.

1. **Wallace-Hadrill, A. (1989). Patronage in Roman society: From Republic to Empire. In A. Wallace-Hadrill (Ed.), *Patronage in ancient society* (pp. 63–87). Routledge.**

Wallace-Hadrill traces the evolution of Roman patronage from republican reciprocity, where it involved voluntary exchanges tying social strata for stability, to imperial hierarchy, with emperors as ultimate patrons enforcing loyalty through benefactions and client networks, as exemplified by Octavian's monopolization of control. The chapter argues that patronage was central to Roman ideology, ensuring social coherence in disparate societies, differing from feudal models and persisting through transformations (Wallace-Hadrill, 1989). Key functions in leadership included aristocrats mediating favors, as in the Republic's power politics, and its demoralization in the Late Republic via material incentives. In society, it reinforced hierarchical dynamics, with patrons in superior positions offering protection for loyalty. Strengths feature a paradigmatic overview drawing on anthropological definitions, providing foundational analysis. Weaknesses include emphasis on pre-empire periods, requiring later integrations. For the paper, this source holds key value by elucidating secular Roman patronage-based leadership's asymmetry, contrasting sharply with Christian and Jewish servant-oriented worldviews, and supporting thesis arguments on redefining norms through interactions.

1. **Huntsman, E. D. (2017). Greco-Roman religion and the New Testament. In R. C. Bohn & J. K. Holzapfel (Eds.), *The New Testament: History, culture, and society* (pp. 123–140). Religious Studies Center, Brigham Young University.** [**https://rsc.byu.edu/new-testament-history-culture-society/greco-roman-religion-new-testament**](https://rsc.byu.edu/new-testament-history-culture-society/greco-roman-religion-new-testament)

Huntsman's chapter examines Greco-Roman polytheism's influence on the New Testament, where early Christians defined themselves against Gentile idolatry, viewing idols as demonic and urging conversion (e.g., 1 Thessalonians 1:9–10), while subverting practices like emperor worship. Contrasts in leadership include Christian rejection of human deification, as Peter and Paul deferred worship to God (Acts 10:25–26, 14:15), embodying servant models versus Greco-Roman authoritative veneration of rulers (Huntsman, 2017). Examples of subversion encompass Paul's condemnation of idolatry causing riots (Acts 19:23–27) and expelling spirits (Acts 16:16–24), prioritizing service over gain. Relevance to servant leadership is evident in leaders like Barnabas rejecting veneration, focusing on communal salvation. Strengths include clear references to primary texts and cultural context. Weaknesses involve a potential Christian exceptionalism bias. Scholarly value lies in highlighting worldview distinctions, aiding comparisons of Christian servant ethics with Roman hierarchical authority.

# **2.5 Journal Articles**

1. **Bilde, P. (1993). The Jews in the Diaspora of the Roman Empire. *Nordisk judaistik/Scandinavian Jewish Studies, 14*(2), 103–124.** [**https://doi.org/10.30752/nj.69502**](https://doi.org/10.30752/nj.69502)

In this article, Bilde explores the historical and cultural interactions between Diaspora Jews and their non-Jewish surroundings during the Hellenistic and Roman periods, emphasizing a "tense and strained dialectic relationship" that influenced Jewish identity across social, political, ethnic, religious, and cultural dimensions. Key arguments include the process of acculturation, where Jews both resisted and engaged with non-Jewish influences, leading to significant events like revolts and the production of Rabbinic literature that reflected isolation and conflict. Historical examples provided involve Hellenization, Jewish apologetics, and mutual influences, such as Jewish impact on surrounding cultures, supported by limited but crucial literary and archaeological sources. Regarding leadership, the article implies that Jewish leaders navigated Roman authority through communication and exchange, adapting communal structures to maintain identity amid tensions (Bilde, 1993). This dialectic framework highlights how Jewish worldview prioritized covenantal responsibility, contrasting with Roman pragmatic governance. The source's strengths lie in its use of primary evidence like inscriptions and literary works to frame acculturation, offering a balanced view of conflict and exchange. However, its 1993 publication may overlook recent archaeological advancements, and the limited focus on specific leadership interactions reduces depth for direct comparisons. Overall, for a research paper on servant leadership in comparative worldviews, this article provides valuable context on Jewish adaptive leadership under Roman rule, though it requires integration with more leadership-focused texts to address Christian and secular parallels fully.

1. **Johnston, R. M. (2006). Leadership in the early church during its first hundred years. *Journal of the Adventist Theological Society, 17*(2), 95–110.** [**https://digitalcommons.andrews.edu/jats/vol17/iss2/7**](https://digitalcommons.andrews.edu/jats/vol17/iss2/7)

Johnston's article categorizes early Christian leadership into three types—charismatic (e.g., apostles like Paul, driven by spiritual gifts), familial (e.g., James in Jerusalem, based on kinship to Jesus), and appointive (e.g., elders and deacons, formalized for stability)—with appointive roles dominating by the second century to counter false prophets and ensure order amid Roman persecution (Johnston, 2006). Biblical references to servant leadership are tied to terms like "diakonos" in Acts 6, reflecting Jesus' model of humility and service in John 13:16, where leaders are called to serve rather than lord over others. In the Roman context, the article discusses how Christianity evolved from Spirit-led, decentralized structures to more organized forms to withstand external pressures, such as imperial demands for loyalty, fostering community cohesion through shared service. Strengths include its thorough biblical analysis and historical progression, drawing on sources like Eusebius and modern scholars (e.g., Giles, 1995), providing a clear framework for understanding Christian leadership's adaptive nature. Weaknesses involve a heavier emphasis on internal church dynamics over explicit interactions with Jewish or Roman leadership, limiting comparative breadth. Scholarly value for the paper is high, as it directly illustrates Christian servant leadership's roots in humility and communal empowerment, contrasting with Roman hierarchical patronage, though supplementation with Jewish sources is needed for full worldview comparison.

1. **Leahy, K. (2010). A study of Peter as a model for servant leadership. *Inner Resources for Leaders*. Regent University School of Global Leadership & Entrepreneurship.** [**https://www.regent.edu/journal/inner-resources-for-leaders/peter-as-model-for-servant-leadership/**](https://www.regent.edu/journal/inner-resources-for-leaders/peter-as-model-for-servant-leadership/)

Leahy's article analyzes Peter's evolution as a servant leader through socio-rhetorical analysis of biblical texts like John 21:17, Acts, and 1 Peter 5, portraying his shift from impulsiveness to humility, embodying charismatic, transformational, and servant leadership by prioritizing community care and inclusivity (Leahy, 2010). Key examples include Peter's role in shepherding God's flock, accepting Gentiles without Jewish laws (Acts 10:9-16), and addressing persecution under Nero in 1 Peter, where he encourages humility and resistance to evil amid Roman societal pressures. In the Roman context, Peter's "co-elder" approach contrasts with hierarchical norms, promoting self-sacrifice and long-term communal benefits. Strengths include detailed exegesis and integration of modern leadership theories, enhancing applicability to ancient settings. Weaknesses involve potential modern bias in applying contemporary models to historical figures, with limited direct comparisons to Jewish or Roman leadership. Scholarly value for the paper is strong, as it exemplifies Christian servant leadership's emphasis on humility and service, offering points for comparison with Jewish covenantal models and Roman patronage, though broader historical sources are needed for depth.

1. **Noam, V. (2024). The identity of the leaders of the Second Jewish Revolt and Bar Koseba's true role in the insurrection. *Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament, 38*(2), 212–229.** [**https://doi.org/10.1080/00310328.2024.2435788**](https://doi.org/10.1080/00310328.2024.2435788)

Noam's article challenges the view of Bar Koseba as the sole leader of the Second Jewish Revolt (132–135 CE), arguing it began with multiple leaders, possibly Roman army veterans, before Bar Koseba centralized power as a messianic figure, causing fragmentation as evidenced by limited coin distribution and regional withdrawals (Noam, 2024). Key evidence from Dio Cassius, archaeology, and scrolls supports a guerrilla phase shifting to centralized control, with Bar Koseba potentially eliminating rivals like Elazar the priest. Implications for Jewish leadership under Rome highlight adaptive yet divisive covenantalism versus pragmatic military strategies. Strengths include innovative use of new evidence to explain discrepancies. Weaknesses involve narrow focus on one revolt and hypothetical timing. Scholarly value is high for depicting Jewish leadership's transition from collaborative to autocratic, contrasting with Christian servant models and Roman hierarchies in worldview comparisons.

1. **Thomas, D. (2018). Jesus' cross-cultural model of 'leader as servant' in Luke 22:24-30. *GFU Digital Commons*. George Fox University.** [**https://digitalcommons.georgefox.edu/gfsb/vol5/iss1/4**](https://digitalcommons.georgefox.edu/gfsb/vol5/iss1/4)

Thomas uses socio-rhetorical analysis and GLOBE Study data to interpret Luke 22:24-30 as Jesus promoting servant leadership against Greco-Roman patron-client hierarchies, emphasizing humility in high power-distance cultures (Thomas, 2018). Arguments highlight Jesus' inversion of norms, serving as a model for Christian communities amid Roman dominance. Strengths include methodological rigor blending ancient texts with modern theory. Weaknesses involve modern cross-cultural focus diluting historical specificity. Scholarly value lies in direct relevance to Christian servant leadership contrasting Roman secular models, useful for the paper's comparisons.

1. **Wallace, J. (2019). Roman leadership patterns in antiquity. *The Journal of Student Leadership, 3*(1), 35–49.** [**https://journals.uvu.edu/index.php/jsl/article/view/308**](https://journals.uvu.edu/index.php/jsl/article/view/308)

Wallace parallels the Romulus-Remus myth with Antony-Octavian leadership, analyzing hierarchical transitions from Republic to Empire, emphasizing political capacities in secular contexts (Wallace, 2019). Arguments focus on power dynamics shaping Roman history. Strengths include accessibility for introductory insights. Weaknesses encompass limited depth in religious or comparative elements. For the paper, it offers supplementary background on Roman patronage-based leadership, contrasting with monotheistic servant models, but requires deeper sources.

1. **Leontaris, J. (n.d.). Philippians 2:5-11: Christian identity of moral wisdom, paradoxical leadership, and servant leadership in the ancient church. *Biblical Theology Bulletin*. Retrieved from** [**https://www.biblicaltheology.com/Research/LeontarisJ01.pdf**](https://www.biblicaltheology.com/Research/LeontarisJ01.pdf)

In this paper, Leontaris evaluates Philippians 2:5-11 through a socio-rhetorical perspective, arguing that Paul called early Christians in the stratified Roman society to adopt humble, obedient leadership modeled by Jesus' kenosis (self-emptying), which aimed to unify communities, promote justice, and expand salvation through sacrificial death. Key examples include Paul's evangelistic work in Philippi around 50 CE, where he engaged Gentile women in leadership and endured imprisonment to share teachings, contrasting with Roman emperor worship initiated by figures like Julius Caesar and Caligula (Leontaris, n.d.). The hymn's social drama structure, with stages of purity, pollution, and resolution, symbolizes status reversal, transforming Christianity globally. Paradoxical leadership is highlighted through components like undertaking kenosis and exhibiting a servant posture, fostering mutual acceptance. Biblical references such as Philippians 2:5-6 ("Christ Jesus, who, being in very nature God, did not consider equality with God something to be grasped") and Philippians 2:7-8 underscore humility and obedience, even to crucifixion. Historically, Paul's forgoing of Roman citizenship benefits inverted social priorities, aligning with Jesus' servant model amid emperor worship. Strengths of the source include its integration of biblical exegesis, leadership theories, and historical context, providing a multidisciplinary view. Weaknesses may involve a theological bias that overlooks some nuances in Roman interactions. For the research paper, this source holds high scholarly value by illustrating Christian paradoxical servant leadership's subversion of Roman autocratic norms, enhancing comparisons with Jewish covenantal and Roman hierarchical worldviews.

1. **Becerra, M. (2017). Divine empowerment of the early church movement: A narrative analysis of Luke-Acts. *Journal of Biblical Perspectives in Leadership, 7*(1), 49–65.** [**https://www.regent.edu/acad/global/publications/jbpl/vol7no1/4\_Becerra.pdf**](https://www.regent.edu/acad/global/publications/jbpl/vol7no1/4_Becerra.pdf)

Becerra's narrative analysis of Luke-Acts posits divine empowerment through the Holy Spirit as the primary driver of early church growth, using exegetical socio-rhetorical criticism on chapters like Acts 1, 2, 4, 6, and 15 to propose a non-institutional model based on community teamwork, contrasting with modern hierarchical empowerment theories. Key principles include the Spirit's role in enabling evangelization (Acts 1:8), communal boldness (Acts 4:31), and decentralized leadership, embodying servant leadership from Jesus' teachings (e.g., Mark 10, John 13:4-5) where serving precedes leading (Becerra, 2017). Biblical examples encompass Pentecost conversions (Acts 2:41), Philip's guidance to the Ethiopian eunuch (Acts 8:29), Peter's inclusion of Gentiles (Acts 10:19-20), and deacon appointments (Acts 6:1-7) for distributed authority. In the Roman context, this empowerment facilitated societal impact by including marginalized groups like slaves and women, leading to rapid expansion by 350 CE, though bureaucratization later adopted Roman hierarchies, diminishing initial zeal. Strengths lie in integrating exegesis with sociological theories, offering comprehensive insights into values like charity and mutual support. Weaknesses include limited direct worldview comparisons beyond Christianity. Scholarly value for the paper is significant, as it supports the Christian worldview's emphasis on divine, servant-oriented empowerment contrasting Roman patronage, aiding analysis of interactions in the empire.

1. **Reynolds, K. (2015). Servant-leadership revisited: διακονία, masculinity and martyrdom in Mark 10:42-45. *Ecclesiology, 11*(3), 320–343.** [**https://research.vu.nl/files/105030741/17455316\_Ecclesiology\_Servant\_Leadership\_Revisited\_Masculinity\_and\_Martyrdom\_in\_Mark10.pdf**](https://research.vu.nl/files/105030741/17455316_Ecclesiology_Servant_Leadership_Revisited_Masculinity_and_Martyrdom_in_Mark10.pdf)

Reynolds reinterprets Mark 10:42-45 by examining διακονία (service) as a subversive model of masculinity in early Christianity, linking servant leadership to martyrdom and contrasting Roman imperial dominance with Jesus' self-sacrifice, where true leadership involves serving and giving life as a ransom. The article integrates feminist perspectives, arguing that Jesus' call to "become slave of all" challenges patriarchal hierarchies and redefines power through vulnerability, with martyrdom as the ultimate expression of διακονία in the face of Roman persecution (Reynolds, 2015). Historical context includes Mark's composition amid Nero's persecutions (c. 64-68 CE), where Christian refusal of emperor worship led to executions, subverting Roman notions of masculine authority tied to conquest. Key biblical insights portray Jesus inverting gentile ruler norms ("those who are supposed to rule over the Gentiles lord it over them"), promoting a leadership of humility. Strengths encompass an interdisciplinary approach blending theology, gender studies, and history, providing fresh insights into worldview clashes. Weaknesses may involve a narrow focus on one text, potentially overlooking broader New Testament themes. For the paper, this source offers strong scholarly value by highlighting how Christian servant leadership subverted Roman masculine hierarchies, facilitating comparisons with Jewish covenantal models and secular Roman patronage.

# **2.6 Book Reviews**

1. **Noreña, C. F. (2025). The problem(s) of empire [Review of the book *The Oxford world history of empire*, by P. F. Bang, C. A. Bayly, & W. Scheidel (Eds.)]. *Journal of Roman Studies*. Advance online publication.** [**https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075435824000465**](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075435824000465)

Noreña's review critiques the book's approach to imperial governance, highlighting Roman leadership's challenges in central-local tensions, territorial control, and hierarchical structures, with parallels to other empires and discussions of women's roles in authority (Noreña, 2025). Arguments emphasize pragmatic pluralism in Roman patronage-based leadership, fostering social order amid diversity. Strengths include analytical depth in comparative synthesis. Weaknesses stem from the review format, offering no original research. For the paper, it provides context on secular Roman worldview's hierarchical norms, valuable for contrasting with monotheistic servant leadership, though limited by brevity.

1. **Oppenheimer, A. (2012). Leadership in Roman Palestine from 70 C.E. to 135 C.E. (Review of the book *Jewish leadership in Roman Palestine from 70 C.E. to 135 C.E.* by Goodblatt, D.). *Journal of Jewish Studies, 63*(1), 174–177.** [**https://www.jstor.org/stable/26346947**](https://www.jstor.org/stable/26346947)

Oppenheimer's review critiques Goodblatt's reconstruction of Jewish leadership post-70 CE, noting seven Jewish and five Roman archetypes (e.g., rabbinic vs. revolutionary), with co-existing biblical and non-biblical models under Roman influence, emphasizing rabbinic testimony's reliability for communal adaptations. Arguments highlight transitions from aristocratic to sage-based authority, balancing theocratic ideals with pragmatic Roman responsibilities during revolts (Oppenheimer, 2012). Strengths include critical evaluation of sources and models, enhancing understanding of leadership dynamics. Weaknesses stem from dependency on the original book, lacking independent data. Scholarly value supports Jewish worldview analysis, contrasting communal responsibility with Christian and Roman models in the paper's comparative framework.

# **2.7 Reference Entries**

1. **Verboven, K. (2018). Roman patronage. In *Oxford bibliographies in classics*. Oxford University Press.** [**https://www.oxfordbibliographies.com/view/document/obo-9780195389661/obo-9780195389661-0103.xml**](https://www.oxfordbibliographies.com/view/document/obo-9780195389661/obo-9780195389661-0103.xml)

Verboven's annotated bibliography defines Roman patronage as a voluntary, asymmetrical reciprocal exchange essential for social coherence, citing works like Fustel de Coulanges (1890) linking it to feudalism and Gelzer (1912) viewing it as aristocratic social phenomenon. Key functions in leadership include evolving from republican power politics (Syme, 1939) to imperial mediation (Saller, 1982), with debates on its demoralization (Benner, 1987) and persistence into Late Antiquity (Ganter, 2015) amid Christian influences (Verboven, 2018). In society, it reinforced hierarchical structures through client loyalty for protection. Strengths as a meta-source include guiding further research with key annotations. Weaknesses encompass lack of original analysis. Value for the paper is in providing resources on Roman secular hierarchy, facilitating contrasts with monotheistic servant leadership.
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