JAMES PETITFILS

Mos Christianorum

Studien und Texte zu Antike und Christentum
99

Mohr Siebeck

Studien und Texte zu Antike und Christentum
Studies and Texts in Antiquity and Christianity

Herausgeber/Editors
Christoph Markschies (Berlin) · Martin Wallraff (Basel)
Christian Wildberg (Princeton)

Beirat/Advisory Board
Peter Brown (Princeton) · Susanna Elm (Berkeley)
Johannes Hahn (Münster) · Emanuela Prinzivalli (Rom)
Jörg Rüpke (Erfurt)

99

James Petitfils

Mos Christianorum

The Roman Discourse of Exemplarity and the Jewish and Christian Language of Leadership

Mohr Siebeck

James Petitfils, born 1981; 2013 PhD from the University of California, Los Angeles; currently Assistant Professor of New Testament and Early Christianity at Biola University.

e-ISBN PDF 978-3-16-154023-3
ISBN 978-3-16-153904-6
ISSN 1436-3003 (Studien und Texte zu Antike und Christentum)

Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliographie; detailed bibliographic data are available on the Internet at *http://dnb.dnb.de*.

© 2016 by Mohr Siebeck, Tübingen, Germany. www.mohr.de

This book may not be reproduced, in whole or in part, in any form (beyond that permitted by copyright law) without the publisher's written permission. This applies particularly to reproductions, translations, microfilms and storage and processing in electronic systems.

The book was printed by Laupp & Göbel in Gomaringen on non-aging paper and bound by Buchbinderei Nädele in Nehren.

Printed in Germany.

To Braelyn

Acknowledgments

Reading through the final drafts of this monograph has been, on a personal and emotional level, like exploring the contents of a time capsule. Page after page brought to mind the institutions, people, and moments that have given shape to both the work and its author. While this book is certainly one of the culminating products of my graduate experience, it is the rich relational moments cultivated in its production that I will treasure forever. As a revision of my Ph.D. dissertation (2013), anything worthwhile in this book is likely a result of the magnificent research environment that is the University of California, Los Angeles. Beyond UCLA's wonderful facilities and rigorous academic ethos, one could not ask for a more supportive dissertation committee. My dissertation chair, S. Scott Bartchy, lavishly invested his time, innovative approaches, and indefatigable passion into my scholarship and life. Ronald Mellor, with his captivating teaching and encyclopedic knowledge, nurtured in me a deep appreciation for and developing understanding of the world and words of the ancient Romans. Ra'anan Boustan, a scholar exemplifying the balance between methodological sophistication, erudition, and creativity, introduced me to so many of the integral questions and dialogue partners in this book. Finally, Carol Bakhos proved a stimulating academic mentor, patient source of encouragement, and all-around life-giving human being. Though an additional book could be written praising these remarkable committee members, any shortcomings in the present monograph are exclusively my own.

A number of additional individuals and communities proved invaluable to the inception and completion of this project. I am thankful for the camaraderie and engaging conversations with my (former) fellow graduate students at UCLA, in particular, Joseph Sanzo, Kevin Scull, Sue Russell, and Patrick McCollough. Also, the entire family of Biola University's Talbot School of Theology afforded (and continues to furnish) countless *exempla* of excellent scholarship and servant leadership in the tradition of Christ. I am truly humbled to serve alongside these extraordinary women and men. Clint Arnold, my former teacher and now boss, first ignited in me an insatiable curiosity about the ancient Mediterranean world and Joseph Hellerman has, for the last ten years, selflessly and self-sacrificially given of his time, heart, prayers, brilliance, and love to my development as a scholar, pastor, and

follower of Christ. Logan Williams deserves special thanks as he has tirelessly and skillfully contributed the copy-editing and indexing of the final manuscript. I am very appreciative to Henning Ziebritzki and Profs. Markschies, Wallraff, and Wildberg for agreeing to include my work in Mohr Siebeck's prestigious STAC series, and Bettina Gade and Klaus Hermannstädter for their very able editorial assistance in bringing the publication to fruition.

Finally, I must acknowledge my debt to those who have imparted so much life during my graduate work and in the preparation of this book. To my best friends, Chris Ioimo, Jack Davis, and Ryan Sholty, I am thankful for their provision of solidarity, laughter, and many sanity-preserving study breaks. I owe an incalculable debt of gratitude to the River Church family (especially Todd, Denise, Jim, Jeff, Janie, and Matt) and the entire Wendorff family for investing so extravagantly into my marriage, children, and soul. Also, I am so grateful for my parents, Sam and Peggy Petitfils, who raised me in love and have only ever affirmed my academic journey. This book is dedicated to my best friend and love of my life, Braelyn, who sacrificed the most as I too often lost myself in this long decade of research.

Redondo Beach, August 2016 James Petitfils

Table of Contents

Acknowledgments VII

List of Abbreviations XVII

Chapter 1: Introduction 1

A. Overview of Scholarship on Roman *Exempla* and Exemplarity Leadership 4

I. *Exempla* and Roman Exemplarity in Scholarship 4
II. Ancient Discourse on Leadership Related to the Figure of Christ 7

B. Overview of Chapters 11

Chapter 2: The Discourse of Exemplarity in the Ancient Mediterranean World 17

A. Examples (παραδείγματα) in Ancient Greek Rhetoric, Education, and Patriotism 18

I. The Greek παράδειγμα: Definition and Place in Rhetorical Theory 18
1. Defining παράδειγμα 18
2. Παράδειγμα in *Rhetorica ad Alexandrum* 19
3. Aristotle 19
II. The Pedagogic and Patriotic Use of παραδείγματα in Greek Culture 20
1. Poetry in Greek Society 20
2. Speeches of Praise 21

B. *Exempla* and Exemplarity in Roman Culture 22

I. Definition and Taxonomical Matters 23
II. *Exempla* in Specific Authors/Rhetorical Handbooks 26

1. *Auctor ad Herennium* 26
2. Marcus Tullius Cicero 26
3. Marcus Fabius Quintilianus 28
III. The Broader Discourse of Exemplarity 29
IV. Venues for the Deployment of *Exempla* in Roman Society and Culture 32
1. Roman Education 33
2. *Imagines* in Roman Culture 35
3. Popular Oratory and Exemplarity 39
4. Architecture, Statues, and Inscriptions 41
5. Exemplarity in Roman Historiography 44

C. Conclusion 45

Chapter 3: Notions of Exemplary Leadership in Roman Society and Culture 47

A. Major Categories of Exemplary Leadership in Roman Society and Culture 49

I. Noble Lineage 49
II. Courage and Martial Prowess 52
III. Education and Eloquence 58
IV. Personal Frugality and Generous Patronage 62
V. Piety towards the Gods 66
1. Definition 66
2. Excursus: The Nature of Roman Religion 67
a) Public vs. Private Practice 67
b) Formalism and the *Mos Maiorum* 68
c) Orthopraxy 68
d) Empirical Epistemology 69
e) Religion and Society 70
3. Leadership and Roman Piety 70

B. Exemplary Leadership in Cornelius Nepos and Plutarch 72

C. *Laudationes* and Exemplary Leadership 74

D. Honorable Leadership in *De Officiis* 76

I. Noble Lineage in *De Officiis* 77
II. Courage and Martial Prowess in *De Officiis* 78

III. Rhetorical Ability in *De Officiis* 79
IV. Generous Patronage in *De Officiis* 81
V. Piety and Other Cardinal Virtues in *De Officiis* 83

E. Conclusion 85

Chapter 4: Moses as an *Exemplum* of Native Leadership in Philo's *De Vita Mosis* and Josephus' *Antiquities* 2–4 87

A. Josephus and Philo's Relative Exposure to Roman Culture and Politics 89

I. Romanization in the East 89
II. Josephus' Exposure to Roman Culture and Politics 90
III. Philo's Alexandria and Experience with Rome 93

B. "A Tale of Two Moseses" 98

I. Josephus' Moses (*Ant.* 2–4) 98
1. Noble Lineage 99
2. Bravery and Martial Prowess 100
a) Action 102
b) Audience 102
c) Commemoration 103
d) Imitation 103
3. Education and Eloquence 105
a) Action 105
b) Audience 106
c) Commemoration 106
d) Imitation 107
4. Generous Patronage 108
a) Action 108
b) Audience 109
c) Commemoration 110
d) Imitation 110
5. The Josephan Favorite: "Piety" 111
a) Action 112
b) Audience 113
c) Commemoration 113
d) Imitation 114
II. Philo's Portrayal of Moses' Exemplary Leadership in *Mos.* 1–2 115
1. Noble Lineage 117

2. Bravery and Martial Prowess 119
3. Moses' Education and Eloquence 120
a) Action 122
b) Audience 122
c) Commemoration 123
d) Imitation 123
4. Personal Frugality and Generous Patronage 124
5. The Philonic Favorite: "Piety" 125
a) Philo's General View of God 126
b) Philo's View of God in *Mos*. 1–2 128
c) Manifestations of Piety in *Mos*. 1–2 129
6. Moses Balancing Reason and Emotions 131
III. Josephus and Philo's Elevating the Figure of Moses in Light of Roman Discourse 133
1. Josephus and Philo's Shared Exaltation of Moses 133
2. Consolidation of Virtue in Valerius Maximus 135
a) Noble Lineage 135
b) Courage and Martial Prowess 136
c) Education and Eloquence 137
d) Personal Frugality and Generous Patronage 137
e) Piety toward the Divine 138
3. Traditional Roman Leadership Preferences in Josephus and Philo 138
4. Form: Traditional Roman Discourse of Exemplarity in Josephus and Philo 139

C. Conclusion and Implications 139

Chapter 5: *Exempla* and Roman Exemplarity in *1 Clement* 141

A. Overview of *1 Clement* 142

I. Preservation and Date of Composition 142
II. Authorship 143
III. Genre and Structure 144
IV. Occasion 145
V. Previous Scholarship on Leadership and Rhetoric in *1 Clement* 146
VI. Advocating a "Native" Morality of Leadership on the Way to Restoring Harmony 149

B. *Exempla* in *1 Clement* 150

I. Ubiquity of *Exempla* 150
II. Selection of *Exempla* 152

C. Leadership Ideals 154

I. Noble Lineage 155
II. Courage, Martial Prowess, and Endurance in *1 Clement* 157
1. Martial Images 157
2. Agonistic Endurance (ὑπομονή) 159
III. Eloquence 161
IV. Generous Patronage 163
V. Piety 164
1. Εὐσέβεια 164
2. General Emphasis on the Divine 165
3. Piety and Orderly Ritual 167
4. Piety as Encompassing All Virtue 169
VI. Love (ἀγάπη) 170
VII. Humility (ταπεινοφροσύνη) 174
1. Unelaborated Exhortations to Humility 174
2. Extended *Exempla* of Humility 176
3. Humility as an Enduring, Honorable Attribute in *1 Clement* 178
4. Excursus: The ταπεινο-Word Group in Ancient Mediterranean Literature 182
a) Traditional "Greco-Roman" Usage 182
i) Epictetus (55–135 CE) 185
ii) Plutarch (46–120 CE) 186
iii) Positive Usage in Plutarch 187
b) The ταπεινο-Word Group in the LXX and Jewish Literature 190
i) Usage in the LXX 190
ii) Other Uses in Jewish Literature 193
c) The ταπεινο-Word Group in the New Testament 194
5. "Humility" in *1 Clement* as a Pauline Preservation 196

D. Conclusion 198

Chapter 6: The Martyrs of Vienne and Lyons as *Exempla* of Christian Leadership 200

A. Overview of the *Letter of the Churches of Vienne and Lyons* 201

I. Date and Contents 201

II. Review of Scholarship on *Lyons* 203

B. Preservation of the *Letter of the Churches of Vienne and Lyons* 211

C. The Presence and Nature of Roman Power and Culture in Gaul 216

I. General Roman Power in the Region 217
II. Roman Patronage Networks in Gaul 217
III. Roman Law and Administration in Gaul 218
IV. Roman Material Culture in Gaul 219
V. Instilling and Broadcasting Roman *Mores* 221
VI. Lyons and Vienne 223

D. Exemplary Discourse on Leadership in the *Letter of the Churches of Vienne and Lyons* 224

I. The Martyrs of Lyons and Vienne as Paragons of Leadership 224
II. The First Depiction of the Martyrs as a Group (*Lyons* 1.4–8) 225
III. Vettius Epagathus (*Lyons* 1.9–10) 227
IV. Two General Groups: Martyrs vs. the Stillborn (*Lyons* 1.11–13) 229
V. Blandina (*Lyons* 1.18–19, 37, 41–42, 53–56) 230
VI. Sanctus (*Lyons* 1.20–24, 38–40) 235
VII. *Lyons* 2.1–8 238
1. Humility 239
2. Love 241

E. *Lyons* in Light of Traditional Roman Leadership Attributes 243

I. Noble Lineage 243
II. Courage and Martial Prowess 244
III. Eloquence 246
IV. Patronage 246
V. Piety 247
VI. Love and Humility 247

F. Conclusion 248

Chapter 7: Conclusion 250

Bibliography 253

Index of Ancient Sources 266

Index of Modern Authors.....286
Index of Subjects.....290

List of Abbreviations

1 Clem.	*1 Clement*
Abr.	*De Abrahamo*
Ach.	*Achilleis*
Aen.	*Aeneid*
Aeschyl.	Aeschylus
Ag.	*Agesilaus*
Alc.	*Alcibiades*
Ant.	*Antiquitates Judaicae*
Ann.	*Annales*
Att.	*Atticus*
Aug.	*Divus Augustus*
Auct. ad Her.	*Auctor ad Herennium*
Bell. Iug.	*Bellum Iugurthinum*
Bell. Jud.	*Bellum Judaicum*
C. Ap.	*Contra Apionem*
Ca.	Cato
Cat. Mai.	Cato Maior, Minor
Cic.	Cicero
CIL	*Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*
Cim.	*Cimon*
Dat.	Datames
De Lib. Educ.	*De Liberis Educandis*
De orat.	*De Oratore*
De Sera	*De Sera Numinis Vindicta*
Di.	Dion
Diss.	*Discourses*
Dom.	*Domitianus*
Ep.	*Epistulae*
Epam.	*Epaminondas*
Eum.	*Eumenes*
Flac.	*Flaccus*
Haer.	*Adversus Haereses*
Ham.	*Hamilcar*
Han.	*Hannibal*
Har. Resp.	*De Haruspicum Responso*

H. E.	*Ecclesiastical History*
Hist.	*History*
ILS	*Inscriptiones Latinae*
Inst.	*Institutio Oratoria*
Iph.	*Iphicrates*
LCL	*Loeb Classical Library*
Leg.	*De Legibus*
Legat.	*Legatio ad Gaium*
Lyons	*Letter of the Churches of Vienna and Lyons*
Mor.	*Moralia*
Mos.	*De Vita Mosis*
Nat.	*Naturalis Historia*
Nep.	Cornelius Nepos
Num.	*Numa*
Off.	*De Officiis*
Or.	*Oratio*
Pan.	*Panegyricus*
Phoc.	*Phocion*
Praep. ev.	*Praeparatio Evangelica*
Plut.	Plutarch
Poly.	Polybius
Praef.	Preface
Ps.Plut.	Pseudo-Plutarch
PV	*Prometheus Vinctus*
Quaest Rom.	*Quaestiones Romanae*
Reg.	*Reges*
Rep.	*The Republic*
Rhet. ad Alex.	*Rhetorica ad Alexandrum*
Spec. Leg.	*De Specialibus Legibus*
Strom.	*Stromata*
Suet.	Suetonius Tranquillus
TDNT	*Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*
Thr.	*Thrasybulus*
Val. Max.	*Facta et Dicta Memorabilia*
Verg.	Virgil

All abbreviations of biblical and apocryphal texts follow *The SBL Handbook of Style* (2nd ed.; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2014).

Chapter 1

Introduction

It is not only the contents of [philosophy] which we should know and constantly turn over in our minds; even more important are the records of the notable sayings and actions of the past. Nowhere is there a larger or more striking supply of these than in the history of our own country. Could there be any better teachers of courage, justice, loyalty, self-control, frugality, or contempt for pain and death than men like Fabricius, Curius, Regulus, Decius, Mucius, and countless others? Rome is as strong in examples as Greece is in precepts; and examples are more important.[1]

As this quotation from the late 1st century rhetorician Quintilian suggests, the preferred ethical curriculum of an elite Roman education largely consisted of exemplary stories and descriptions of Rome's native heroes.[2] Whether in the home, the classroom, the forum, or the arena, Romans were regularly encountering, digesting, and deploying narratives offering ancestors, ancient heroes, or contemporary notables as paragons of virtue or vice. As a growing number of scholars have demonstrated, moreover, this pedagogical preference for example over precept was in no way exclusive to the literate elite, but was shared by "all of Roman society, from the loftiest aristocrats to the humblest peasants, laborers, and slaves."[3] Thus, when Roman writers, orators, or parents wished to articulate or inculcate their conceptions of virtuous leadership, they consistently deployed *exempla* (of varying degrees of sophistication) as rhetorical vehicles of the *mos maiorum* (way of the ancestors).[4]

This ongoing moral dialogue was inevitably a major feature of the ideological and didactic geography in which the members of non-Roman ethnic groups and voluntary associations throughout the empire organized

[1] Quint. *Inst*. 12.2.29; see Morgan (2007: 125).

[2] In his classic *History of Education in Antiquity*, H. I. Marrou summarizes, "the old Greek education [was] an imitation of heroes in the Homeric style; Roman education was an imitation of one's ancestors" (1982: 236).

[3] Roller (2004: 6). Cf. Hölkeskamp (1996: 305–308); and Morgan (2007: 1–8). I will review these contributions below.

[4] Marrou underscores the centrality of the ancestral ethic in Roman education: "Its fundamental idea, the thing it was based on, was respect for the old customs – *mos maiorum* – and to open the eyes of the young to these, to get them to respect them unquestionably as the ideal, as the standard for all their actions and all their thoughts, was the educator's main task" (1982: 231).

their communities, socialized their boys and girls, and distinguished their leaders. How did these groups interact with and respond to this Roman cultural conversation? What effects, if any, did the Roman cultural penchant for ancestral *exempla* have on the literary production and moral instruction of these communities? More precisely, in what ways did such authors navigate, eschew, or participate in this ubiquitous didactic discourse as they contended for their particular understandings of ideal ancestral leadership? In the chapters that follow, I will begin to address these largely overlooked lines of inquiry by focusing on a small sample of texts 1) written in highly Romanized cultural contexts but 2) advocating non-Roman native traditions of exemplary leadership.[5]

While I will listen to a number of both ethnically and legally Roman and non-Roman voices participating in the polyvocal cultural interchange on exemplary leadership, my project culminates with a sustained exploration of two corporate correspondences produced by Christ-confessing communities in the western Roman Empire – namely, the *Letter of the Romans to the Corinthians* (*1 Clement*) and the *Letter of the Churches of Vienne and Lyons* (*Lyons*). Following an extended survey of the form, function, and broad popularity of rhetorical *exempla* and exemplary discourse in the western empire, as well as a study of multiple texts liberally deploying leadership *exempla* (including the works of Cornelius Nepos, Cicero, Plutarch, Valerius Maximus, Flavius Josephus, and Philo of Alexandria, et al.), I will seek to

[5] In this book I will be using the term "Roman" and the concept of "Romanness" in at least three (at times overlapping) ways. First, I will frequently use "Roman" as a geographic and ethno-linguistic label, signifying Latin-speaking Italian natives. This usage covers concrete historical actors (e.g. Cicero, Virgil, or Augustus) as well as mythic Roman ancestors (e.g. Romulus, Lucretia, or Horatius Cocles). It is often in this sense that I use the terms "Roman" or "non-Roman" to describe an ancestor or exemplary figure or tradition celebrated in a particular text. Legally, "Roman" may more broadly designate an individual possessing Roman citizenship, irrespective of their language or place of birth (e.g. Josephus or Plutarch). Finally, as a cultural label the term encompasses a series of discourses (moral and otherwise), practices, and material products (e.g. *terra sigillata* pottery, epigraphy, amphitheaters) originating in significant Italian urban centers and broadly disseminated and variously replicated throughout the Roman world (in the case of material culture, I do not mean that the products themselves were all produced in Italy, but that the preferences for such items and perhaps their designs originated in Roman centers). Culturally, though signifying recognizable and in certain cases relatively stable characteristics, "Romanness" was far from a monolithic, uncontested notion; it was constantly up for debate and re-negotiation, and its boundaries (as configured in various discourses) were continually in need of re-inscription. Moreover, participation in Roman culture was neither restricted to native Italians, Roman citizens, or elites. Rather, as my project will demonstrate with respect to Roman exemplarity, ethnically and legally non-Romans could actively participate in Roman culture and their deployment of even ethnically non-Roman *exempla* (e.g. Moses or Christ) could culturally be considered quite Roman.

trace the way in which *1 Clement* and *Lyons* adopt, adapt, or eschew both the *form* and *content* of the Roman discourse of exemplarity as they deal with intracommunal issues of leadership and authority. In terms of *form*, I will examine the rhetorical and narratological shape of the *exempla* deployed in these texts. With respect to *content*, I will highlight the core values and leadership attributes celebrated in these non-Roman ancestral *exempla* in light of the popularly advertized attributes and morals characterizing paradigmatic Roman leaders.

In addition to synthesizing a diverse body of scholarship on "example" in Roman antiquity as well as outlining and textually substantiating several popular and relatively stable categories of exemplary Roman leadership, my project will provide a nuanced exploration of at least three texts (Josephus' *Ant.* 2–4; *1 Clement*, and *Lyons*) offering native paradigms of leadership in the cultural and political contexts of the Roman west. Among other contributions, my work demonstrates these authors' robust participations in the Roman discourse of exemplarity as well as their relative appropriation and "naturalization" of many (though not all) traditional Roman leadership priorities. Moreover, I show the utility of the Roman discourse(s) to preserve and articulate distinctive "native" leadership traditions. In *Antiquities* 2–4, for example, while the Josephan Moses reflects traditional Roman preferences for noble birth, martial prowess, and eloquence (among other leadership characteristics), these attributes are all dramatically eclipsed by and subsumed under the category of the paragon's unparalleled piety. Both *1 Clement* and *Lyons*, to take another example, celebrate the courage and agonistic endurance of their *exempla* while simultaneously eschewing the cherished Roman leadership priorities of bloodline and traditionally ascribed honor. More conspicuously, these texts deploy characteristically Roman discursive practices to advocate the rather un-Roman, Pauline leadership priority of "humility" (ταπεινοφροσύνη).

Put differently, my project does not challenge the notion that these texts actively sought to present their non-Roman ancestral leaders (especially the figures of Moses and Christ) as distinct from and superior to traditional Roman *exempla*. Rather, I seek to demonstrate that even in the throes of cultural competition, the pedagogical approach and many of the leadership priorities in these authors' native accounts reflect their specific historical moments and Roman cultural contexts. At the same time, especially in the cases of *1 Clement* and *Lyons*, participation in the Roman discourse of exemplarity did not necessarily discourage patently un-Roman virtues; on the contrary, the flexible and debate-welcoming conversation provided a rhetorically and narratologically intelligible means of inculcating such

attributes in the context of the Roman west.[6] In fact, the Roman preoccupation with ancestral models of leadership seems to have fueled the literary deployment of Christ and Christ-imitating authoritative paragons.

A. Overview of Scholarship on Roman *Exempla* and Exemplary Leadership

While particular chapters in my book will challenge scholarly assumptions and approaches related to those chapters' specific topics and foci, my overall project is not fundamentally polemical. Rather, my project seeks to fill lacunae in the study of 1) Roman example and moral pedagogy and 2) ancient discourse on leadership related to the figure of Christ. Because each major section of my book includes extensive interaction with relevant scholarship and the last two chapters involve substantial historiographical reviews, I will limit the present discussion to the most significant projects dealing with the abovementioned fields.

I. Exempla *and Roman Exemplarity in Scholarship*

By far, the majority of scholarly attention on example (*exemplum* or παράδειγμα) in Roman antiquity deals with its deployment in formal rhetoric. The definitive works on this topic include two dissertations, namely, Hildegard Kornhardt's Göttingen thesis (1936) and Bennett Price's Berkeley dissertation (1975). Both consider the nature and various prescriptions for the use of example in the major ancient Greek and Roman rhetorical handbooks. Of course, other scholars additionally examining various nuances of such formal persuasive deployment share their focus.[7]

Furthermore, most works dealing with Christ and other biblical figures as examples examine them in view of the Greco-Roman rhetorical handbooks.

[6] This is not to suggest that authors intentionally modeled their narratives after the Roman discourse. Rather, the pedagogical approach was likely inherited simply due to these authors' prolonged exposure to the cultural conversation – a conversation that, as I will demonstrate, was a perennial element of the moral and ideological ambiance of urban centers like Rome and Gaul.

[7] Several of these studies provide a general overview of the rhetorical *exemplum* or παράδειγμα in ancient literature; see Lumpe (1966: 57), Hock and O'Neil (1986 and 2002); Kaufmann (1994) or van Der Poel (2009). Others treat the use of rhetorical *exempla* in specific Roman authors. Robinson (1986) and Stinger (1993), for example, treat the Ciceronian corpus, while Valerius Maximus is dealt with by a litany of scholars including Helm (1939), Klotz (1942), Honstetter (1981), Maslakov (1984), Bloomer (1987), Mueller (1994), and Skidmore (1996). Additionally, Mayer (1991) devotes an article to Roman historical *exempla* in Seneca.

Michael Cosby (1988), for example, explores the rhetoric of *exempla* lists in antiquity. After examining the rules for *exempla* in the *progymnasmata* (systematically presented in a very helpful appendix), Cosby provides a rhetorical analysis of the example lists in Hebrews 11 as well as *1 Clem.* 4–6; 9.2–12.8; and 17–18. Similarly, Hélène Pétré (1940) explores Tertullian's formal deployment of *exempla*.[8] Finally, with a later chronological focus than these projects, Elizabeth Goldfarb (2005) provides a comprehensive analysis of the fusion of classical *exemplum* and scriptural hero in the formation of a distinctive exemplary discourse in post-classical literature.[9] Again, these studies are primarily limited to *exempla* (and related tools of persuasion) in the context of the rhetorical exercises and guidelines found in Greco-Roman *progymnasmata*.

Moving beyond this more narrow literary and rhetorical focus, Matthew Roller builds on the work of Karl-Joachim Hölkeskamp (1996), directing scholarly attention to the broader social and cultural context of the Roman deployment of *exempla*. In his watershed article, "Exemplarity in Roman Culture: The Cases of Horatius Cocles and Cloelia" (2004), a work I will discuss in detail in chapter 2, Roller explores the Roman habit of mining the past for behavioral models and presents the main features of what he calls "'exemplary' discourse in Roman culture".[10] His focus on example as a ubiquitously deployed tool of moral formation and socialization in Roman culture, though certainly not the first project to consider the moral utility of *exempla*, has been well received among Classicists and Roman historians.[11]

---

[8] Furthermore, many projects examining early Christ-confessing literature focus on rhetorical phenomena very similar to *exempla*. For example, in an effort to better understand the "pronouncement story" and its significance with respect to Gospel narratives, Vernon Robins and the "SBL Pronouncement Story Work Group" engaged in a 10-year study exploring pronouncement stories and the related rhetorical form χρεία. According to Robbins, the somewhat broad rhetorical category of χρεία discourse "concerns speech and/or action attributed to a specific person. Therefore, discourse which allows the personage behind it to disappear is not chreia discourse" (1993: xiv). The group's study culminated in a number of publications, including Robbins' *Ancient Quotes and Anecdotes: From Crib to Crypt* (1989) and a series of articles in *Semeia* 64 (1993) outlining an expanded taxonomy of χρεία, and exploring pronouncement stories and χρεία in the Gospels as well as Rabbinic and Hadithic literature.

[9] For additional treatments of *exempla* in late antique Christian sources, see Studer (1985); Torvend (1990); Demoen (1996); and Ayres (2009).

[10] Roller (2004: 4).

[11] Works focusing on the moral utility of *exempla*, include Litchfield (1914) and Morgan (2007), among others. In the latter work, Morgan studies the *exempla* preserved in Valerius Maximus' *Facta et Dicta Memorabilia* as sources for reconstructing both elite and "popular" morality. Cf. Skidmore (1996) and van der Blom (2010). A number of German projects have appeared which deal with *exempla* and the Romans' pedagogical use of the past; for notable examples, see Walter (2004), Hölkeskamp (2009), and Scholz

While these studies provide invaluable insights into the utility, form, and manifold application of examples and exemplary discourse(s) among self-identifying Romans, they do not consider the role of this didactic discourse in the moral formation and socialization of non-Roman communities functioning in areas conspicuously marked by Roman culture and politics. To my knowledge, Annette Reed remains the only scholar to investigate the participation of such groups (in this case, Jewish authors) in this pervasive pedagogical conversation.[12] Thus, no one has yet explored the interaction with and possible appropriation of elements of the Roman discourse of exemplarity by communities cultivating and espousing first and foremost Christian identities. Similarly, the portrayal of Christ and other biblical figures as paragons of leadership remains largely unexplored from the heuristic vantage point of Roman exemplarity. Rather than understanding Roman discourse on exemplary leadership and Christian discourse on the topic as stable, disparate conversations, my project encourages scholars to view the latter as very much participating in the former.

Finally, the morally exclusivist claims and/or claims to cultural superiority promulgated by the Jewish and Christian texts I consider do not signal their repudiation of or insulation from the Roman discourse of exemplarity.[13] On

---

(2011). Matthew Roller's initial exploration of the widespread Roman discourse of exemplarity has been developed in several works including Stem (2007), Langlands (2008); and in a number of his own articles (2009, 2010, and 2011).

[12] As I will discuss in more detail in chapter 4, Reed applies Roller's schema to the presentation of Abraham in Philo, Josephus, and *The Testament of Abraham*. To be sure, Henry Nguyen employs Roller's fourfold schema in his *Christian Identity in Corinth: A Comparative Study of 2 Corinthians, Epictetus and Valerius Maximus* (2008). Nevertheless, he only applies Roller's work to Valerius Maximus' *Facta et Dicta*; see Nguyen (2008: 68–69). In addition to Reed, several scholars, though not using Roller's work, have focused their research on the moral use of paradigmatic "biblical" figures (and exemplary events) in Jewish literature. Louis Feldman, for example, has devoted a number of books and articles to the portrayal of Moses in the works of Philo and Josephus (1992a, 1992b, 1993, 2005, and 2007), and Hindy Najman (2003) creatively explores how a number of pseudonymous works of the Second Temple period sought to participate in the "Mosaic Discourse" by replicating in their own literary products an exemplary event, namely, the Sinaitic revelation. I will discuss many of these works further in a chapter 4 looking at Philo's *De Vita Mosis* 1–2 and Josephus' *Antiquities* 2–4.

[13] I use the term "Jewish" here in light of Shaye Cohen's discussion of its complex and historically developing meaning outlined in his *The Beginnings of Jewishness: Boundaries, Varieties, Uncertainties* (1999). There, Cohen nuances the ancient understandings of the Greek term Ἰουδαῖος, noting its original ethno-geographic nature: "a Judean is a member of the Judaean people (*ethnos*) and hails from Judaea, the ethnic homeland. In the diaspora a 'Judaean' is a member of an association of those who hailed originally from the ethnic homeland, a person might be a Judaean even if he or she had not been born in Judaea" (104). By the 2nd century B. C. E., following the Maccabean revolt, two new definitions of the term emerged – a political definition referring to those individuals and groups allied

the contrary, such dispute and contestation was very much part and parcel to this didactic and ideological exchange. As Roller insists, the "ubiquitous opportunities for debate and contestation are the lifeblood of exemplary discourse – this is how every example can be made anew, or deployed in a novel way, to meet the requirements of any new contingency."[14] Along these lines, my study of culturally competitive texts celebrating non-Roman ancestors will further demonstrate that this Roman discourse, like its Hellenistic predecessor, could be, in the words of Annette Reed, "creatively appropriated for the articulation of new expressions of local pride, ethnic specificity, and cultural resistance."[15] Having sketched out my project's relationship to the academic discussion of Roman example in antiquity, I will briefly introduce the major scholarship treating ancient discourse on leaders and leadership in voluntary associations oriented around the figure of Christ.

II. Ancient Discourse on Leadership Related to the Figure of Christ

The balance of scholarly attention regarding leadership in Christ-confessing communities focuses on the nature and development of church office and leadership structures.[16] By far, the hegemonic line of inquiry in the 19th and

---

with the Judeans, and a cultural (or "religious") definition which extended to those individuals and communities (including non-natives) who demonstrated loyalty to the God of the Judeans whose temple was in Jerusalem (105–106). Significantly, according to Cohen, Ἰουδαϊσμός should not consequently be understood in antiquity as referring to any clearly defined "religion of Judaism," but rather as "the aggregate of all those characteristics that make Judaeans Judaean (or Jews Jewish)" (106). For his full discussion, see Cohen (1999: 69–106). When using the term "Christian" or "Christians," I am not referring to a reified category or a non-disputed monolithic identity fundamentally distinct from Judean/Jewish, Greek or Roman identities. Where I employ either "Christian" or the adjective "Christ-confessing," I am simply referring to individuals, communities, or texts that espouse loyalty (of varying degrees) to the figure of Christ. In chapter 6 treating the *Letter of the Churches of Vienne and Lyons*, I will use the term with more frequency as the protagonists in that text self-identify using such language.

[14] Roller (2004: 7).

[15] Reed (2009: 195). In this way, my project aligns in many ways with Christopher Frilingos' study of Revelation. Without denying the ideology of resistance embedded in the text, Frilingos attempts "to read the book of Revelation as a cultural product of the Roman Empire, a book that shared with contemporaneous texts and institutions specific techniques for defining world and self" (2004: 5). Again, though his literary focus is different than mine, his words neatly capture a large portion of my agenda: "I seek to discern the power of the Apocalypse for subjects of the Roman Empire by embedding the book in this empire" (2004: 6).

[16] Before moving on, I will make a few comments regarding my use of the terms "leader" and "leadership." With respect to the former, looking through the lens of cultural anthropology, Bruce Malina makes a distinction between "managers" who he claims are granted authority based on ascription (birth, custom, law), and "leaders" whose positions are dependent upon achievement (1986: 107). My study will be interested in discourse

20th centuries deals with the "conflict" between charisma and office in early Christian communities. Rudolf Sohm's influential *Kirchenrecht* (1892) laid the groundwork for a broad consensus in protestant scholarship arguing that as church "office" grew, spiritual (charismatic) power steadily diminished.[17] More recently, a number of scholars have challenged the latter trajectory, including James Burtchaell (1992) and Alastair Campbell (1994). Both studies, in their own ways, argue that authority structures were in place from the very inception of the various Christ-confessing communities. [18] Nevertheless, like Sohm, Käsemann, and von Campenhausen, these scholars are almost exclusively focused on the structural development of early Christian communities.

More recent studies interested in leadership in Christ-confessing texts tend to focus on the New Testament and consult its contents insofar as they assist in a reconstruction of the social, political, and historical situations "on the ground" in the 1st century. Specifically, since the 1970's with the resurgence

---

relating to both forms of authority. Since I have not identified such a semantic distinction in the primary sources I consult, however, I will continue using the term "leadership" more broadly – denoting an individual in a position of communal authority.

[17] Two of the more prominent 20th century works along these lines include Käsemann's (1964) and von Campenhausen (1969). Elisabeth Schüssler-Fiorenza (1983) likewise studies the trajectory from egalitarian communities to institutionalized leadership structures. Unlike most scholars in Sohm's shadow, however, Fiorenza views the Jesus movement as the originally "charismatic" (to use Sohm's language) organizations, while Paul's letters signal a trend toward the implementation of patriarchal authority. Peter Haley outlines Sohm's indelible influence on 20th century scholarship (1980: 185–197). For a review of the 20th century "consensus" view, see Clarke (1993: 2–6) and Campbell (1994: 3–19).

[18] Burtchaell rejects von Campenhausen's notion of two distinct veins of "Christian" leadership organization. He attempts to reconstruct the origin of leadership structures in the early church by postulating that the three-tier leadership model (consisting of an *episkopos*, *presbuteroi*, and *diakonoi*) was not a later synthesis, but was taken over as a whole from the synagogue. To be sure, Burtchaell contends that in the 1st century this structure was not as visible due to many "Christians'" continued participation in the synagogue as well as the charismatic leadership of prophets and itinerant apostles. Nevertheless, by the late 1st century, he argues, when "Christians" were largely expelled from the synagogue, the displaced synagogue-going "Christians" revived the already present three-tiered leadership structure in the *ekklesiai*. Campbell, for his part, argues that from the start of the earliest Christ-confessing communities there existed forms of local structure. Engaging in a thorough study of the term "elder" in ancient Israel, 2nd Temple Judaism, Greco-Roman antiquity, and Christian documents into the early 2nd century, Campbell argues that the term was commonly applied to anyone in authority or a position of respect, and that it can describe an individual engaged in a range of roles and functions. In Pauline communities, Campbell contends, leaders of individual households were called *episkopoi,* and only after the groups had expanded was the designation "elders" consistently employed to describe leaders who now represented their churches in a larger Christian community within a city.

of interest in social history among New Testament scholars, a litany of historians have turned their attention to understanding the social *realia* reflected in the documents of the New Testament and later Christ-confessing texts. The seminal works along these lines which interact with issues of leadership and authority – among other foci – include Gerd Theissen's socio-historical study of Paul's Corinthian correspondences (1982), Wayne Meeks' now classic *The First Urban Christians* (1983), as well as many of the projects of Bruce Malina, Jerome Neyrey, S. Scott Bartchy and others in the Context Group.[19]

Perhaps more than any New Testament scholar, Andrew Clarke has devoted his career to social historical studies of leaders and leadership in Pauline communities and texts.[20] Though he eschews tools from the social sciences in his own work, his research agenda is very much aligned with the socio-historical concerns of the abovementioned projects. His primary goal is to describe the (what he understands to be "countercultural") prescribed and practiced models of "ministry" and structures of organization in Paul's communities in light of the various Jewish and Greco-Roman leadership models.[21] Closely aligned with much of my own methodology, Andrew Clarke not only consults a broad sample of voices on leadership in the Roman Mediterranean, but he is careful to establish their relevance for the Christ-confessing communities he studies; that is, he takes the time to argue the latter's likely exposure to the former priorities.[22]

---

[19] See, for example, Malina (1986), Malina and Neyrey (1996), and Bartchy (1999, 2002, 2003, and 2005). For a detailed overview of scholarship in the social-scientific study of the New Testament, see David Horrell (1999: 3–28). John Elliot and Dan Otto Via (1993), furthermore, provide a helpful introduction to the social-scientific approach to the New Testament.

[20] In particular, see his *Secular & Christian Leadership in Corinth: A Socio-Historical & Exegetical Study of 1 Corinthians 1–6* (1993); *Serve the Community of the Church: Christians as Leaders and Ministers* (2000); and *A Pauline Theology of Church Leadership* (2008).

[21] Clarke emphasizes Paul's "countercultural stance, preferring the notion of service (or 'ministry') to that of leadership" (2000: 250). In many ways the recent work of Jack Barentsen (2011) follows Andrew Clarke, albeit applying social identity theory to the Pauline corpus.

[22] Clarke (2000: 145–172). Joseph Hellerman, sharing Clarke's interest in issues of status and polity in Paul's letters, likewise builds a case for a robust intersection between elite and non-elite Roman notions of leadership and honor. In addition to his dialogue with modern scholarship on the issue (especially John Lendon's *Empire of Honor* [1997]) Hellerman illustrates this connection using the many sub-elite inscriptions in Roman Philippi which replicate the aristocratic Roman *cursus honorum*; see Hellerman (2005). Wayne Meeks, dealing more with moral values, engages in a similar undertaking, noting especially education and rhetoric as vehicles for the transmission of traditionally Greek and Roman values even to many sub-elites (1986: 61–64).

Nevertheless, his project does not significantly address my primary interest, namely, the form, function, and essential content of the *discourses* on moral leadership themselves. That is, while Clarke focuses on the various manifestations of the Greco-Roman love of honor or the authority structures within Greco-Roman, Jewish, and Pauline communities, my project is interested in the *language* of leadership and its rhetorical and narratological deployment in the Roman world.[23] At the same time, the few studies that come closest to my concern for moral discourse tend to focus on morality in Christ-confessing communities more broadly, foregoing a conversation on virtuous leadership.[24]

Methodologically, my project approaches the sources differently than the above works. While most of these histories primarily seek to understand the *realia* behind the texts they consider, my study – though not ignoring such socio-historical context – treats the major primary sources as cultural artifacts participating in the polyvocal Roman discourse on exemplary leadership. In terms of focus, my project will contribute to bridging the gap between scholarship on morality, on the one hand, and those works dealing with leadership, on the other. To accomplish this, as I will outline more fully

[23] That is, I will not be outlining leadership structures or analyzing "Jewish" or "Christian" texts so as to reconstruct the events they claim to recount. Rather, my study is interested in the way in which these texts use "ancestral history" or sacred memory in the service of moral formation. Though focused on Republican Rome, Uwe Walter's introduction to his own project articulates well this focus on ancestral history as pedagogical discourse and memory: "Nicht Kriege oder Karrieren, Verfassung oder Völkerrecht stehen also im Mittelpunkt dieses Buches, sondern die Frage, wie Geschichte in den Kopf der Römer zur Zeit der Republik gekommen ist, wie sie deren Selbstbild und Handeln beeinflußt hat und wie wohnlich das Haus war, das sich Nobilität und Volk durch die *memoria* an ihre *res publica* errichtet haben" (2004: 9).

[24] Though examining different corpora than my book treats, Wayne Meeks' short monograph, *Moral World of the First Christians* (1986), endeavors to "understand the moral formation of the early Christian communities . . . by trying to understand the symbolic and social world they shared with other people in their villages or cities" (1986: 15). To be sure, the balance of his project is driven by sociological concerns as Meeks invites "the reader to join [him] in an effort to piece together, in our imagination, what we can of the world within which those words once worked" (1986: 16). Nevertheless, my monograph similarly desires to confront these early communities' "involvement in the culture of their time and place" and likewise seeks to trace "new patterns they made of old forms, to hear the new songs they composed from old melodies" (1986: 97). In short, though my project is not sociological, I share Meeks' general curiosity with respect to the nature of these communities' participation in Roman culture. In addition to Meeks' project, a number of studies restrict themselves more specifically to the moral discourse of Christ-confessing texts and authors in light of popular philosophical movements in the Empire; see Malherbe (1989); Engberg-Pedersen (2000); and Thorsteinsson (2010). The latter works are primarily comparative and draw (often overly general) parallels between Paul's moral universe and that of many Greek and Roman philosophers.

below, my book will provide a systematic analysis of the Roman discourse on exemplary leadership as well as two nuanced case studies tracing the appropriation of Roman forms and values for the articulation of what the authors understand to be a non-Roman, Christ-like morality of leadership. My extended studies of *1 Clement* and *Lyons*, furthermore, will illustrate both their moral diversity while at the same time their overlapping celebration of several relatively stable "Christ-like" virtues of leadership – for example, endurance, love, and humility.

B. Overview of Chapters

Before proceeding to the body of the book, I will briefly summarize its chapters. In the second chapter, "The Discourse of Exemplarity in the Ancient Mediterranean World," I seek to accomplish two major goals. First, I provide a general introduction to "example" and exemplarity in the ancient Mediterranean world. Second, I endeavor to illustrate and underscore the utility of the (originally Hellenistic) discourse of Roman exemplarity for individuals and groups seeking to articulate, inculcate, and maintain what they consider to be native ancestral virtues. To accomplish these goals, I begin by introducing the role of example (παράδειγμα) in ancient Greek rhetorical theory, education, and patriotism. Here, I outline the use of example in two major rhetorical handbooks, *Rhetorica ad Alexandrum* and Aristotle's *Rhetoric*, before considering the pedagogic function of poetry and praise speeches celebrating moral examples on a more popular level in Greek society.

The balance of the chapter then considers in detail the development, characteristic elements, and popular deployment of a distinctively Roman discourse of exemplarity. My exploration of the latter begins by outlining a few general differences between characteristically Greek and Roman approaches to example. With these distinctions in place, I study the *exemplum* in Roman formal rhetorical theory as it was represented in *Auctor ad Herennium*, the works of Cicero, and Quintilian's *Institutio Oratoria*, before occupying the balance of the chapter with an outline of the form, nature, popular dissemination of, and pervasive participation in exemplary discourse in the late Republic and Empire. With respect to the widespread presence of this Roman moral habit, I focus on five sites that were well-suited for the deployment of leadership *exempla.* These venues include 1) education proper, 2) the display of *imagines* (waxen masks of late magistrates), 3) orations (especially funerary *laudationes*), 4) architecture and inscriptions, and 5) historiography.