UNIVERSITY OF
GLOUCESTERSHIRE

This is a peer-reviewed, final published version of the following document and is licensed under All Rights Reserved license:

Esler, Philip F ORCID logoORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4889-4889 (2007) Prototypes, antitypes and social identity in First Clement: outlining a new interpretative model. Annali di storia dell'esegesi, 24 (1). pp. 125-146.

Official URL: https://asejournal.net/2013/05/04/ase-vol-241-2007/

EPrint URI: https://eprints.glos.ac.uk/id/eprint/4567

Disclaimer

The University of Gloucestershire has obtained warranties from all depositors as to their title in the material deposited and as to their right to deposit such material.

The University of Gloucestershire makes no representation or warranties of commercial utility, title, or fitness for a particular purpose or any other warranty, express or implied in respect of any material deposited.

The University of Gloucestershire makes no representation that the use of the materials will not infringe any patent, copyright, trademark or other property or proprietary rights.

The University of Gloucestershire accepts no liability for any infringement of intellectual property rights in any material deposited but will remove such material from public view pending investigation in the event of an allegation of any such infringement.

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR TEXT.

ASE 24/1(2007)125-146

Philip P. Esler

Prototypes, Antitypes and Social Identity in *First Clement*: Outlining a New Interpretative Model[1]

I. Introduction

First Clement, which can be dated with reasonable confidence to 95-96 CE,[2] is a precious document from the dawn of Christianity, the oldest Christian writing we have outside the New Testament corpus (unless a first century date could be demonstrated for the *Didache*). It takes the form of a letter from «the church of God dwelling in Rome» (ἡ ἐκκλησία τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡ παροικοῦσα Ῥώμην) to the church in Corinth (τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ τῇ παροικούσῃ Κόρινθον) aimed at helping the later overcome problems that had developed in the Corinthian Christ-movement. The significance of *First Clement* is enhanced by the possibility that the single Latin manuscript of this work extant represents a translation made in the first half of the second century CE in Rome.[3] It thus has a claim to be the earliest surviving Christian text in Latin.[4]

How best might we categorise the communicative intention of *First Clement*? The precise reason for the letter is clear. Certain men had supplanted elders from their rightful positions in the Corinthian church, thus causing schism among the members. The author wants the original position restored and peace re-introduced.[5] This aim perva-

[1] This is an edited version of the a paper delivered in the Construction of Christian Identities Section, at the SBL Meeting in San Antonio, Texas, on 21st November 2004. I am grateful for the discussion that occurred on that occasion.

[2] Lightfoot–Harmer 1990: 25.

[3] See the edition by Morin 1894. This is unaffected by the suggestion that the text may have been reworked to an extent to legitimate later claims of papal succession.

[4] On this subject see Mohmann 1949; also see Turner 1912b and 1912c.

[5] On the occasion and communicative strategy of *First Clement*, see Harnack 1929, Barnard 1966, Jeffers 1991, Jefford 1996: 98-116, Lane 1998 and Maier 2002.

sively influences what he says. According to Donald Hagner, in his careful and balanced study of the use of the Old and New Testaments in this work, «Clement's concern throughout the epistle is with proper conduct, and not with correct doctrine».[6] Similarly, having cited most of Section 62 as representing a summary of the text, Hagner suggests that «Clement's concern is exclusively a practical one, and that the epistle may be fairly summed up as an extended piece of ethical paraenesis».[7] For reasons I have advanced more fully elsewhere, however, I consider that to talk about the «ethics» of a New Testament text is anachronistic, unnecessarily reductive and not conducive of understanding the phenomena under discussion, while «paraenesis» was only introduced into biblical criticism by Martin Dibelius in the 1920s and obfuscates rather than enlightens.[8] To characterize *First Clement* adequately we need a framework that is not stamped with anachronism and is broad enough to address the data.

A new interpretative model is needed. My overall thesis in regard to *First Clement* is that it is best construed as an enterprise in the construction and legitimation of Christian identity. It was aimed at telling Christ-followers of the mid nineties of the first century CE, only sixty years after the death of Jesus, who they were and, importantly, who they were not. While directed to the church in Corinth, the advice offered in the letter obviously reflects how identity-in-Christ was understood in Rome. Probably the letter was read out to the congregations in Rome as well, for as the author himself says, «We are not only writing these things to you, beloved, so as to admonish you, but also to remind ourselves» (7.1). In the present essay I am concerned with a central aspect of this exercise in identity exposition and affirmation, namely, the use of figures from the past – mainly people known from Israelite tradition, but also people from the recent past, Christ, Peter and Paul, and other martyrs from Rome – to tell the audience of the document who they should be in the present and, in the case of one or two villains, to tell them who they should not be. The invocation of figures from the past to serve the needs of the Christ-movement in the present (here meaning 95-96 CE) is a most prominent feature of this text. Yet its full significance has not hitherto been properly appreciated. Thus, Donald

[6] Hagner 1973: 6.

[7] Hagner 1973: 6-7.

[8] See Esler 1998: 45, 2003a: 20-21 and 2003b. See Starr–Engberg-Pedersen 2004 for a valiant effort to maintain use of the notion of "paraenesis". The main problem with the word is that it was not used in the ancient world in the sense current among scholars of early Christianity and in modern times it has not derived from nor is it embedded in any particular theoretical framework, in relation to which it might be employed and evaluated. As seen clearly in the contributions in Starr–Engberg-Pedersen 2000, it means whatever individual scholars or groups of scholars want it to. None of this is to dispute the high quality of the individual essays that appear in that volume.

Hagner notes that the author «devotes approximately one-fourth of his epistle to direct quotations from Old Testament (and apocryphal) writings. It is these quotations in fact which provide him with the materials of his argument».[9] While this is true, Hagner (writing before social-scientific interpretation had become established) overlooks the circumstance that these quotations are nearly always of a of a very particular type: they concern the behavior or discourse of figures from the past as bearing upon the identity of Christ-followers contemporary with the author. Let us now consider what «identity» might mean in this context. I will then apply my model of identity to the text.

II. Social identity, prototypes and collective memory

I take it as axiomatic that we should lay out for scrutiny the *central* concepts we employ in our analysis of ancient texts.[10] The unexamined concept is not worth using. As just noted, the focus of my approach to *First Clement* is identity. Here, if anywhere, we have a word which requires careful theoretical explanation, for as, Aleida Assmann and Heidrun Friese observed quite accurately in 1999, this word has broken out like an epidemic in everyday speech; it has, in fact, become a «plastic word». [11] For some years now I have been employing a theory of social identity that originated in British social psychology in the 1970s and 1980s. Whereas some social-scientific theory seems to have a past more than a future, social identity theory is still the subject of lively development, in both laboratory and real world settings.[12] I will now summarize those aspects of the theory which I will employ in relation to *First Clement*.

The core of the theory, noticed by M. Sherif in work with boys in American summer camps in the 1950s and elaborated by Henri Tajfel in the 1970s, is that merely categorizing people into distinct groups results in behavior in which members of one group favor one another over members of other groups.[13] «Social identity» means that component of a person's self-concept which is derived from his or her membership of a group.[14] Social identity embraces three elements: the

[9] Hagner 1973: 21.

[10] It is manifestly impossible to model every concept we employ.

[11] Assmann–Friese 1999b: 11.

[12] The *European Journal of Social Psychology* regularly publishes essays from social identity theorists.

[13] See Sherif–Sherif 1953; Sherif *et al.* 1955 (the summer camp experiments are discussed in Brown 2000: 246-50) and Tajfel *et al.* 1971. For the foundations of social identity theory, see Tajfel 1978 and 1981.

[14] The theory recognizes, however, that a self-concept includes more than the identity that comes from group affiliations.

cognitive recognition of belonging to the group, connotations of the value attached to such belonging and emotional dimensions. The theory is especially concerned with the ways in which the members of one group seek to differentiate it from other groups so as to achieve a positive social identity.

Social identity theory interests itself in how a group installs its distinctive identity on individual members. There is a positive and a negative dimension to this process. Members must be told who they should be and who they should not be. One prominent method of installing positive identity is by the generation and inculcation of what social identity theorists call group «norms» but which I prefer to refer to as «identity-descriptors».[15] These are the values that embody acceptable and unacceptable attitudes and behaviors by group members. Note that they are broader than «ethics». Thus, peace and joy might be identity-descriptors for a particular group,[16] but they are not «ethics». They tell members what patterns of thinking and feeling and behaving are required if they are to belong to the group and share its identity. They thus bring order and predictability to the environment, especially by narrowing down personal and social dispositions and moral choices from the vast range of possibilities on offer to those that accord with the group's sense of who and what it is. Identity-descriptors come most into their own when a group has entered a period of crisis or ambiguity so that its distinctive values and behavior are either seriously challenged or marginalized.

Telling members who they should *not* be almost always involves the phenomenon of stereotyping. Stereotypes are deployed in the context of intergroup relations to describe outgroups. «When we stereotype people we attribute to them certain characteristics that are seen to be shared by all or most of their fellow group members».[17] Inevitably, the characteristics that form a stereotype of an outgroup are negative in character. In particular, members of an outgroup tend to be designated in terms of dispositions, values and behaviors that are the opposite of those featuring in the norms or identity-descriptors of the ingroup.[18]

Very frequently a group will accredit certain individuals as actualizing to the highest degree its characteristic values and behaviors. Here it is useful to distinguish between exemplars and prototypes.[19] An «exemplar» is an actual person (usually still living, but sometimes dead) who is thought to typify the identity of the ingroup. Such a person is re-

[15] See Esler 2003a: 20-21.

[16] As at Gal 5,22 for example.

[17] Brown 2000: 290.

[18] See Brown 1988, Chapter 8.

[19] Some social identity researchers, however, do not draw this distinction – see Haslam 2001: 66.

garded as the person most representative of the shared social identity and consensual position of the group as a whole.[20] Often he or she will have, or have had, a position of actual leadership in the group. During the Second World War Winston Churchill was an exemplar of Britishness and he has remained so since his death. A «prototype», on the other hand, is a summary representation which is considered to capture the central tendency of the category and derives from multiple experiences with category members.[21] A prototype of a group of people is a representation of a person thought to typify the group. Such a prototype will not be a current or actual member of the group, but rather the image of an ideal person who embodies its character.[22]

I will develop the theory a little here by proposing «antitype» as the negative of prototype. In this context «antitype» means a representation of a person (not necessarily a real one, either now or in the past) who typifies or embodies one or more of the negative stereotypes associated with an outgroup.

The final aspect of social identity theory necessary for investigating *First Clement* is the significance of time. In recent years social psychologists have begun to insist on the importance of chronological duration in understanding social identity. Susan Condor provides a useful general perspective. She proposes that social groups must be regarded as ongoing processes, extending over macro-time, not as reified entities existing in a single moment of micro-time, divorced from the historical dimensions of social life. As social actors we understand the groups to which we belong as historical phenomena, stretching backwards in time and forwards into the future.[23] Marco Cinnirella, secondly, has employed the notion of cognitive alternatives known as «possible selves», meaning the beliefs held by an individual as to his or her self in the past and what he or she might become in the future, together with some estimate of the probability that different possible selves will be realized. By this notion he is assisting social identity theory to address *past* social identities and the manner in which past, present and future may be re-constituted to create meaningful «stories» at both the individual and group levels. He has noted that the choice of prototypes and exemplars will be affected by the temporal orientation of the ingroup.[24] I have argued elsewhere, in relation to the portrayal of Abraham in Romans 4,[25] that is reasonable to expect that groups originating

[20] See Haslam 2001: 66.
[21] Smith-Zarate 1990: 245.
[22] Smith-Zarate 1990: 246.
[23] Condor 1996.
[24] Cinnirella 1998.
[25] Esler 2003a: 171-193.

in cultures that treasure the past – shown, for example, in the veneration of ancestors – and which are not oriented to the future as are modern North Atlantic cultures will be most likely to choose as prototypes and exemplars people from the past, especially actual or alleged former members. It is worth noting that from the insider or emic viewpoint, a figure from the past will have been someone who actually existed (= exemplar), while from a modern and etic perspective such a person may well be regarded as not necessarily having existed (= prototype). In this essay, I will usually refer to characters from Israelite tradition as prototypes in recognition of the circumstance that some of them may not have been historical figures. At times, however, I will employ the word exemplars in deference to insider beliefs.

We can assimilate the last two aspects discussed by noting that group prototypes will often represent «possible selves» that group members may be urged to manifest in their own lives, whereas «antitypes» will constitute the negatively viewed inversion of such possible selves.

If space permitted, I would amplify this discussion in line with my view that in the ancient, largely non-literate Mediterranean world the mass of the population maintained their knowledge of the past through the processes of collective memory, not through familiarity with texts.[26]

We must now consider how social identity theory throws light on *First Clement*. First, I will consider two areas which indicate the «prima facie» suitability of this approach. Then, after setting out the basic textual data schematically, I will explore the role of prototypes and antitypes in the way this text develops and reinforces a particular type of social identity for its audience.

III. The Broad Applicability of Social Identity Theory to *First Clement*

1. Group Identity as an Issue in First Clement

The character of *First Clement* renders it highly susceptible to an approach focusing on social identity. Barbara Bowe has shown the extent to which this text «demonstrates a dialectical vision of a church still wrestling with problems of self-identity and cohesion within and over against the wider culture». There is a strong emphasis on group solidarity and reinforcing group boundaries.[27] This is the sort of group

[26] For this discussion, now see the essays in Kirk–Thatcher 2005.

and inter-group reality for which social identity theory is specially adapted, given its central interest in the ways in which members of a group acquire identity from it as it exists in a state of tension or even conflict with outgroups.

The importance of humility in *First Clement*, which is expressed by a variety of paronyms on the stem ταπειν- appearing, in total, thirty two times in the text,[28] nicely illustrates these phenomena at a fairly general level. This is a totally positive identity-descriptor in this text. Yet this was not the case in the surrounding Greek culture. Epictetus is explicit in his negative evaluation of this word group.[29] The reason for this is that someone of honour in the ancient Greco-Roman world paraded the reality and cause of that honour for all to see and did not act humbly.[30] Here we have a group erecting an identity-descriptor that represents the opposite of a value in the social setting. The ingroup are using this norm to define themselves positively against the outgroup. They are telling themselves who they are by asserting who they are not.

But let us come to the focal identity issue here – prototypes and archetypes.

2. *The Significance ὑπόδειγμα in* First Clement

Confirmation that an approach based on a study of prototypes and antitypes is likely to prove helpful in interpreting *First Clement* exists in a prominent linguistic feature of this text – the repeated use of the word ὑπόδειγμα.[31] The first of these words appears six times in the letter (5.1 [twice], 6.1, 46.1, 55.1 and 63.1) and, as we will see, in significant locations.

By way of contrast, there is not a single instance of the word in the other Apostolic Fathers,[32] while there are only are only five instances

---

[27] Bowe 1988: 105.

[28] See the details in Bowe 1988: 112. Here is the basic data: the adjective ταπεινός appears at 30.2, 55.6, 59.3 and 59.4; the verb ταπεινοφρονέω occurs at 2.1, 13.1, 13.3, 16.1, 16.2, 16.17, 17.2, 19.1, 30.3, 38.2, 48.6, 62.2; the noun ταπεινοφροσύνη occurs at 21.8, 30.8, 31.4, 44.3, 56.1, 58.2; the adjective ταπεινόφρων appears at 19.1 and 38.2; the verb ταπεινόω occurs at 18.8, 18.17, 59.3 (twice); the noun ταπείνωσις occurs at 16.7, 53.2 and 55.6.

[29] Epictetus. *Diss.* 1.4.25; 2.16.8; 3.24.38 and 4.1.54. See the discussion in Bowe 1988: 113.

[30] While Malina (2001, but originally published in 1981) provided the pioneering discussion of honour and shame in the ancient Mediterranean in relation to New Texts, classical scholars have also now begun vigorously to address this subject: see Lendon 1997 and Barton 2001.

[31] Hagner offers a brief discussion of ὑπόδειγμα (1973: 126). The somewhat similar word ὑπόγραμμος also appears three times (5.7, 16.17 and 33.8). Bowe discusses both words (1988: 70). The word ὑπόγραμμος is found in 2Macc 2,28 and and 1Pet 2,21. It does not appear in Philo or Josephus. Its only other appearance in the Apostolic Fathers comes in the *Letter of Polycarp to the Philippians* 8.2.

[32] See Kraft 1963.

in the Septuagint (Sir 44,16, Ez 42,15, 2Macc 6,28.31, and 4Macc 17,23) and six in the New Testament (John 13,15, Heb 4,11; 8,5 and 9,23, James 5,10 and 2Pet 2,6).[33] This repeated and unusual use of ὑπόδειγμα in *First Clement* suggests that it plays an important role in the text and detailed analysis provided below supports this view. But first the usage of the word in the semantic context of *First Clement* warrants brief consideration.

In Hellenistic Greek ὑπόδειγμα meant an «example», but it also acquired the sense of «document», «proof» or even «model».[34] A similar semantic spread can be observed in the LXX. In Sir 44,16 it is stated that «Enoch pleased the Lord, and was translated, an example (ὑπόδειγμα) of repentance to all generations». In Ez 42,15 the prophet states that his informant who is describing the Temple to him «measured the plan (ὑπόδειγμα) of the house round about in order». Here the word means a full scale outline of the Temple. In 2Macc 6,28 and 31 the word is used of Eleazar, who refused to eat pork and was tortured to death. He stated that he would leave a «noble example», ὑπόδειγμα γενναῖον, to the young (6,28). He left his death as an example of nobility (ὑπόδειγμα γενναιότητος) and a memorial of virtue, not only to the young but to his whole people (6,31). In 4Macc 17,23 we learn that Antiochus proclaimed the endurance of Eleazar and a mother with her seven sons (as they were tortured to death) as an example (ὑπόδειγμα) for the endurance of his soldiers.

In Philo ὑπόδειγμα only means «example» or «instance».[35] Its range of meaning in Josephus is more interesting. Of six occurrences, two appear in the plural ὑποδείγματα with οἰκεῖα to mean «someone's own experiences».[36] In another case it means «example» in the sense of «warning».[37] I will return to the remaining three instances below.

As for the New Testament cases, in John 13,15 Jesus, after he has washed his disciples' feet, says, «For I have given you an example (ὑπόδειγμα) in order that just as I did for you so should you also

[33] Note that Schlier suggests that the LXX «often employs ὑπόδειγμα and παραδείγμα as alternatives» (1964: 33). Whatever the accuracy of this view, it is noteworthy that παραδείγμα does not occur in the New Testament. Its verbal paronym παραδειγματίζω does appear in Heb 6,6, but in the sense of "expose to contempt", to "make a spectacle of". As Koester has noted (2001: 315), «The word *paradeigmatizein* was used for public punishments that made an example of the victim...». In addition, neither παραδείγμα nor παραδειγματίζω appears anywhere in the Apostolic Fathers.

[34] Schlier 1964: 32, who also notes that in Attic Greek παράδειγμα was preferred to ὑπόδειγμα.

[35] There are four instances in Philo, all in this sense (*De posteritate Caini* 122; *De confusione linguarum* 64; *Quis divinarum heres sit* 256; and *De somniis, Liber* 2.3).

[36] Josephus, *Bellum Iudaicum* 1.374 and 1.507.

[37] Josephus, *Bellum Iudaicum* 2.208 (the death of Gaius Caligula is a warning of the need for moderation).

do».[38] In Heb 4,11 we find it used in relation to the possible negative behavior, «Let us therefore hasten into that rest, lest anyone might fall by the same example (ὑπόδειγμα) of faithlessness (ἀπείθεια)». In Heb 8,5 the word occurs in describing the difference between appearance and reality, in reference to those «who serve the copy (ὑπόδειγμα) and shadow of the heavenly realities». There is a similar sense in Heb 9,23; here the Temple vessels that need to be purified are described as «copies (ὑποδείγματα) of heavenly things». R.M. Grant (in a discussion of Greek exegetical terminology) suggests that ὑπόδειγμα is what writers using better Greek employ instead of δεῖγμα. He suggests that at Heb 4,11 ὑπόδειγμα means «instance», which is accurate, and that at 8,5 and 9,23 it means «pattern», which is correct as far as it goes, but fails to specify that this is a pattern of a particular sort, a lower-level copy.[39] James 5,10 states, «Take as an example (ὑπόδειγμα) of perseverance and endurance the prophets who spoke in the Lord's name». Finally, in 2 Pet 2,6 we find, «if by turning the cities Sodom and Gomorrah to ashes he condemned them to extinction and made them an example (ὑπόδειγμα) to those who were to be impious».

These biblical examples provide the following range of meanings for ὑπόδειγμα. The first two refer to something inanimate:

1. A plan (Ez 42,15).
2. A lower-level copy of some other reality (Heb 8,5; 9,23).

Then we have another category connected with human beings:

3. Behavior of a particular person which exemplifies either (most commonly) a particular type of good (Sir 44,16; 2Macc 6,28 and 31; 4Macc 14,23; John 13,15; James 5,10) or (occasionally) evil (Heb 4,11; 2Pet 2,6). This latter type is similar to the two references in Josephus just noted where the word referred to people exemplary of evil or misfortune. In relation to the instance at John 13,15 Schlier states that here ὑπόδειγμα «is more than an example. It is a definite «prototype». In a typical act they experience the love of Jesus and are to cause others to have the same experience».[40] Yet really all of the examples of good behavior in this group are more than just examples. In each case they are expressly or implicitly of-

[38] On the use of this word in John, see Culpepper 1991.

[39] Grant 1957: 125. He notes that Philo uses δεῖγμα in discussing the story of the serpent in Eden (*Opif.* 157). A δεῖγμα is a an example or type, which encourages allegory in accordance with data given through hidden meanings.

[40] Schlier 1964: 33.

fered as worthy of emulation. Although in John 13,15 Jesus, as the agent of the exemplary behavior, himself urges its repetition, Eleazar does much the same in 2Macc 6,28.

But Josephus provides another, very significant sense where ὑπόδειγμα is applied to exemplary figures from the past. Two of these refer to a person exemplary in virtue (Jehoiachin in 2 *Kings* 24,12);[41] this usage is different from that of Eleazar in *2 Maccabees* 6 just mentioned, in that Jehoiachin is himself the ὑπόδειγμα, not his behavior. The remaining occurrence in Josephus is similar, since the word refers to a group of people – the Judeans under the Roman threat, who are likely to become «exempla» of misfortune.

This provides a semantic context to compare and contrast the use of the word in *First Clement* and to demonstrate its significance in the text. In *First Clement* 6.1 the word is used in the singular in reference to martyrs in Rome and refers to their exemplary endurance in suffering, which is essentially the same as the meaning in the third category. It is likely, also, that the mention of «the noble examples (τὰ γενναῖα ὑποδείγματα) of our generation» at *First Clement* 5.1 has been influenced by the two similar expressions in 2Macc 6,28 and 31 mentioned above. Yet in all of the examples of the word in *First Clement*, except for that at 6.1, while ὑπόδειγμα is still used solely in relation to exemplary good or bad behavior of people in the past (the third category above), we find a notable development of this sense.

Take the first instance, at 5.1: «But, in order to cease from these ancient ὑποδείγματα, let us come to the athletes nearest to us; let us take the noble ὑπόδειγματα of our own generation». This first instance of ὑποδείγματα refers summatively to all of the characters from the Old Testament mentioned in *First Clement* 4,[42] who either acted out of jealousy (like Cain, who committed fratricide through jealousy and envy) or who experienced some evil consequence of jealousy (with the jealousy being their own or someone else's). Yet here ὑποδείγματα does not designate *forms of behavior*, as in the third category of biblical data above, but refers to the *people* who produce such behavior or suffer in consequence of it. This meaning is continued in the second example of the word in *First Clement* 5.1, which looks forward to Peter and Paul. The word is again used summatively in relation to *persons* from Israelite scripture at 46.1 («Therefore, brothers, we must to cleave to such ὑποδείγματα), since the author continues by saying, «For it is written, "Cleave to

[41] Josephus, *Bellum Iudaicum* 6.103 and 6.106.

[42] Cain and Abel, Jacob and Esau, Joseph, Moses and Pharoah, Aaron and Miriam, Dathan and Abiram, and David and Saul.

those who are holy, because those who cleave to them shall be made holy"») in 46.2. In 55.1 ὑποδείγματα again refers to exemplary people, this time from outside Israel. At 63.1, in particular, ὑποδείγματα appears – just after a chapter epitomizing the communicative thrust of the letter – in the key concluding exhortation to the Corinthians and again in relation to all the exemplary persons who have been mentioned in the text hitherto. It is not possible to say that the author of *First Clement* invented this usage, since we have seen above that it is found in three places in the *Judean War* of Josephus. Yet it is clearly a highly unusual usage that the author of *First Clement* has made his own.

This means that in ὑπόδειγμα we have a distinctive emic expression which fits closely with the etic language of exemplar/prototype and antitype we have adapted for use in relation to this text from social identity theory. In *First Clement* the expression ὑπόδειγμα repeatedly refers to a person from the past who has either exhibited an exemplary/prototypical instance of positive behavior or who has suffered from or manifested an exemplary/prototypical instance of negative behavior. The instances of positive disposition and behavior described (some of which we will look at in more detail below) represent identity-descriptors for the group in the sense explained above, while the forms of negative disposition behavior (such as jealousy and envy) represent the inversion of group values and behavior, that are or should be located solely outside the group. Although the author and original audience of *First Clement* almost certainly regarded the characters from Israel's written tradition mentioned in this text as having once existed (which would make them «exemplars» from our social identity perspective), in this essay I will refer to them as «prototypes», while reserving «exemplars» for Peter and Paul, who were definitely real figures, had both died in Rome and may well have been personally known to some of the Christ-followers in Rome and Corinth. The early Latin translation of the text mentioned above uses «exemplum» in place of ὑπόδειγμα.

The time has now come to consider the data in the text concerning prototypes and antitypes, a task most conveniently performed using a schematic summary.[43]

[43] I have been helped in preparing this chart by the information in the chart in Jefford (1996: 112).

Name	*Text*	*Source*	*Identity Descriptor*
Cain & Abel	4.1-7	*Genesis* 4,3-8	jealousy & results
Jacob & Esau	4.8	*Genesis* 27,41 – 28,5	jealousy & results
Joseph	4.9	*Genesis* 37	jealousy & results
Moses & Pharoah	4.10	*Exodus* 2,14	jealousy & results
Aaron & Miriam	4.11	*Numbers* 12	jealousy & results
Dathan & Abiram	4.12	*Numbers* 16,1-35	jealousy & results
David & Saul	4.13	*1 Samuel* 18 – 31	jealousy & results
Peter	5.4	Living memory	jealousy & results
Paul	5.5-7	Living memory	jealousy & results
Roman martyrs	6.1-2	Living memory	jealousy & results
Noah	7.6	*Genesis* 7	repentance
The Ninevites	7.7	*Jonah* 3	repentance
Enoch	9.3	*Genesis* 5,24	obedience
Noah	9.4	*Genesis* 7	obedience
Abraham	10.1-7	*Genesis* 12 – 25	obedience
Lot	11.1	*Genesis* 19	hospitality/piety
Lot's wife	11.2	*Genesis* 19	doubting
Rahab	12.1-7	*Joshua* 2	hospitality/faith
Christ	16	Living memory	humility
Elijah & Elisha	17.1	1Kgs 17 – 2Kgs 13	humility
Ezekiel	17.1	*Ezekiel*	humility
Abraham	17.3	*Genesis* 18,27	humility
Job	17.3-4	*Job* 1,1; 14,4-5	humility
Moses	17.5-6	*Numbers* 12; *Exod* 4	humility
David	18.1-17	*Psalm* 89,20; 51,1-17	humility
Abraham	31.2	*Genesis* 21,17	faith
Isaac	31.3	*Genesis* 22	faith
Jacob	31.4	*Genesis* 28 – 31	humility
Moses	43.1-6	*Numbers* 12,7; 17	need for order
The righteous	45.3-5	Memory (?)	persecution
Daniel, Ananias, Azaria, Misael	45.6-7	*Daniel* 6,16-24	persecution
Paul	47.1-7	*1 Corinthians* 1,10	division warning
David	52.1-4	*Psalm* 69,30-32.50-51	confession of sins
Moses	53.2-5	*Deuteronomy* 9	Selfless love
Outsiders	55.1-3	Memory (?)	Selfless love
Judith	55.4-5	*Judith* 8 – 14	Selfless love
Esther	55.6	*Esther* 7	Selfless love

3. *General Observations Concerning the Data on Prototypes and Antitypes*

The first observation required is the large proportion of the text devoted to prototypes and antitypes and their prominence. Of the sixty five chapters of the text in its current form, eighteen are devoted to this subject and they are positioned throughout the text. The discussion of these ὑποδείγματα also begins early, in Chapter 4, and continues until near its end, in Chapter 55.

Secondly, the plan of the author is to run through in succession what readily reveal themselves as identity-descriptors (or their antitheses) within a social identity framework: jealousy and envy (and their consequences), repentance, obedience, hospitality, piety, faith, humility, faith, selfless love and so on. Each identity-descriptor is presented through its embodiment in one or, more usually, two or more figures from the remote or recent past. That is, representatives of each identity-descriptor are clumped together, with the greatest attention being paid to jealousy/envy, clearly viewed as the worst negative value, and humility, which is the most prominent identity-descriptor and provides the main opposition for jealousy/envy. This pattern reveals that the author has the various identity-descriptors at the forefront of his attention and then looks round for people who might best represent them. This approach is very close indeed to the way in which social identity theory relates identity-descriptors and group prototypes and antitypes.

Thirdly, many of the figures whom the author mentions are prototypical or antitypical in respect of only *one* group identity-descriptor or outgroup vice. This is worth noting, since, as noted above, a group prototype or exemplar will usually be regarded as maximally representative of its identity in a broad variety of ways. We need to modify our theory a little to take account of the data before us. Yet this is an accepted feature of this method and there is ample justification for doing so here. If one thinks of how the British viewed Winston Churchill during World War II, for example, it is clearly necessary to have in mind a range of aspects of Britishness that he represented. On the other hand, even for Churchill the element of indomitable resistance to oppression was probably the main characteristic as far as the people of Great Britain were concerned, which means that this particular identity-descriptor was focal and dominant. In *First Clement*, moreover, while the majority of the figures only appear once, several appear a number of times in relation to different identity-descriptors:

(a) Jacob twice (result of jealousy [4.8] and humility [31.4]);
(b) Moses four times (result of jealousy [4.10], humility [17.5-6], need for order [43.1-6] and selfless love [53.2-5]);

(c) David three times (result of jealousy [4.13], humility [18.1-7] and confession of sins [52.1-4]),
(d) Noah twice (repentance [7.6] and obedience [9.4]); and
(e) Abraham (obedience [10.1-7], humility [17.3] and faith [31.2]).

In addition, Lot and Rahab are described as each representing two identity-descriptors. Lot represents 'hospitality and piety' (11.1) and Rahab 'hospitality and faith' (12.1). The attribution to the one figure of two or more identity-descriptors means that this author was no stranger to the phenomenon that we are describing within social identity theory where one person is maximally representative of the group across a fair range of its identity.

Fourthly, there is a broad division in the text between Chapters 4 to 6, that concern people who have either typified envy or jealousy or who have suffered as a result of it, and Chapters 7 to 55 that are, by and large, concerned with prototypes of group identity-descriptors. This arrangement is explained by the author's wish to start with the church in Corinth, whose problems (mainly internal but some external) are the cause of his writing. After sending the Corinthians his greetings (in the preamble to the text), he briefly explains his delay in writing and then mentions the pathological condition it which their church now finds itself (1.1), before providing a detailed and glowing account of what the Corinthian church used to be like, of its previously exalted identity (1.2-2.7). But now, he writes, this identity is imperilled by jealousy, envy, strife, sedition, persecution and disorder, war and captivity (3.1-4). This establishes the foundation for the figures representing jealousy and envy and their results in 4.1-6.2. After this, however, the author moves on to consider the positive aspects of the identity of the Christ-movement beginning, appropriately enough, with repentance (Chapter 7).

Fifthly, the author adopts a variety of approaches to introducing the prototypes and antitypes. One pattern is to announce the importance of a group identity-descriptor (or a negative feature characteristic of outgroup) in a didactic manner, then to describe the prototypes or antitypes, and then to return to a discursive account. Thus, general statements about jealousy and envy (3.1-4) and (6.3-4) surround the illustrative prototypes and antitypes proffered by the author (4.1-6.2). Repentance is advocated in 7.1-5, embodied in ὑποδείγματα in 7.6-7 and covered again through scriptural citations in 8.1-5. Similarly, humility – a topic of fundamental importance in the letter, as noted above, and which is a (or, perhaps, the) core identity-descriptor of the Christ-movement[44] – is subject to a lengthy introductory account in Chapters

[44] See the data for the thirty two instances of this semantic field in footnote 28 above.

13-15, illustrated through the prototype of Jesus in Chapter 16 and a series of Old Testament prototypes in Chapters 17 and 18, and then rounded off in general terms in 19.1. In this material, therefore, the prototypes and antitypes are embedded in didactic passages which the author plainly believes requires their presence to carry the meaning. A second pattern is to introduce the identity-descriptor and then to bring on the prototype; thus obedience is introduced in 9.1-2 and illustrated with prototypes in 9.3-10.7. A third pattern is to move straight into the prototype as revelatory of the identity-descriptor. So it is with Lot and Rahab in relation to hospitality in 11.1 and 12.1-7, with Abraham and Isaac in relation to faith in 31.2-3, with Moses, certain outsiders, Judith and Esther in relation to selfless love in 53.2-5 and 55.1-6.

Before considering a brief sample of these figures and how they function in the text, it is necessary to consider possible stimuli for the author's use of prototypes and antitypes. We must especially consider what seems to the dominant influence on their appearance in this text – the phenomenon of *Hebrews* 11.

4. *Stimuli for the Use of Prototypes and Antitypes in* First Clement

Barbara Bowe has noted the range of sources for the figures mentioned in *First Clement*: Israel's history, Christian history, Christ himself, and even examples from the «gentiles». She adds that the usage is well attested in other sources, such as *Sirach* 44-45 and *Hebrews* 11, while the emphasis on Israelite figures as models of virtue is also commonplace, as in the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*.[45] Yet in *Sirach* 44-45 the focus is on the illustrious men of the past, who figured in the history of God's dealings with humanity in significant ways and who exemplified certain virtues, not on identity-descriptors which require to be illustrated by human representatives. The picture is similar in the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, although in that text there is also a set of warnings to avoid vice. *Hebrews* 11 is a much more promising source, since here we have a series of figures illustrative of faith (πίστις; Heb 11,1-2). Although anyone working on this text is indebted to Pamela Eisenbaum's recent monograph on it, I have recently suggested that her interest in the «literary» context for the figures of *Hebrews* 11 leads her to overlook other paths into its meaning more at home in a culture where most people were illiterate and stored and accessed group traditions in memory.[46]

[45] Bowe 1988: 70.

[46] See Eisenbaum 1997 and Esler 2005.

Nevertheless, as a result of the persuasive case mounted by Donald Hagner, there is little doubt that the author was acquainted with and dependent upon *Hebrews*.[47] Hagner begins by noting the «particularly revealing fact» that *First Clement* 9-12 «appear to be patterned after Heb 11. Exhorting his readers to fix their gaze on those who have been faithful in obedience, Clement successively cites the examples of Enoch, Noah, and Abraham (9.2–10.3), precisely as is done in Heb 11,5-8», and then describes them in similar ways.[48] For example, both texts stress the faith of Noah and Abraham and the faith associated with the birth of Isaac. *First Clement* gives a rather full account of Rahab (12.1-7), mentioning her faith at the outset (*First Clement* 12.1), just as in Heb 11,31. Hagner shows that further allusions to *Hebrews* 11 appear in other sections of First Clement. Thus Heb 11,37 lies behind *First Clement* 17.1, while Heb 11,34 is alluded to in *First Clement* 55.33ff.

This reliance on *Hebrews* suggests that the author of *First Clement* actually gained from Heb 11 something of foundational importance for his composition of the work – the idea of structuring it around the memory of great figures from the past who were, to use the language of the model, prototypes of an identity-descriptor, a particularly positive aspect of group identity. In the case of *Hebrews* 11 this was faith (πίστις), while the author of *First Clement* wanted to highlight descriptors that were necessary for the Corinthians to hold onto if they were to restore the peace and tranquillity of their church, such as repentance, obedience, faith, piety, hospitality, humility, purity, good order, forgiveness and the sacrifice of self-will. Yet, as we have seen, the author of *First Clement* also referred to the opposite or inversion of group norms (such as jealousy, envy and division) and to the dire effects these produce. And here again, *Hebrews* may have been the stimulus. As we have seen, in Heb 4,11 ὑπόδειγμα is used in relation to faithlessness (ἀπείθεια). Apart from the instance in *2 Peter* (2,6), a late New Testament text to which the author of *First Clement* probably did not allude,[49] this is the only instance of those cited above from the LXX or the New Testament where ὑπόδειγμα relates to a negative disposition or behavior. This may therefore have provided the author with a model for extending the word to encompass values or actions of the sort he wished to stigmatize as typifying the dysfunctional church in Corinth and as representing the antithesis of the norms of the Christ-movement. The circumstance that the ἀπείθεια mentioned in Heb 4,11

[47] Hagner 1973: 179-95.
[48] Hagner 1973: 184.
[49] Hagner 1973: 348 (a conelusion reached after a eareful review of possible allusions).

constitutes precisely the opposite of the πίστις which is celebrated in the great figures of *Hebrews* 11 supports this view.[50]

Yet it is worthwhile noting two points of difference between the two works. Firstly, whereas in *Hebrews* 11 there is really only one identity-descriptor in focus, faith, in *First Clement* there is a much greater range and with respect to the prototypical figures faith itself occupies a smaller role than humility, for example (see 12.1 and 31.2-3). Secondly, the author of *First Clement* does not merely illustrate the group identity-descriptors with figures from Israelite tradition, he relies on men and women from the Christ-movement itself, including Christ himself. This is the result of the a self-conscious decision on his part, as is apparent from 5.1: «But in order to cease from the examples (ὑποδείγματα) from of old, let us come to those who contended nearest to us; let us take the noble examples (ὑποδείγματα) of our own generation». This leads him into a consideration of Peter and Paul (5.2-7) and the great multitude of people killed in the persecution (6), probably that under Nero after the great fire in Rome. Later he relies upon the example of Christ himself (16). This resort to people actually part of the Christ-movement and reasonably close in time to the author underlines the extent to which he is concerned with group identity and views it as extending in a chronological progression from distant past, to recent past and no doubt into the present. The range of possible selves that group members can entertain covers a broad spectrum.

As the last substantive section of this essay, I will now consider a sample of these prototypes and antitypes in more detail, in *First Clement* 3-15, to provide a flavor of how the author uses these devices to advance his case.

IV. Examining some prototypes and antitypes in *First Clement*

1. Prototypes/Exemplars and Antitypes in First Clement *3-6*

As already noted, *First Clement* 3-6 addresses the antithesis of the optimal group identity, while *First Clement* 7 ff. moves, by and large,[51] to consider its positive dimensions. In *First Clement* 3.2 the author catalogues these problems as: jealousy (ζῆλος) and envy (φθόνος), strife (ἔρις) and sedition (στάσις), persecution (διωγμός) and disorder (ἀκαταστασία), war (πόλεμος) and captivity (αἰμαλωσία). Some statistics reveal the centrality of these problems in the

[50] For my study of *Hebrews* 11 in relation to collective memory, see Esler 2005.

[51] But note Lot's wife at 11.2.

text. Jealousy is mentioned first in this list and tops the bill as the worst problem being experienced by Corinth as revealed by its appearance twenty three times in the text.[52] Envy (φθόνος), which the author related closely to jealousy, appears five times,[53] strife (ἔρις) eight times[54] and sedition (στάσις) sixteen times.[55] This is the only instance of persecution but disorder occurs on this and two other occasions.[56]

With Chapter 4 we arrive at the first of the prototypes and antitypes in *First Clement*. At 4.1 the author abruptly announces «For thus it stands written» and then sets out a lengthy quotation of the story of Cain and Abel from Gen 4.3-8, in a form that follows the Septuagint closely.[57] At the conclusion of the quotation the author draws this lesson: «You see, brothers, jealousy (ζῆλος) and envy (φθόνος) produced homicide».[58] Within the framework adopted here, Cain is an antitype, standing for these negative dispositions. They were the first in the list at 3.2 and are thus mentioned first. The author regards jealousy and envy as the major cause of the problem in Corinth. After pointing to this moral, the author lists six other cases where jealousy produced terrible consequences: Jacob running away from Esau (Gen 27,41 – 28,5), Joseph being persecuted (*Genesis* 37), Moses having to flee Egypt (Exod 2,14), Aaron and Miriam being lodged outside the camp (*Numbers* 12), Dathan and Abiram being brought alive into Hades (Num 16.1-35) and David's suffering persecution from Saul (*1 Samuel* 18-31). The figures here who suffered the consequences of jealousy and envy without exhibiting those dispositions themselves, namely, Jacob, Joseph, Moses and David, are prototypes of the identity that the author of *First Clement* is recommending to the Corinthian church. Those who suffered the baleful consequences of jealousy or envy they themselves had exhibited, namely, Cain, Esau, Aaron and Miriam and Dathan and Abiram are antitypes of the desired identity. As such, the first group represent possible selves for the Corinthian Christ-followers, telling them who they could and should be. On the other hand, the second group represent the reverse, telling the Corinthians who they should not be.

---

[52] In *First Clement* the noun ζῆλος occurs at 3.2, 4; 4.7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13; 5.2, 4, 5; 6.1, 2, 3, 4; 9.1; 14.1; 39.7; 43.2; 45.4; 63.2, while the verb ζηλόω appears at 4.3.

[53] 3.2; 4.7, 13 and 5.2 (φθόνος) and 15.5 (φθονέω).

[54] 3.2; 5.5; 6.4; 9.1; 35.5; 44.1; 46.5; 54.2.

[55] 1.1; 2.6; 3.2; 14.2; 46.9; 51.1; 54.2; 57.1; 63.1 (στάσις) and 4.12; 43.2; 46.7; 47.6; 49.5; 51.3; 55.1 (στασιάζω).

[56] 14.1 and 43.6.

[57] Hagner 1973: 38-39.

[58] Although in many contexts jealousy means the passionate (often disproportionate) preservation of what is one's own, while envy refers to the feeling of begrudging someone a good he or she possesses and a desire to gain it for oneself (see Malina 2001: 126-28), the author of *First Clement* does not draw such a distinction.

2. *Prototypes and Antitypes in* First Clement *7-16*

In Chapter 7 the author draws out a lesson for both the Corinthian and Roman churches. He reminds his audience that Christ's blood was poured out for «our salvation» and «brought the grace of repentance (μετάνοια) to the whole world». In generation after generation the Master has given the grace of repentance to those who turn to him. Thus repentance clearly forms part of the identity of Christ-followers and to illustrate the point he refers to the repentance of Noah and of the Ninevites, even though the later were aliens to God. These figures then become prototypes of Christ-follower identity-descriptor of repentance, with the Ninevites perhaps most suitable for those who had been idolaters prior to their conversion to Christ. *First Clement* 8 reinforces the importance of repentance by quoting teaching from Old Testament prophets rather than through the vehicle of prototypical figures. Chapter 9 marks the author's introduction of the virtue – or, in our terms, identity-descriptor – of obedience (ὑπακουή). The figures chosen to prototypify obedience are Enoch (9.3), Noah (9.4) and Abraham (10.1-7).

Yet Abraham is also described as faithful and hospitable (10.7) and hospitality (φιλοξενία) also characterizes Lot (11.1; also mentioned on account of his piety [εὐσέβεια]) and Rahab (11.1-7; also mentioned for her faith [πίστις]).

Lot's wife is mentioned immediately after Lot (11.2). But she is portrayed as typifying the negative disposition of being «double-minded» (δίψυχος), here meaning to have doubts concerning the power of God. While this word only appears twice more in *First Clement* (23.2: the noun and 23.3: its verbal form), it plays a major role in another early Roman text, the *Shepherd of Hermas*.

The author then proceeds to discuss the identity-descriptor of being humble-minded (ταπεινοφρονέω), which stands in stark contrast to the pathological dispositions such as arrogance, conceit, foolishness and wrath, without the use of prototypes (13). After an exhortation that covers many of the positive features of identity and their opposites that have been mentioned hitherto (14-15), the author describes Christ as exemplifying humble-mindedness, by means of a quotation of the fourth Suffering Servant Song in Isaiah, here Isa 53.1-12, (16).

These details provide a reasonable sample of how the author uses prototypes and antitypes.

V. Conclusion

Social identity theory offers useful resources for explaining the presence and the force of some thirty five individuals, pairs or larger

groups of people from the past, most of them, but by no means all, from Israelite tradition. These characters stand to be interpreted either (a) as prototypes, that is, persons embodying positively valued expressions of an experience, disposition or action characteristic of the identity Christ-movement, or (b) as antitypes, people representing the opposite of such experience, disposition or behavior. Prototypes are possible selves for the members, to be emulated as the way to interiorise whatever they embody. Antitypes tell the members what to shun. Here, to conclude, we have an example of social-scientific theory allowing us to characterize phenomena in a text in new way that situates this work in larger frameworks of Christian identity construction, not just in early Rome, but in other parts of the Christian movement.

List of references

Assmann, Aleida – Friese, Heidrun, eds. (1999a) *Identitäten: Erinnerung, Geschichte, Identität 3.* Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.

– (1999b) "Einleitung", in: Assmann–Friese 1999a: 11-23.

Beyschlag, Karlmann (1966) *Clemens Romanus und der Frühkatholizmus: Untersuchungen zu 1 Clemens 1-7.* BHth 35. Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck.

Barnard, L.W. (1966) "St. Clement of Rome and the Persecution of Domitian", in his *Studies in the Apostolic Fathers and Their Background.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 5-18.

– (1967) "The Early Roman Church, Judaism and Jewish-Christianity", Anglican Theological Review 49: 372-78.

Barton, Carlin A. (2001) *Roman Honor: The Fire in the Bones.* Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: University of California Press.

Bowe, Barbara Ellen (1988) *A Church in Crisis: Ecclesiology and Paraenesis in Clement of Rome.* Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

Brown, Rupert (1988) *Group Processes: Dynamics Within and Between Groups.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell. This text is also cited in the 2000 second edition of the same name. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Cinnirella, Marco (1998) "Exploring Temporal Aspects of Social Identity: The Concept of Possible Social Identities", European Journal of Social Psychology 28: 227-48.

Condor, Susan (1996) "Social Identity and Time", in: Robinson 1996: 285-315.

Culpepper, Alan R. (1991) "The Johannine Hypodeigma: A Reading of John 13:-38", in: Culpepper, Alan R. – Segovia, Fernando F., eds. (1991) Semeia 53: The *Fourth Gospel from a Literary Perspective.* Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 133-52.

Donfried, Karl P. – Richardson, Peter, eds. (1998) *Judaism and Christianityin First Century Rome.* Grand Rapids, MI and Cambridge: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.

Eisenbaum, Pamela, (1997) *The Jewish Heroes of Christian History: Hebrews 11 in Literary Context.* SBLDS 156. Atlanta: Scholars.
Esler, Philip F. (1998) *Galatians.* London and New York: Routledge.
– (2003a) *Conflict and Identity in Romans: The Social Setting of Paul's Letter.* Minneapolis: Fortress.
– (2003b) "Social Identity, the Virtues and the Good Life: A New Approach to Romans 12:1-15:13", Biblical Theology Bulletin 33: 51-63.
– (2005) "Collective Memory and *Hebrews* 11: Outlining a New Investigative Framework", in: Kirk–Thatcher 2005: 151-71.
Foster, L.A. (1958) *Clement of Rome and His Literary Sources.* Harvard Ph.D.
Grant, R.M. (1957) "Appendix II: Greek Exegetical Terminology", in: *The Letter and the Spirit.* London. SPCK, 120-42.
Hagner, Donald Alfred (1973) *The Use of the Old and New Testaments in Clement of Rome.* Supplements to *NovT*, Volume 34. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
Harnack, Adolf von (1929) *Einführung in die Alte Kirchengeschichte: Das Schreiben der römischen Kirche an die korinthische aus der Zeit Domitians. 1. Clemensbrief.* Leipzig: Hinrichs.
Haslam, S. Alexander (2001) *Psychology in Organizations: The Social Identity Approach.* London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi: Sage Publications.
Jeffers, James S. (1991) *Conflict at Rome: Social Order and Hierarchy in Early Christianity.* Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
Jefford, Clayton N. (1996) *Reading the Apostolic Fathers: An Introduction.* Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers.
Kirk, Alan – Thatcher, Tom, eds., (2005) *Memory, Tradition, and Text: Uses of the Past in Early Christianity Christian.* Semeia Studies, 52. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.
Koester, Craig R. (2001) *Hebrews: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary.* The Anchor Bible. New York: Doubleday.
Kraft, Henry (1963) *Clavis Patrum Apostolicorum: Catalogum Vocum in Libris Patrum Qui Dicuntur Apostolici Non Raro Occurrentium Adiuvante Ursula Früchtel Congessit Contulit Conscripsit.* Munich: Kösel Verlag.
Lampe, Peter (2003) *From Paul to Valentinus: Christians at Rome in the First Two Centuries.* Minneapolis: Fortress.
Lane, William L. (1998) "Social Perspectives on Roman Christianity during the Formative Years from Nero to Nerva: Romans, *Hebrews*, *1 Clement*", in: Donfried and Richardson 1998: 196-244.
Lendon, Jon E. (1997) *Empire of Honour: The Art of Government in the* Roman World. Oxford and New York: Clarendon Press and Oxford University Press.
Lightfoot, J.B. – Harmer, J.R. (1990) *The Apostolic Fathers.* Second edition edited and revised by Michael R. Holmes. Leicester, England: Apollos.
Maier, Harry O. (2002) *The Social Setting of the Ministry as Reflected in the Writings of the Hermas, Clement and Ignatius.* Waterloo, Ontario: Wilfrid Laurier University Press.

Malina, Bruce J. (2001) *The New Testament World: Insights from Cultural Anthropology.* Third revised and expanded edition. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press.
Mohmann, C. (1949) "Les Origines de la Latinité Chrétienne à Rome", Vigiliae Christianae 3: 67-106; 163-83. PerBR2.V5C5
Morin, Germanus, ed. (1894) *Sancti Clementis Romani ad Corinthios epistulae versio latina antiquissima.* Maredsoli: The editor and Oxford: J. Parker and Soc.
Robinson, Peter, ed. (1996) *Social Groups and Identities: Developing the Legacy of Henri Tajfel.* Oxford: Butterworth Heinnemann.
Schlier, Heinrich (1964) "ὑπόδειγμα", TDNT 2: 32-33.
Sherif, M. – Sherif, C.W. (1953) *Groups in Harmony and Tension: An Integration of Studies on Intergroup Relations.* New York: Octagon Books.
Sherif, M. – White B.J. – Harvey, O.J. (1955) "Status in Experimentally Produced Groups", American Journal of Sociology 60: 370-9.
Smith, Eliot R. – Zarate, Michael A. (1990) "Exemplar and Prototype Use in Social Categorization", Social Cognition 8: 243-62.
Starr, James – Engberg-Pedersen, Troels, eds. (2004) *Early Christian Paraenesis in Context.* Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter.
Tajfel, Henri, ed. (1978) *Differentiation between Social Groups: Studies in the Social Psychology of Intergroup Relations.* London: Academic Press.
– (1981) *Human Groups and Social Categories: Studies in Social Psychology.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Tajfel, Henri – Billig, Michael G. – Bundy, R.F. – Flament, C. (1971) "Social Categorization and Intergroup Behavior", European Journal of Social Psychology 1: 149-77.
Turner, C.H. (1912a) *Studies in Early Church History.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.
– (1912b) "St. Clement's Epistle and the Early Roman Church", in: Turner 1912a: 220-49.
– (1912c) "On the Value For Textual Purposes of the Latin Versions of St. Clement's Epistle", an Appendix to Turner 1912a: 250-56.

Philip F. Esler
The Acts and Humanities Research Council Whitefriars
Lewins Mead
Bristol BS1 2AE
United Kingdom
P.Esler@ahrc.ac.uk

ATLAS erials

Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may priut, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the eopyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.