

# ***1 CLEMENT: A MODEL FOR CHRISTIAN HERMENEUTICS AND ESCHATOLOGY?***

## **THE USE OF SCRIPTURE AND OTHER LITERATURE IN 1 CLEMENT**

### **With Special Attention to the Use of Isaiah 60:17 in 1 Clement 42:5**

#### **INTRODUCTION**

Through the centuries Christians have addressed the use of the Old Testament by the New as a means for discovering a biblical hermeneutic. This is the only, finally authoritative source for contemporary hermeneutics. With varying results, many have sought to emulate this biblical hermeneutic as the Church's hermeneutic.

Others, however, have argued that the use of the Old Testament by the New has little significance for contemporary Christians. It is argued that the New Testament writers were inspired in their interpretation, in their hermeneutic, of the Old Testament, and we are not inspired. They held a revelatory position. So we can employ a literal approach but not employ the approaches going beyond this.<sup>1</sup> Others simply affirm that our world and world view differ from that of the New Testament, and how New Testament writers use the Old is irrelevant for us.<sup>2</sup> These views usually arise from a concern that the hermeneutic of the New Testament writers occasionally finds meaning in the Old Testament that seems to go beyond what we can find by grammatical, historical interpretation. It may be akin to reading the text for devotional purposes.<sup>3</sup> It seems that the method of the New Testament differs from a modern approach. Biblical scholars are usually more uncomfortable in employing the hermeneutic of the New Testament than are lay people.

---

<sup>1</sup>R. Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975), 218-220, argues that we may follow the New Testament authors in their more literal approach to the Old Testament, but not when they approach it by other methods such as midrash, pesher, or allegory. The New Testament authors were inspired, we are not, when they used these approaches to find meaning other than literal meaning.

<sup>2</sup>So D. L. Baker, *Two Testaments, One Bible* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, rev. 1991), 268. He writes: ". . . we live in a different world from the authors of the New Testament, and our task is not to imitate the way they interpreted the Old Testament but to develop our own way."

<sup>3</sup>As M. Silva discusses in his and W. Kaiser's, *An Introduction to Biblical Hermeneutics* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1994), 268. Silva writes favorably of this devotional reading of the text.

So the concern is twofold. First, what is the hermeneutic employed in the New Testament by which meaning is found in the Hebrew Scriptures (i.e., how does the New Testament interpret the Old)? Second, should the Church reproduce this hermeneutic?

In order to help answer these two questions, it seems that a subsequent pursuit needs to follow the study of the New Testament's use of the Older Testament. This is a study of how the earliest Christians, beyond the New Testament writers and speakers themselves, used Scripture, both the Old and New Testament. Do these Apostolic Fathers, who are disciples of the Apostles, find the New Testament hermeneutic acceptable and emulate it, or do they distance themselves from it? Do they interpret Scripture the way the New Testament interprets Scripture?

The purpose of this study is to examine 1 Clement in light of three questions: How does one of the earliest writers of the Church use, i.e., interpret, the Scriptures, particularly the Old Testament? How does this usage compare with the way the New Testament uses the Old? Does this writer set forth a model for how we today should use the Scriptures? The answers to these three questions about early Christian hermeneutics impact Christian belief and practice in the most basic ways.

I will develop this study in the following way. First, I will give an overview of how 1 Clement uses the Old and New Testaments. It will be especially helpful to see if he treats the Old Testament in the same way that the New Testament treats the Old. Then, I will discuss in detail one particular use of the Old Testament which for various reasons (to be cited) is representative of and crucial to 1 Clement. This will allow us to discover specifics in the hermeneutic of 1 Clement, and seek to enumerate them. Then, I will summarize the features of Clement's hermeneutic. Finally, I will show how similar 1 Clement is to the Book of Hebrews, both in its use of the Old Testament and in its theological and eschatological concerns. Discovering the points of comparison has significant implications for contemporary hermeneutics and theology.

The cumulative effect of all of these steps will be to demonstrate the similarity of the hermeneutics of 1 Clement to that of New Testament authors in their interpretation of the Old Testament. If such similarity exists, there arises a very natural question: If one of the earliest Christian interpreters of Scripture got his hermeneutic from Scripture, why should not we?

Of course, rarely if ever do the Apostolic Fathers discuss hermeneutics, which is also the case with the New Testament. It is a matter of considering the phenomena of their many instances of interpreting Scripture. From these phenomena we can establish the parameters and the patterns of their hermeneutic to a degree sufficient to describe it.

This study impacts not only general approaches to hermeneutics, but also such matters as midrash, peshet, typology, allegory, figurative interpretation, etc. In addition, this study has ramifications for textual criticism, the nature of the text of the Septuagint known to Clement, the use and authority of extra-biblical sources, the extent of the Old and

New Testament canons, the nature of the Church, the nature of the kingdom, the work of the Holy Spirit in the Church, inspiration, election, etc.

From among the Apostolic Fathers, I have chosen 1 Clement as the focus of my study.<sup>4</sup> The reason for this is that 1 Clement is nearest to the canonical New Testament, both in time and in nature. It is dated by all to be no later than the last decade of the first century, and by some as early as A.D. 70 or 70-80. While parts of the Didache (A.D. 40-60) and Barnabas (A.D. 75) may be earlier, their character is quite distinct from books of the New Testament. 1 Clement is an epistle from the Church in Rome to the Church in Corinth (1 Clem. intro.). Tradition has assigned it to various authors, including the third or fourth bishop of Rome during the last decades of the first century; the Clement of Philippians 4:3; the Clement mentioned in the Shepherd of Hermas (*Visions* 2.4, 3); and Titus Flavius Clemens, a slave or freedman of the imperial Flavian family who was martyred in A.D. 95 by his cousin Domitian. Most take the view that the author is the third bishop of Rome who probably knew the Apostles.<sup>5</sup> General opinion holds that it was written near the end of, or just after, the persecution of Domitian (A.D. 95-96), although it may be as early as A.D. 70.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup>I use the terms "1 Clement" and "Clement" interchangeably. There is virtually no support for the idea that Clement authored 2 Clement, so the term "Clement" is clear and sufficient in its reference to "1 Clement."

<sup>5</sup>See the extensive discussion in J. B. Lightfoot, *The Apostolic Fathers*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Baker, rep. 1981), 1:14-103, 358-361. This Clement, according to Irenaeus (*Against Heresies*, 3.3.3), was third "bishop" of Rome and had seen and spoken with the apostles. See the discussion in John Lawson, *A Theological and Historical Introduction to the Apostolic Fathers* (New York: Macmillan, 1961), 26-27.

<sup>6</sup>See K. Lake, trans., *The Apostolic Fathers* (Cambridge: Harvard, 1965), 3-5, who dates it 90-100. J. A. T. Robinson, *Redating the New Testament* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1976), 327-335, gives it the date of early 70. Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers* 1:66-67, 346-358, dates it about A.D. 90 or the last decade of the first century on the basis of both external testimony from Irenaeus and Hegesippus and internal evidence (personal notices, notices of persecutions and church government, and the form and substance of his quotations of Scripture). It seems that 1 Clement should be dated during the last decade of the first century.

Obviously the matter of authorship affects the dating, although Robinson argues that there is no reason why Clement could not have authored it before he became "bishop." Following Edmundson, Robinson finds support for the early date in the words describing the sacrificial system (1 Clem. 41.2); the possibly quick succession of two or three elders within a few years (44.1-3); the "beginning of the gospel" (47.1-6) as requiring no more than a decade (cf. Phil. 4:15); the lack of appeal to episcopal authority (supplemented by my observation that he appeals to the Old Testament instead); the designation of Jesus as the servant or child of God (59.2-4); the quotations of the gospels showing a very early type (i.e., "Remember the words of the Lord Jesus," as in Acts 20:35) (13.1f.; 46.7f.); and the possible identification of Fortunatus (65.1) as the same person as that of 1 Corinthians 16:17f. who is also of Corinth.

J. S. Jeffers, *Conflict At Rome: Social Order and Hierarchy in Early Christianity* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991), 90-94, carefully weighs all of the preceding views and concludes in favor of the traditional view, that Clement was written in the 90s (93-97). This is also the view of Donald A. Hagner, *The Use of the Old and New Testaments in Clement of Rome* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1973), 1-6.

Regarding the nature of 1 Clement, the work resembles several epistles of the New Testament, especially 1 Corinthians and Hebrews. Indeed, a few in the history of the Church have considered it as canonical, or as almost canonical, Scripture. This seems to be the view of the Church in Alexandria and Egypt, for Clement is included within Codex Alexandrinus and in the Strassburg Coptic manuscript, where it is directly joined to the canonical books.<sup>7</sup>

In addition, Clement stands unique in his frequent and extensive use of the Old Testament. No other Apostolic Father cites or alludes to Scripture as frequently as 1 Clement does, nor does he follow the pattern of New Testament usage as Clement does.<sup>8</sup> Also, no author in the New Testament cites the Old Testament as extensively (as far as the amount of material from any one passage is concerned), nor as frequently, as Clement does. Romans cites the Old Testament only 65 times, compared to 105 times for Clement.<sup>9</sup> This feature alone makes 1 Clement an appropriate, if not the best, focus of a study in early Christian hermeneutics.

---

<sup>7</sup>Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History*, 3.16 and 4.23, maintains that from the beginning Clement was publicly read in the churches. He also identifies the author as the Clement of Philippians 4:3 who wrote under Emperor Domitian (3.15-16). Lake, *Apostolic Fathers*, 6-7, thinks Clement of Alexandria thought 1 Clement should be treated as Scripture. However, Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, maintains that he "nowhere treats it as Scripture" (1:366). Lightfoot argues that "there is no evidence that any respectable writer during the early centuries ever placed it in the same category, or invested it with the same authority, as the canonical books of Scripture" (366). Apparently, not till the 6th century (the dating of Codex Alexandrinus) did it appear in the 85th of the *Apostolical Canons* attached to the *Apostolic Constitutions*. The Clementine Epistles are both attached to the Syriac version (dated 1170). Yet testimony of later fathers concurs with the earlier fathers in rejecting it as canonical (see 1:366-378).

<sup>8</sup>Barnabas comes closest, followed next by 2 Clement, but there are significant differences. Neither gives first place to the Psalms, as Clement and the New Testament do, and the quotations are less frequent. The rest of the Apostolic Fathers have little in common with 1 Clement or the New Testament.

Following Hagner, *Use*, 24-25, Barnabas has about 100 citations, but cites the Old Testament in the order of Isaiah, Psalms, and Genesis. 2 Clement has about 15 quotations, with 9 from Isaiah and only 1 each from the Psalms and Genesis. The Shepherd of Hermas has no explicit quotes of the Old Testament. The Didache has only 2 explicit quotes (of the Prophets) and several allusions. The epistles of Ignatius have about 6 quotes (of Proverbs, Isaiah, and Psalms) and a few allusions.

In addition, 1 Clement is the best attested of the Apostolic Fathers as far as the manuscripts are concerned. Hagner, *Use*, 13, observes: "Of all Greek writings, the epistle of Clement stands second only to the NT in the wealth of evidence available for purposes of textual criticism." Clement is found in Codex Alexandrinus, Codex Constantinopolitanus, in the Latin, Syriac, and Coptic (two in number) Versions, and is often cited in Clement of Alexandria.

<sup>9</sup>Using the citations from the UBSGNT<sup>4</sup>, the order of New Testament authors in their use of quotations of the Old Testament is: Romans (65), Matthew (62), Acts (42), Hebrews (37), Mark (31), Luke (26), 1 Corinthians (17), and John (15). Proportionately, Matthew is twice as long as Clement, Luke-Acts is four times as long, Romans is 85% as long, and Hebrews is half as long. So proportionately adjusted the order is: Romans (76), Hebrews (74), Matthew (31), Luke-Acts (17), all in comparison to Clement's 105 quotes. See Hagner, *Use*, 23.

The limitations to this study are obvious. It concentrates on one example of early church writings, the Epistle of 1 Clement. Hence any conclusions based on this study may or may not represent the rest of early church interpretation/hermeneutics.

Others have discussed the hermeneutics of 1 Clement either as part of larger works or as the focus of particular studies.<sup>10</sup> The present study is unique, I believe, in its concentration on the use of Isaiah 60:17 in 1 Clement 42.5 and in its detailed focus on the similarity of 1 Clement and the Book of Hebrews.

## OVERVIEW OF CLEMENT'S USE OF SCRIPTURE AND OTHER LITERATURE

Many features of the use of Scripture and other literature as found in 1 Clement are provocative and challenging. They begin to help us to understand the nature of early Christian hermeneutics. This section gives an overview of the phenomena of the uses of Scripture in 1 Clement. From these phenomena, I will seek to draw out the traits of his hermeneutic.

Clement cites or alludes to the Old and New Testaments at least a total of 395 times.<sup>11</sup> Of these uses 124 are quotations and 271 are allusions and/or verbal parallels. Interestingly, the vast number of these quotations are of the Old Testament and the vast number of allusions are to the New Testament. That is, regarding the Old Testament, there are 105 quotations and 88 allusions; regarding the New Testament, there are only 19 quotations but 183 allusions. Thus Clement *uses* the Old Testament about as frequently as the New, but his *quotations* of the Old vastly outnumber his *quotations* of the New. When

---

<sup>10</sup>Note especially Hagner, *Use*, and others cited by him. Generally speaking, there are few studies which have concentrated on Clement's use of the New Testament or of the Old Testament.

<sup>11</sup>Of course, the criteria used to determine what is a quotation and an allusion/verbal parallel are important. Yet they are not precise. I presume that an allusion or verbal parallel must incorporate at least two or more words, but at times rare or special uses of single words are included. I assume that a quotation must be two or more words exactly (or, almost exactly) corresponding to those in the New or Old Testament source. However, I have usually counted as one allusion or quotation those examples where the text of Scripture may be duplicated in the text. That is, where Clement uses words or phrases which occur more than once in Scripture (e.g., the same words occur in Deut., Ps., or Isa.), I count these as only one allusion or quotation since it seems that Clement would have only one text in mind, and not two or three or more. On the other hand, even with these criteria, allusions are easily overlooked. In addition, variant readings in the manuscripts of 1 Clement affect in particular the number of allusions.

By discovering some allusions of my own, my figures are slightly higher than the count one gets by counting the actual references cited in the margin of Lake's edition or in Lightfoot's commentary on 1 Clement.

However, I believe the criteria are similar to those used in the UBSGNT<sup>4</sup>, and comparing my figures with those helps give some relative perspective. I'm confident that the figures are proportionately accurate enough to gage the relative significance of each section or book of Scripture and other literature used by Clement. Overall, Hagner's work has similar results when one counts up his references, although I have higher numbers.

one compares this to the uses of the Old Testament as found in the index of uses for the New Testament as a whole, listed in the fourth edition of the UBSGNT<sup>4</sup>,<sup>12</sup> there are interesting parallels. By and large, the frequency of Clement's use of the Old Testament parallels that of the New Testament, but no book in the New Testament cites the Old as much as Clement does. About a quarter of 1 Clement consists of quotations of the Old Testament.<sup>13</sup>

### Use of the Old Testament

When one considers the totality of quotations and allusions to the Old Testament discovered in the entire New Testament, the results are as follows:<sup>14</sup>

BOOK	QUOTATIONS	ALLUSIONS	TOTAL USES
Pentateuch	148	705	853
History	7	247	254
Poetry	87	415	502
Prophets	<u>108</u>	<u>923</u>	<u>1031</u>
	350	2290	2640

By comparison, Clement's use of the Old Testament breaks down as follows, following the order of books, chapters, and verses as found in the Septuagint (the LXX), which is Clement's Old Testament.<sup>15</sup>

Pentateuch	35	29	64
History	9	17	26
Poetry	44	21	65
Prophets	<u>17</u>	<u>21</u>	<u>38</u>
	105	88	193

---

<sup>12</sup>Barbara Aland, et. al., eds., *The Greek New Testament*, (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, Fourth Revised Edition, 1994). Herein known as UBSGNT<sup>4</sup>.

<sup>13</sup>Hagner, *Use*, 21f. The exactness of the citations is similar to that of the New Testament. He is more often in exact agreement (or nearly so) with the LXX (especially in his long quotations) than differing from it (see Hagner, *Use*, 33ff.).

<sup>14</sup>I assume full responsibility for the accuracy of these figures as calculated from the UBSGNT<sup>4</sup>.

<sup>15</sup>The citation of the LXX Old Testament also affects chapter and verse numbers. I've given the numbering of the chapters and verses as they appear in the LXX.

Hagner, *Use*, 22ff., finds about 70 direct citations or quotations of the Old Testament in 1 Clement, although his actual list has about 79 (351f.). These numbers do not include any allusions.

The usage of the Old Testament by the entire New Testament, in the order of Prophets, Pentateuch, and Poetry, is quite the reverse from the order of Poetry, Pentateuch, and Prophets found in 1 Clement.<sup>16</sup>

The total uses (quotations and allusions) of individual books made by the whole New Testament are as follows (ranking the top nine books):

Isaiah		66		348		414
Psalms	79			333		412
Exodus	44			199		243
Genesis		34		203		237
Deuteronomy		50		143		193
Ezekiel		2		139		141
Daniel		5		130		135
Jeremiah		5		120		125
Leviticus		17		90		107

In 1 Clement the totals for uses of the top nine books are:

Psalms	29		15		44
Genesis		12		13	25
Isaiah		10		8	18
Numbers		6		10	16
Deuteronomy		9		3	12
Job		8		4	12
Exodus	8		0		8
Proverbs		7		1	8
Joshua	5		3		8

The predisposition of 1 Clement for Poetry, especially the Psalms and Job, is clear, both when we consider entire sections of the LXX and when we consider the phenomena of individual books.<sup>17</sup>

The books *quoted* most frequently by the whole New Testament are the Psalms, Isaiah, Deuteronomy, Exodus, and Genesis. After this, quotations fall off greatly, by threefold and then tenfold. This slightly contrasts the usage of 1 Clement who *quotes* most

---

<sup>16</sup>Hagner, *Use*, 350ff., ends up with the same order for Clement's use, with Poetry being used twice as frequently as Pentateuch. His figures which include only quotations and "important allusions" are: Poetry, 46 uses; Pentateuch, 23; and Prophets, 13.

<sup>17</sup>Again, *Hagner*, *Use*, 350ff., finds the order of Old Testament books (counting quotations and "important allusions") used by 1 Clement to be: Psalms (31 uses), Genesis (12), Isaiah (11), Job (8), Proverbs (7), Exodus (5), Deuteronomy (3), Numbers (3), 1 Kings (2), and Ezekiel (2). His first three are identical with mine, and the next five we have in common but in a different order. In place of Joshua, Hagner has 1 Kings.

frequently the books of the Psalms, Genesis, Isaiah, Deuteronomy, Job, and Exodus. Whereas the order of using quotations as done by the New Testament is Pentateuch, Prophets, and Poetry, the order in 1 Clement is Poetry, Pentateuch, and Prophets. This order is the same for total uses of the Old Testament as found in 1 Clement (see above), but differs from the order of total uses found in the entire New Testament (where Prophets came before Pentateuch; yet Poetry is last in both instances).<sup>18</sup>

I now turn my attention to Clement's use of individual books in the Pentateuch. The following chart displays the details of this usage of quotations and allusions/verbal parallels.

	BOOK QUOTATIONS	ALLUSIONS	TOTAL USES
Genesis	12	13	25
Numbers	6	10	16
Deuteronomy	9	3	12
Exodus	8	0	8
Leviticus	<u>0</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>3</u>
	35	29	64

The virtual lack of reference to Leviticus in 1 Clement is surprising since he several times addresses sacrifices and the priestly service. This contrasts the number of uses (quotes and allusions) found in the New Testament, where the figures are as follows.

Exodus	44	199	243
Genesis	34	203	237
Deuteronomy	50	143	193
Leviticus	17	90	107
Numbers	<u>3</u>	<u>70</u>	<u>73</u>
	148	705	853

Clement uses the Books of History this way.

Joshua	5	3	8
Judges	0	0	0
Ruth	0	0	0
1 Samuel	1	6	7
2 Samuel	0	2	2
1 Kings	1	2	3
2 Kings	0	1	1
1 Chronicles	0	0	0
2 Chronicles	2	0	2
Ezra	0	0	0

<sup>18</sup>Again, these statistics are based on those listed in UBSGNT<sup>4</sup>, 887ff.

Nehemiah	0	0	0
Esther	<u>0</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>3</u>
	9	17	26

Clement uses the Books of Poetry more frequently than the Pentateuch. Of all the books of the Old Testament, he makes the greatest usage of the Psalms.

Job	8	4	12
Psalms	29	15	44
Proverbs	7	1	8
Song of Solomon	0	0	0
Ecclesiastes	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>
	44	21	65

Clement uses the Prophets according to the following numbers.

Isaiah	10	8	18
Jeremiah	1	5	6
Lamentations	0	0	0
Ezekiel	3	3	6
Daniel	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>
	15	17	32
Hosea	0	0	0
Joel	1	0	1
Amos	1	0	1
Obadiah	0	0	0
Jonah	0	1	1
Micah	0	0	0
Nahum	0	0	0
Habakkuk	0	0	0
Zephaniah	0	0	0
Haggai	0	0	0
Zechariah	0	1	1
Malachi	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>
	2	4	6

The longest portions from Genesis include (following the order of their occurrence in 1 Clement) 4:3-8; 27:41ff.; 6:1-8 (various verses); 12:1-3; 13:14-16; 22 (various verses); 1:26-27. The longest portions used from the rest of the Pentateuch include Exodus 14: 23-28 (various verses); 32:7-8, 9-10, 31-32; a summary of Numbers 17; 12 (four uses); 16 (five uses); and Deuteronomy 32:15, 8-9, 39; 9:12, 13-14; and 12:25, 28.

The longest portion from the books of History is Joshua 2 where verses 1-3, 6, 3, 4-5, 9-13, 14, 18 are used in this order. Clement makes a special effort to identify the red

cord of this chapter as a type of Christ. I will return to this special use below. From this section the only other chapter used several times is 1 Samuel 2 (verses 10, 7, 6 (twice)).

As far as the Books of Poetry are concerned, Clement uses the Psalms more frequently than any other portion of the Old Testament, or of the New Testament, for that matter. Almost one-third of all of his quotations are from the Psalms (29 out of 105), and over one-fifth of his total use (quotations and allusions) are from the Psalms (44 out of 193). Also, some of his longest quotes are from the Psalms, including 51:1-17 (of all his quotes probably the longest); 34:11-17; 139:7-10; 50:16-23, 14-15. He returns to Psalms 37 and 32 frequently, but most frequently he cites or alludes to Psalm 118 (five times), verses 19-20, 18, 114, 133, 135. It is also here that Clement has some of his most problematic citations, a subject to which I will return later. He also cites the long portion of Job 4:16-18; 4:19-5:5; 5:11; and 5:17-26 (in conjunction with Ps. 141:5); and the long section of Proverbs 1:23-33. By the gage of the amount of material, his use of the Poetry section of the Septuagint is greater than any other portion of Scripture. As noted above, no other writer, canonical or non-canonical, cites the Old Testament as extensively.

What is somewhat interesting is Clement's sole quote of Psalm 110:1 by way of citing Hebrews 1. This is the passage most frequently cited by the New Testament authors, especially by Hebrews.

Regarding the Prophets, Clement makes one of his second longest quotes of all Scripture from Isaiah 53:1-12. He introduces it by saying that it speaks of Christ. Another long section is Isaiah 1:16-20. It is Clement's use of Isaiah 60:17 that will be the subject of the more detailed study below.

By way of general observations, it appears that Clement is familiar with virtually all of the Old Testament. However, he makes no reference to Judges, Ruth, 1 Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, Song of Solomon, Lamentations, Hosea, Obadiah, Micah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, and Haggai. He uses some others only once: 2 Kings, Ecclesiastes, Joel, Amos, Jonah, and Zechariah. Several of these books contain highly Christological passages cited by the New Testament as fulfilled in the first or second advent of Christ.

### **Use of the New Testament**

When we turn attention to Clement's use of the New Testament, we find that the frequency of usage follows this order: Paul's Epistles, General Epistles, Gospels, Acts, and Revelation. Within the General Epistles, the greatest usage by far is of the Book of Hebrews.

Parallel passages within the Gospels are not counted in the following figures. The two passages common to the three synoptics are Matthew 26:24 (with Mark 14:21 and Luke 22:22) and Matthew 18:6 (with Mark 9:42 and Luke 17:2). The Sermon on the Mount is used three times (plus the parallel of Luke 6:31, 36-38).

	BOOK QUOTATIONS	ALLUSIONS	TOTAL
Matthew	5	6	11
Mark	0	1	1
Luke	1	8	9
John	<u>0</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>5</u>
	6	20	26

The usage in Clement of the Book of Acts is as follows.

Acts	1	10	11
------	---	----	----

Of Paul's Epistles the rank of the number of uses is in the order of 1 Corinthians, Romans, Philippians, 1 Timothy, 2 Corinthians, Ephesians, Titus, Galatians, Colossians, 1 Thessalonians, and 2 Timothy. Books not used are 2 Thessalonians and Philemon. This information is helpful in light of the claim often made by higher critics that the Pastoral Epistles are non-pauline and belong to the Second Century. Clement uses all three Pastorals, especially 1 Timothy.

Romans	2	13	15
1 Corinthians	2	19	21
2 Corinthians	0	7	7
Galatians	0	4	4
Ephesians	0	7	7
Philippians	0	11	11
Colossians	0	4	4
Philemon	0	0	0
1 Thessalonians	0	4	4
2 Thessalonians	0	0	0
1 Timothy	0	11	11
2 Timothy	0	4	4
Titus	<u>0</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>6</u>
	4	90	94

The usage of the General Epistles is as follows: Hebrews, 1 Peter, James, 2 Peter, 1 John, and Jude. 2 John and 3 John are not used. Clement's apparent use of 2 Peter and Jude argues against the view that these epistles are late and that 2 Peter is non-petrine.<sup>19</sup>

Hebrews	6	31	37
James	0	6	6
1 Peter	1	15	16
2 Peter	0	5	5

---

<sup>19</sup>Hagner, *Use*, 248, thinks that the evidence for Clement's knowledge of 2 Peter and Jude is unconvincing, and his knowledge of John, 1 John, and Revelation is only possible but not probable (268-271). Clement does not know 2 and 3 John (270).

Jude		0		1		1
1 John	0		2		2	
2 John	0		0		0	
3 John	<u>0</u>		<u>0</u>		<u>0</u>	
		7		60		67

Revelation is represented by 1 quotation and 3 allusions for a total of 4 uses.

Revelation		1		3		4
------------	--	---	--	---	--	---

In summary, the New Testament is represented in 1 Clement as follows.

Gospels	6		20		26	
Acts	1		10		11	
Paul	4		90		94	
General Epistles	7		60		67	
Revelation	<u>1</u>		<u>3</u>		<u>4</u>	
	19		183		202	
[Hebrews		6		31		37]

The order of New Testament books preferred by Clement is: Hebrews (37 uses), 1 Corinthians (21), 1 Peter (16), Romans (15), Matthew (11), Acts (11), Philipians (11), and 1 Timothy (11).<sup>20</sup> The use of Revelation is uncertain.<sup>21</sup>

---

<sup>20</sup>Hagner, *Use*, 353ff., listing only the "more conspicuous" allusions and some "especially probable" ones, finds the order to be: 1 Corinthians (16), Romans (14), Hebrews (12), 1 Peter (10), Acts (11), Matthew (11), James (9), and John (8). Thus he does not find Hebrews used as frequently as I do. Yet when one tallies all the allusions which Hagner discusses (179-209), one seems to find more allusions to Hebrews than to 1 Corinthians (about 60 to 40). It is clear that the allusions to or quotations of 1 Corinthians are more substantial in length and substance than those of Hebrews. When one considers other matters of comparison, such as introductory formula, interpretative method, recognition of the Holy Spirit, etc., the similarity with Hebrews is more complete than it is with 1 Corinthians. Of course, as Hagner (195) points out, the strong similarity with 1 Corinthians arises from the fact that both it and 1 Clement had the same destination and the same purpose (in general, to restore unity and order). Hagner also warns about the subjectivity of counting allusions (278).

Robert M. Grant and Holt H. Graham, *First and Second Clement*, vol. 2 in *The Apostolic Fathers* (New York: Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1965), 103-104, are closer to my position, finding that Clement uses both 1 Corinthians and Hebrews 14 times (all allusions).

See my section below where I detail the many points of similarity with Hebrews which I think show Clement's greater dependence on Hebrews.

<sup>21</sup>While the one quotation listed (1 Clem. 34.3) may come from Revelation 22:12, the fact that it is introduced by an introductory formula ("for he says beforehand to us") in stark contrast to all other uses of the New Testament makes this unlikely. Either it is a combination of passages from Isaiah 40:10; 62:11; and Proverbs 24:12; or it derives from an apocalyptic writing no longer extant. Hagner, *Use*, 271, prefers the latter alternative. Thus there is no proof that Revelation was known to Clement.

The surprisingly high use made of Hebrews calls for special comment (37 times). Clement uses it more frequently than any other single book of the New Testament, outranking even the aggregate of Paul's Epistles as far as quotations are concerned. It is used on a par with Genesis, Psalms, and Isaiah. Indeed, the most frequently used books in 1 Clement are as follows.

Psalms	29	15	44
Hebrews	6	31	37
Genesis	12	13	25
1 Corinthians	2	19	21
Isaiah	10	8	18
Numbers	6	10	16
Romans	2	13	15

What is interesting in this comparison is the fact that Clement usually quotes these Old Testament books more frequently than he alludes to them, while his allusions to the New Testament books far outweigh his quotations of them. For the books cited above, there are 57 quotes of the Old Testament books and 46 allusions, but only 10 quotes of the New Testament books and 63 allusions.

This may be explained by the observation that perhaps the Old Testament was more readily available to Clement but not to believers in general (at least in Corinth), and his desire that he wanted to reveal the content of the Old Testament books more clearly or fully to his readers. No author of the New Testament ever quotes individual sections of the Old Testament as fully as 1 Clement does. In addition, both the Old Testament canon and that of the New were unsettled. The Old Testament canon was in process of finalization, but the New Testament was still in quite a state of flux and not to be settled for another three hundred years. The more complete state of the canon of the Old Testament may have contributed to Clement's fuller use of it. Also, he may have deliberately sought to emulate Hebrews', and thereby Jesus', use of the Old Testament in order to be a true disciple of Christ.

The attention given to Hebrews suggests that Clement was especially acquainted with Hebrews and appreciated it highly. This suggests that Hebrews may well have been written to the place where Clement is--in Rome, according to tradition. It suggests, too, that Hebrews was written early, perhaps before A.D. 70. Finally, this suggests that we will find that Clement often employs the Old Testament in the manner that Hebrews does, and embraces a similar theology, including Christology and eschatology.

Indeed, this is the case. For example, Clement virtually follows Hebrew 1:3-13 in his exposition of who Christ is, keeping the quotations of Psalms 104:4; 2:7-8; 110:1 while slightly changing the wording of the introductory formulas which Hebrews employs. He follows Hebrews in its unique designation of Jesus Christ as high priest (1 Clem. 36.1). He also follows Hebrews 11 in citing the examples of faith (1 Clem. 9:3-4--Enoch, Noah; 10:1-2, 7--Abraham; 12:1-4--Rahab; 17:1-2--"those in the skins of goats and sheep"; 17:5--

Moses). He similarly concludes the examples with an exhortation to "run on to the goal of peace" (19:2; cf. Heb. 12:1-2). There are other patterns of thought that are similar to those of Hebrews. This similarity is the subject of our deliberate attention in a separate section below.

Some special features characterize Clement's use of the New Testament. Except for introducing the words of Jesus in two places (13.1; 46.7f.; these may derive from oral tradition), Clement does not use introductory formulas for his quotations or allusions to the New Testament. The free manner by which Clement uses the New Testament may be explained in various ways, according to Hagner.<sup>22</sup> He considers the use of a different canonical text (which he discounts), memory, extra-canonical written sources, and oral tradition. The last three are possible, but should not replace the probability of the use of the canonical writings themselves.

Regarding Clement's evaluation of the New Testament,<sup>23</sup> Hagner proposes that there is probability that a Pauline Corpus of ten, perhaps thirteen, epistles is known by Clement. The rest of the New Testament was circulating as individual writings. It is clear that Clement regards the writings of the Apostles as having high authority, even though they are not cited as "Scripture."<sup>24</sup> Finally, as he does with the Old Testament, Clement does little to interpret the New Testament. Since his purpose is hortatory, not didactic, he simply cites the material so that the readers conduct themselves according to the message. According to Hagner, he gives little information by which to construct his theology, and "no indication of his own hermeneutic approach to these writings."<sup>25</sup>

## Use of Non-canonical Sources

### Use of the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha

1 Clement also uses non-canonical sources. I've divided these sources into three categories.

Clement uses the Old Testament Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha about 25 times. The uses are as follows.

BOOK QUOTATIONS	ALLUSIONS	TOTAL USES
-----------------	-----------	------------

---

<sup>22</sup>Hagner, *Use*, 288ff.

<sup>23</sup>Ibid., 313ff.

<sup>24</sup>Ibid., 340ff. Hagner explains this lack of identification of Scripture as due to the following: (1) the authority of Christ and his Apostles had not yet passed from oral proclamation to the written documents recording the proclamation; (2) the epistolary form and personal character of the apostolic writings are radically different from the Old Testament books; (3) the apostolic writings lacked antiquity and hence status and esteem; (4) it was simply not yet customary to refer to the apostolic writings as "Scripture."

<sup>25</sup>Ibid., 350. Yet see my summary of Clement's hermeneutic below.

Tobit	0	2	2
Judith	0	2	2
Wisdom	2	7	9
Ecclesiasticus	2	4	6
1 Maccabees	1	0	1
2 Maccabees	0	3	3
4 Maccabees	0	1	1
Assump. Moses (?)	$\frac{1}{6}$	$\frac{0}{19}$	$\frac{1}{25}$

The following is a selection of the allusions: Wisdom 12.10 (1 Clem. 7:5: "place of repentance"); Ecclesiasticus 16.18, 19 (1 Clem. 59:3-4: "who looks upon the abyss"); Judith 9.11 (1 Clem. 59.3: "the savior of those in despair"; cf. 59.4); Tobit 13.6, 10 (1 Clem. 61.2: "the king of eternity") are the allusions. Examples of those that involve quotations are Wisdom 2.24 (1 Clem. 3.4: "death entered into the world" (five words)); Wisdom 12.12 (1 Clem. 27.5: "Who shall say to him, What have you done? or who shall withstand . . . ?"); Ecclesiasticus 2.11 (1 Clem. 60.2: "merciful and compassionate"). Finally, there is a summary of the events recorded in Judith 8 (1 Clem. 55.4-5) where Judith is first cited, then Esther, as women who "have received power through the grace of God and have performed many deeds of manly valor" (55.3).<sup>26</sup>

In all of these uses of the Apocrypha, as with the use of the New Testament, there is never a citation of them as "Scripture" or as "it is written" or "God says" or a similar introductory formula. This shows, it seems, that the author makes some sort of distinction between the canonical Old Testament and the Apocrypha (and New Testament). Apparently there are no uses of pseudepigraphal or apocryphal sources from the New Testament era.

### Use of the Story of the Phoenix and Other Secular Literature

Yet 1 Clement does use literature that has come from sources other than Christian or Jewish literature. The most famous of these is his use of the story of the Phoenix, a bird. The account appears in the midst of proofs of the resurrection, which in turn arises from mention of the return of Christ. Clement quotes Isaiah 13:22 (according to the LXX) and Malachi 3:1: "he shall come quickly and shall not tarry; and the Lord shall suddenly come to his temple, and the Holy One for whom you seek" (23.5). Next, Clement (24.1ff.) moves to proofs of a future resurrection, of which the resurrection of Christ is the firstfruits (alluding to 1 Cor. 15:20). He cites the phenomena of day and night which replace the other, and the sowing of crops in which the Master raises up new grains from the decay of the seed fallen on the ground (24.1-5).

Then Clement (ch. 25) immediately moves to recount "the strange sign" (το παραδοξον σημειον) which takes place in the East, near Arabia. A unique bird, the

<sup>26</sup>Here, as my usual practice is elsewhere in this study, I am quoting Lake's translation of 1 Clement.

Phoenix, lives for 500 years, then dies after entering into its own sepulcher made of incense, myrrh, and spices. In time, a worm grows, nourished by the juices of the dead bird. It puts forth wings, and, after gaining strength, it takes up its sepulcher containing the bones of its predecessor, and carries them to Heliopolis, Egypt. In broad daylight the bird deposits these bones on the altar to the Sun, and returns to Arabia. The priests inspect the records and find that the event has come at the fulfillment of the 500th year.

This story has been much discussed. Apparently the bird and/or the story associated with it, is found among the Greeks, in Hesiod, Herodotus (2.73), and Antiphanes. Then the story passed to the Romans: Manilius in Pliny (*Natural History* 10.2), Dion Cassius, Tacitus, Ovid (*Metamorphoses*), and elsewhere. According to Lake and Lightfoot, many Christians and Jews thought that it was true, just as the most learned and intelligent heathen writers before and after them.<sup>27</sup> Jewish sources as early as the second or third centuries B.C. adopted it, connecting it with the Exodus to show how even the heathen paid homage to the true God (so also the *Assumption of Moses*). There are numerous rabbinic references to it. Many Christian writers (Tertullian, Cyril of Jerusalem, Ambrose, Rufinus, *Apostolic Constitutions*, Epiphanius, and others) believed the story, some finding it sanctioned by the LXX version of Psalm 92:12, where there is a confusion between φοινιξ ("phoenix") and φοινιξ ("palm tree"), or by Job 29:18. Some, however, doubted it, at least certain features of it, including Theophilus of Antioch, Origen, Eusebius, Gregory Nazianzus, Augustine, and Photius. It is the object of Roman and Christian art and symbolism (occurring on Roman coins and medals to denote immortality or renovation). According to Lightfoot, the origin of the story arises from the "recurrence of some prominent astronomical phenomenon which marked the close of a period." The length of time was variously understood as 972 generations of people, and as 509, 540, 1461, 1000, or 7006 years, but most give it as 500 years.<sup>28</sup> So the phoenix was a symbol from the very beginning, representing "a soul, or an inundation, or a stranger paying a visit after long absence, or a restoration after a long absence."<sup>29</sup> It is a symbol in Milton. Christians then linked it to the resurrection and even made it a type of the person of Christ (the Phoenix arose after three days, according to some).

The connection with the resurrection is intriguing. If the sign accompanied the Exodus at the time of Passover, and Christ as the "unique" one (note the same term used in the Phoenix story in 1 Clem. 25.2) rose just after Passover, then the phoenix brings the two events together and aptly symbolizes the resurrection. Many timed its appearance again with the resurrection of Christ. Even its connection with 1000 years gives it Christian import.

My interest in citing the account of the Phoenix is to draw attention to how Clement uses it. He introduces it by saying: "Let us consider the strange sign

---

<sup>27</sup>Lake, *Apostolic Fathers*, 53. Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, 2:83-89.

<sup>28</sup>Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, 2:86.

<sup>29</sup>Ibid., 87.

(το παραδοξον σημειον) which takes place in the East" (25.1). Immediately after recounting the story, he asks (26.1) whether it is a "great and wonderful thing" if the creator of the universe will bring about the resurrection of those who have served him "when he shows us the greatness of his promise even through a bird?" Then there immediately follow three quotations of texts from Psalm 28:7; 3:5 (cf. 23:4); and Job 19:26. These are bound together by the verb "raise" common to all three sources.

It is clear that Clement uses the story of the Phoenix to bolster his lists of proofs for the resurrection. He puts the "strange sign" side-by-side with Scripture.<sup>30</sup> It is a symbol of the resurrection. Did Clement regard the story as true? Apparently so. Yet whether true or not, it illustrates the essence of resurrection just as do the other matters that Clement takes from general revelation (day and night, sowing dead seed, etc.). They are authoritative universally, just as the Scripture is.

### Use of Other Non-canonical Literature

Another interesting use of an unknown source is found in 23.3-4. It immediately preceeds the above section concerning the phoenix as a sign of the certainty of the resurrection which comes after the mention of the return of Christ (23.5). The source is identified as "Scripture . . . in which he says." This introductory formula is clearly meant to identify canonical Scripture. It reads:

Wretched are the double-minded, who doubt in their soul and say "We have heard these things even in the days of our fathers, and behold we have grown old, and none of these things has happened to us." Oh, foolish men, compare yourself to a tree: take a vine, first it sheds its leaves, then a flower, and after this the unripe grape, then the full bunch.

Clement then draws out the lesson: "See how in a little time the fruit of the tree comes to ripeness." He then goes on to affirm the nearness of the return of Christ.

This quotation also occurs in 2 Clement 2.2 (with variations). Lake does not know its source.<sup>31</sup> Lightfoot suggests that it is derived from the lost apocalypse of *Eldad and Modad*, an apocryphal work known in the early Roman church and cited in Hermas, *Visions* 2.3, for the same purpose as in 1 Clement.<sup>32</sup>

It is certainly strange that the two most challenging and unknown sources come juxtaposed in 1 Clement. Yet Clement seems to run in patterns, grouping similar ideas one

---

<sup>30</sup>The word παραδοξος occurs in Christian literature elsewhere only in Diognetus 5.4 and in Luke 5:26 where the people, at the healing of the paralytic say, "We have seen strange things today." It may well be that Clement is borrowing the word from Luke.

<sup>31</sup>Lake, *Apostolic Fathers*, 51.

<sup>32</sup>Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, 2:80. Hagner, *Use*, 74ff., 86-88, concludes in favor of this source. Eldad and Modad are mentioned in Numbers 11:26-29.

after the other. The remarkable thing is that Clement has identified this source as Scripture!

There are other examples where Clement cites sources as authoritative when they cannot be identified with any canonical literature. His regard for truth in general revelation has biblical parallels (Paul in Acts 17, 1 Cor. and Titus; also Jude; etc.).

Another peculiarity in Clement's use of the Old Testament is his quotation of texts for which there is neither a Hebrew nor a Greek source. That is, his quotation agrees neither with Hebrew nor Greek extant manuscripts. Apparently he cites some unknown source.

One example of this phenomenon is found in Clement's quotation of Ezekiel 33:11ff. Actually, all that 1 Clement 8.3 has is something close to the text of verse 11: "For as I live, said the Lord, I do not desire the death of the sinner so much as his repentance." Then Clement continues (8.2-3):

. . . and he added a gracious declaration, "Repent, O house of Israel, from your iniquity. Say to the sons of my people, 'If your sins reach from the earth to Heaven, and if they be redder than scarlet, and blacker than sackcloth, and you turn to me with all your hearts and say "Father," I will listen to you as a holy people.'"

While both the Hebrew text and the LXX have something akin to the first words of this quote ("Repent, O house of Israel, from your iniquity."), they have nothing to correspond to the rest of the words, beginning with: "Say to the sons . . ." Yet Clement introduces the words by affirming that the "Master of the universe . . . added a gracious declaration." Clearly he views the words as authoritative. He introduces the whole passage by saying that "the ministers (i.e., the prophets) of the grace of God spoke through the Holy Spirit about repentance." Lake acknowledges that the origin of these words is obscure, and suggests that Clement's text was different from ours and actually contained them.<sup>33</sup> Lightfoot simply identifies it as "loosely quoted."<sup>34</sup>

In 1 Clement 17.6 there are words attributed to Moses at the burning bush which go beyond what the biblical text has. After recounting the words of Exodus 3:11 and 4:10, Clement adds: "And again he says, 'But I am as smoke from a pot.'" Apparently there is no known source for these words given as spoken by Moses.<sup>35</sup> The introductory phrase, "And again he says," is how Clement often introduces subsequent texts of Scripture (note 1 Clem. 15.1-7, using "and again" three times to link Ps. 61:5; 77:36-37; 30:19; and 12:3-5 to the first text of Is. 29:13; see also 14.5; 26.3; 36.5; 46.3). This occurs in a similar way in

---

<sup>33</sup>Lake, *Apostolic Fathers*, 21.

<sup>34</sup>Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, 2:38.

<sup>35</sup>BAGD cites no other Christian use, nor is there any use in the LXX. Similar ideas occur not only in James 4:14 but also in Hosea 13:3 and Psalm 119:83. The quote may come from the *Assumption of Moses*, but Lightfoot (65) doubts this and suggests the source is *Eldad and Modad*, as suggested above for the quote found in 1 Clement 23.3-4. Clearly, it is some apocryphal source.

Hebrews (e.g., 1:6; 2:13 (twice)). This linkage by "again" seems to be another evidence of Clement's use of Hebrews.

In Clement 29.3 the author seems to allude to various biblical texts (Deut. 4:34; 14:2; Num. 18:27; 2 Chron. 31:14; Ezek. 48:12). Yet his words are considerably different from all these passages as he writes: "And in another place he says 'Behold the Lord takes to himself a nation from the midst of nations, as a man takes the first-fruit of his threshing-floor, and the Holy of Holies shall come forth from that nation.'" Clement cites this source after clearly citing the Scriptures, namely Deuteronomy 32:8-9. The origin of these words is unknown, yet Clement would have us take them as equal with Scripture in authority.<sup>36</sup>

Finally, there is another text in 1 Clement 46.2 whose origin is unknown. The words are: "Cleave to the holy, for they who cleave to them shall be made holy." Once again, the words are viewed as authoritative Scripture, for they are introduced by the phrase: "For it is written." Confirmatory of this import is the subsequent phrase and clause used elsewhere (see the paragraph just above) to introduce another quote from Scripture, namely the words, "And again in another place it says." These words introduce the quotation of Psalm 17:26f.

From the preceding it is clear that Clement on occasion follows a text considered as Scripture for which we have no extant manuscript. It may be that he has a variant text different from our present copies, so actually does quote Scripture. On the other hand, he may be citing an extra-biblical source known in his tradition which he considers as authoritative as Scripture. In part this may reflect his conviction that "all truth is God's truth" and worthy of being treated as authoritative as Scripture. There are a few examples in the New Testament corresponding to this last alternative (by Paul in Acts 17:28; Titus 1:12; 1 Cor. 15:33; by James 4:5; by Jude 14ff.). Again, he may simply be in error in his recall of certain texts, thinking that a saying is biblical when actually it is not. Finally, Clement may simply be giving from memory the sense of some canonical texts.<sup>37</sup>

All of these explanations have a place. It is most probable that Clement is following his memory when variations from a canonical text are in view. Elsewhere, he uses an extra-canonical source in those cases of texts not found in the LXX, or he uses a textual variant. The LXX was not yet a clearly defined collection of books such as we have

---

<sup>36</sup>Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, 2:39-40, suggests that this passage comes either from a different recension of the canonical Ezekiel having an interpolation here, or (more likely) from some apocryphal writing ascribed to Ezekiel by several church fathers. It would be a "patchwork of passages borrowed from the canonical prophets" (39). Lightfoot finds this same source used in 1 Clement 8, 13, 17, 23, 46. After weighing the alternatives, Hagner, *Use*, 111-120, sides with Lightfoot. Clement's canon was not closed. He uses writings from the Apocrypha (Wisdom, Judith, etc.), the Pseudepigrapha (*Assumption of Moses*), and unknown non-canonical works (*Eldad and Modad*, Apocryphal Ezekiel, etc.).

<sup>37</sup>Hagner, *Use*, 80-108, considers all of these possibilities, as well as an early anthology of texts brought together as a *testimonia* now lost. Hagner discounts this last explanation for Clement's variations, and gives special place to loss of memory as the explanation of variation in the quotation of canonical writings (107-108).

today. The Old Testament canon (at least the third division of it), as the New, was unsettled.<sup>38</sup>

### Special Uses of the Septuagint and Other Sources

There is still another group of uses of Scripture found in 1 Clement. These are those passages which quote words from the Septuagint for which there is no Hebrew text or that differ substantially from the Hebrew text. There are many instances of this phenomenon. A few illustrate this point well. The first instance occurs in 4.4 where Clement is quoting Scripture ("it is written"), namely Genesis 4:3-8. The LXX of verse 7 reads:

οὐκ εἰν ὀρθῶς προσενεγκῆς, ὀρθῶς δὲ μὴ διελης, ἡμαρτες; ἠσυχασον. Translated these words are: "If you offered rightly, but did not divide rightly, did you not sin? Be still." The translation of the Hebrew reads: "If you do well, will not *your countenance* be lifted up? And if you do not do well, sin is crouching at the door." Even though both the Hebrew and the Greek are difficult to understand, 1 Clement 4.4-5 follows the LXX word for word here. Interestingly, Clement also follows the LXX in its addition in Genesis 4:8: "Let us go into the field." These words also occur in the Samaritan Pentateuch, the Vulgate, and the Syriac, but are lacking in the Masoretic text.<sup>39</sup>

In 1 Clement 46.3 the author follows the LXX by making the subject of the verbs "you", that is, the believer. In the Hebrew the subject is God.

In Job 11:2-3 Clement (in 30.4-5) follows the LXX virtually word for word. This passage differs considerably from the Hebrew. It reads: "He that speaks much shall also hear much; or does he that is a good speaker think that he is righteous? Blessed is he that is born of woman and has a short life. Be not profuse in speech." The Hebrew reads: "Are all these words to go unanswered? Is this talker to be vindicated? Will your idle talk reduce men to silence? Will no one rebuke you when you mock?"

It is clear from this and other examples that Clement follows the LXX exclusively. He probably does not know the Hebrew text. This again puts him in alignment with the Book of Hebrews, which also uses the Greek Old Testament rather than the Hebrew. Both authors are probably Hellenistic Jews or proselytes whose minds were saturated with the knowledge of the Old Testament.<sup>40</sup>

One more anomaly exists. There are a couple occasions where Clement cites texts from the Psalms and Proverbs and introduces them as coming from the third section of the

---

<sup>38</sup>The Jews' work on the canon at Jamnia did not occur until near the end of the first century, and had little initial impact on Christians.

<sup>39</sup>The NIV also follows the addition in Genesis 4:8.

<sup>40</sup>So Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, 1:59, describes the author of 1 Clement and thinks he is like the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews.

Hebrew Bible, the "Writings" or the Hagiographa (the "holy writings"). He introduces Psalm 139:7-9 by the words (1 Clem. 28.3): "For the Writing says in one place . . ." The "Writing" translates το γραφειον. Lake believes that this division of the Hebrew Bible "was in a sense 'Scripture' but not considered as important as the 'Law' and the 'Prophets.'"<sup>41</sup> The other example of this occurs in 1 Clement 57.3 where the author cites Proverbs 1:23-33 with the introductory formula: "For 'the excellent wisdom' says thus . . ." The "excellent wisdom" translates η παναρετος σοφια. Lake notes that this is "a title used (a) of Proverbs, (b) of Proverbs, Ecclesiasticus, and Ecclesiastes, (c) of the third division of the O.T. (Hagiographa or 'Writings') as a whole."<sup>42</sup>

Yet Lake's comments regarding the importance of the "Writings" must be reconciled with the fact that of all the portions of the LXX, Clement cites the Psalms the most frequently and views the words he quotes as truly Scripture, as the words of God. . . There are several evidences of this. He introduces texts simply as "he" (possibly "it") "says," referring to God as the speaker (rather than David and others); as "it is written" (putting the Psalms on a par with Scripture); as "the Scripture says"; as the words of Christ (Ps. 22:6-8). Surely Clement did not think of the "Writings" as less important than other Scripture.

This title for the "Writings" does not occur in the New Testament in any introductory formulas. What is surprising is that Clement quotes the LXX at these places, as elsewhere, but uses a word that represents the threefold division of the Hebrew text. This finds its counterpart in Jesus' reference to the sections of the Hebrew Bible as "Moses and all the prophets" (Luke 24:27; cf. Rom. 3:21) and "the Law of Moses and the Prophets and the Psalms" (Luke 24:44). Yet he probably spoke Greek. Why Clement, a converted Gentile, would write to converted Gentiles in a manner that reflects the divisions of the Hebrew Bible is surprising. It is probably due to traditional terminology.

### **CLEMENT'S HERMENEUTIC ILLUSTRATED BY HIS USE OF ISAIAH 60:17**

There is one use of the Old Testament in 1 Clement that deserves special attention. It illustrates well Clement's creative use of Scripture. It is also one of the most deliberate,

---

<sup>41</sup>Lake, *Apostolic Fathers*, 57. Such a threefold division was also used by Ecclesiasticus, Luke (24:44), and Philo (see Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, 2:92). While the entire New Testament uses Psalms and Poetry after Prophets and Pentateuch (see tables elsewhere in this paper), clearly Hebrews uses Poetry more frequently than Prophets, and uses the Psalms more frequently than any other single book. As far as quotations alone are concerned, Hebrews cites more often from the Psalms (16) than from any other book, even more than from the entire Pentateuch (13). This argues that Hebrews, following the example of Jesus himself, considered the Psalms (or, the third division) to be just as important as the other two divisions. Clement parallels the use of Hebrews.

<sup>42</sup>Lake, *Apostolic Fathers*, 107. According to Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, 2:166-167, "wisdom" is also the title given at times to the Song of Songs. "The excellent wisdom" is also given by church fathers to the apocryphal Wisdom of Solomon, as well as to Ecclesiasticus and the others cited by Lake. Clement may have first used this title.

and most explicit, uses of an Old Testament text to prove a point crucial to the whole purpose for the writing of 1 Clement. 1 Clement 42.5 employs Isaiah 60:17 in order to justify from Scripture the offices of bishops and deacons.

This passage (1 Clem. 42) is a crucial, perhaps pivotal one for Clement. Clement himself makes this clear. First, he introduces the legitimacy of the offices of overseer and deacon in this chapter by twice making mention of the Holy Spirit-- as guiding the Apostles in their preaching and in their appointing of the bishops and deacons. Second, he makes his appeal to the Isaiah passage in two separate ways: ". . . for many years before it had been written about bishops and deacons; for so somewhere the Scripture says."

The crucial nature of the passage is also demonstrated by its special role in the context of the epistle. Much of the rest of the epistle is written to reinforce these church offices. Indeed, the purpose in writing the epistle was to rebuke the Corinthians for their sedition and their removing some overseers and ministers from the ministry which they had blamelessly fulfilled (44.6). The Corinthians had cast out the righteous (ch. 45) and the innocent, and this action had led to strife and division (ch. 46). They had responded after Paul's earlier Epistle to them, but now one or two had led them in even more partisan ways and the church had become disloyal to the presbyters (ch. 47).<sup>43</sup> Clement appeals for an end to the division and for love and humility to prevail (chs. 48-50). Clement calls for forgiveness (ch. 51), confession (chs. 52-53), and a sacrificial spirit (chs. 54-55). Prayer (ch. 56), correction, and submission to the presbyters are all in order (chs. 57-58). These topics comprise the concern of the rest of the epistle.

From the very beginning Clement (in 1.1) expressed his abhorrence at the "abominable and unholy sedition" that a few had flamed up into a frenzy with the result that the name of the Corinthian church had been slandered. They had once been above reproach but jealousy and envy with strife and sedition sprang up (chs. 2-3). They were now like Cain and unlike the Apostles (chs. 4--5). The subsequent chapters mix together examples of the saints of Old with exhortations to repentance, humility and submission.

In the context prior to chapter 42, Clement exhorts the need to do all things in order and at the appointed times. He appeals to the order and practices belonging to the sacrificial ritual of the Jews as carried out by the High Priest and the Levites (ch. 40-41). None should violate the appointed rules of spiritual service (ch. 41), he affirms. Then Clement reminds the readers that by God's will Christ appointed the Apostles, and the Apostles appointed their first converts to be bishops and deacons, after testing them by the Spirit. So this appointment was by God's will and by the Spirit.

Apparently, the existence itself of such offices was being attacked by the partisans. So Clement turns to the Old Testament as another authority in which to find the basis and precedent for the appointment of people to the offices of bishop and deacon. To introduce Isaiah 60:17 Clement writes:

---

<sup>43</sup>As Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, 2:129, points out, Clement uses the terms "overseers" and "presbyters" as synonyms. There are only two offices in 1 Clement, overseers (or, bishops or presbyters) and deacons.

They [the Apostles] preached from district to district, and from city to city, and they appointed their first converts, testing them by the Spirit, to be bishops and deacons of the future believers. And this was no new method, for many years before had bishops and deacons been written of; for the scripture says thus in one place: "I will establish their bishops in righteousness, and their deacons in faith."<sup>44</sup>

Is this the meaning of the words in Isaiah 60:17? What is in the context of Isaiah 60?

When we turn to Isaiah 60 we discover that the context is clearly a messianic one. It lies in that great section of comfort for the people of Israel (chs. 40-66). More particularly, the chapter comes in the third and last division of this section (chs. 58-66) where the messianic hope is strongly in view. The last part of chapter 59 (v. 20) promises that the Redeemer will come to Zion, and verse 21 heralds the arrival of an everlasting covenant and God's Spirit. Immediately, 60:1 urges Israel to arise for her light has come and the glory of the LORD has risen on her (v. 2). Israel will be honored among the nations and receive unprecedented prosperity. The nations will bring their wealth to Israel--camels, gold, incense, flocks, silver, and wood products--as God endows her with splendor (vv. 3-9). Foreigners will restore and rebuild Jerusalem which will never be shut again. The nations that formerly oppressed Israel will bow before her (vv. 10-14). Israel will be the everlasting pride and joy of all generations. All this will transpire to confirm that the LORD is Israel's Savior and Redeemer (vv. 15-16).

The latter part (vv. 19-22) of the chapter promises that in the place of the sun and moon, the LORD will be the everlasting light and glory of Israel. There will be no more sorrow. All the people will be righteous and possess the land forever. The LORD will make of the smallest and least a mighty nation. The LORD will do all this swiftly in its time.

Isaiah 61:1ff. continues the promises for Israel. The Spirit of the LORD will be on the anointed one to bring good news, to heal, to bring freedom, and to proclaim the year of the LORD's favor. The rest of the chapter makes additional promises of restoration and righteousness for Israel. Indeed, the Israelites will be called priests of the LORD and ministers of God (v. 6.). Again God promises to make an everlasting covenant with them (v. 8).

Clearly, Isaiah 60:17 sits in the midst of a messianic portion, as Jesus and his Apostles themselves understood it. At the start of his public ministry in the synagogue of Nazareth (Luke 4:16-21), Jesus quoted Isaiah 61:1-2 and claimed that he was fulfilling it. The verse that Clement uses, as translated from the Hebrew, reads:

---

<sup>44</sup>Again, this is the translation of Lake, *Apostolic Fathers*, 81.

Instead of bronze I will bring you gold, and silver in place of iron. Instead of wood I will bring you bronze, and iron in place of stones. I will make peace your governor and righteousness your ruler.

The following verse (18) promises an end to violence and ruin, and Israel will call her walls Salvation and her gates Praise. Clearly there is much metaphor and symbol in this passage.

When we consider the textual matters involved in this citation, it is clear that, as elsewhere, Clement is not using the Hebrew text but the LXX. The latter reads 60:17 as follows:

And in place of brass I will bring you gold, and in place of iron I will bring you silver; and in place of wood I will bring you brass, and in place of stones, iron; and I will give your rulers in peace, and your overseers in righteousness.

The translation of the LXX is a fairly faithful translation of the Hebrew. The latter part of the LXX may be rendered: "I will make peace your rulers, and righteousness your overseers." Clearly there is once again metaphorical language.

Yet Clement's citation reads differently from the LXX as he pens:

I will establish (having καταστησω in place of δωσω) their bishops in righteousness (having τους επισκοπους αυτων εν δικαιοσυνη in place of τους αρχοντας σου εν ειρηνη), and their deacons in faith (having τους διακονους αυτων εν πιστει in place of τους επισκοπους σου εν δικαιοσυνη).

How do we explain these differences, especially Clement's discovery of the words "deacons" and "faith" which neither the Hebrew nor the Greek has? It could be that Clement had a text of the LXX different from the one we now have. More likely, Clement is probably giving a freer rendering of the LXX.<sup>45</sup> Since he found there the verbal correspondence with the word for "overseers" he believed that it was reasonable to render "rulers" by "overseers" and "overseers" by "deacons"; or, more probably, he transposed the order and put "their deacons in faith" for "your rulers in peace," and "their bishops (overseers) in righteousness" for "your overseers in righteousness." He may have been influenced by Philippians 1:1, the only place in the New Testament where "elders" and "deacons" are linked this way. He also substitutes "faith" for "peace" and "their" for "your"

---

<sup>45</sup>Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, 2:129, remarks that it is "loosely quoted from LXX Is. lx.17." The introduction of "deacons" is "due to misquotation." Lightfoot points out that Irenaeus also "applies the passage to the Christian ministry, but quotes the LXX correctly."

Hagner, *Use*, 64ff., puts the use of Isaiah 60:17 under the category of "non-septuagintal quotations" by which he means those that are derived from the LXX but their text-form is freely rendered, perhaps from memory. It could be that it is from a variant LXX text or from some other source (67).

(sing.).<sup>46</sup> His substitutions are certainly not opposite ideas to what the text reads, and approximate it quite closely. The passage is teaching that there will be no tyranny or evil or oppression.

What hermeneutical observations can we make about Clement's use of Isaiah 60:17? Is there any basis for Clement's using this text for the Church? Has he misquoted the text, or misinterpreted it? The following seem to be in order.

(1) In light of the messianic context, it is appropriate that Clement should find here a precedent for church offices now that Christ has come. In other words, Clement believed he lived in the era of fulfillment, the era of the new covenant, just as Jesus himself claimed about this section of Isaiah (61:1-2) in Luke 4. In addition, Hebrews makes much of the fact that the old covenant is obsolete as the new covenant mediated by Jesus takes effect (Heb. 7:22; 8:6-13; 8:8-12 quotes Jer. 31:31-34). Clement has not wrested a passage out of context by finding in it the biblical basis for the two offices of the Church.

(2) Clement contemporizes the Old Testament. He cites the passage with the clear intent of proving his point that the two church offices are divinely intended. If this is the case, then the dissidents at Corinth have violated the Scriptures of the Church, and not only the more subjective will of God and will of the Spirit.

(3) Clement assumes, it seems, that what is promised to a future Israel has been fulfilled in the Church. That is, it seems that he views the Church as the Israel of the new covenant.

(4) The correspondence between Isaiah and 1 Clement is quite remarkable. Isaiah is metaphorical or symbolical. The text means that there will be no tyranny and oppression but peace and righteousness. This is exactly the point of Clement. Repeatedly he speaks of the need for righteousness and peace to prevail (3.4 to 60.4 and 65.1) and these will come through their appointed deacons and overseers. Also faith and submission to rulers must prevail. The best thing would be for the peace and righteousness, and faith, to be personified in their rulers. Thus Clement appropriates the symbolism of the text for his situation.

(5) Yet some observations qualify the import of the changes from the Old Testament. The changes or additions of Isaiah 60:17 which Clement makes concern the word "deacons." In the subsequent passages of 1 Clement, "deacons" go virtually unmentioned while "overseer" or "bishop" (the same office) are the expressed focus. He seems to identify the strife at Corinth as focused on the office of bishop-overseer (see 44.1ff.; 47.6; 54.2; 57.1). In addition, he identifies God as "overseer" (not "deacon," 59.3).

---

There are no textual variants given in Rahlfs' edition.

<sup>46</sup>It is not clear what sense to give to "faith." Clement may refer to "the faith" or, more likely, to the personal faith the deacons should have. Each idea seems to accord with the Christological approach, that faith in Christ is now necessary as distinctive of the new era.

He also is concerned to write about human magistrates as "rulers" and "governors" (60.4; cf. 61.2). All of this suggests that the very word disputed in Isaiah 60, namely "deacon," is of little concern any way to Clement. That is, his purpose in citing Isaiah is to justify the office of overseer, not deacon.

In light of the preceding, there are certain theological ramifications. In some sense, the Lord has come to his temple and righteousness and peace are to prevail. Yet the very nature of 1 Clement as an appeal for righteousness and peace and faith to yet prevail belies the full reality of the promise of Isaiah 60:17. The kingdom is here, yet not here.

Clement's use of Isaiah 60:17 is in accord with his hermeneutical approach as a whole, particularly his approach to the Old Testament. He interprets this symbolic passage with new symbolism for the new era which has dawned. Peace and righteousness, and faith, are even more appropriate now, whatever the embodiment of them might be.

## **SUMMARY OF CLEMENT'S HERMENEUTICAL APPROACH**

### **Broad Foundation**

The most impressive element in Clement is his use of Scripture and his premier concern to contemporize Scripture. The former concerns how he cites Scripture; the latter concerns why, or to what end, he cites or uses Scripture. Other matters, such as his eschatology, the teaching about election, the place of the Holy Spirit, leadership of the church, and inspiration, all result from his hermeneutic. In light of the preceding study, I wish here to summarize some distinctives of the broader foundation for the hermeneutics of 1 Clement, particularly in his use of the Old Testament.

(1) Clement adopts the biblical world view as his own, including what constitutes reality, what is truth, and what is moral or the good. He believes in the theological constructs of the New Testament. He accepts the existence of God, even the trinity, the Holy Spirit, angels, and the dignity of human beings as made in God's image and likeness. He accepts Scripture as true historically and as fully authoritative. He accepts the final revelation of God in the person of Christ. He finds truth in other literature, in general revelation.

(2) Clement views himself as writing under inspiration of the Holy Spirit (1 Clem. 63.2) and as continuing the apostolic concern for the Church ("the glorious and venerable rule of our tradition," 1 Clem.7.2).

(3) Clement does not seem to be conscious of constructing Scripture himself, even though he has the precedent of the New Testament before him. His use of the Scriptures seem to be retrospective, as bolstering his position or arguments. He does not seem to present any new doctrine. His deliberate, lengthy quotations support this observation.

(4) Clement views himself as living in the time of fulfillment, that the kingdom of God (or of Christ?) has arrived. The Church is the elect and chosen people of God.

(5) Clement views sedition and opposition to the constituted officials of the Church, the elders (or, overseers) and deacons, as especially serious, as violating the new era when righteousness and peace, and faith, should prevail.

### **Distinctive Hermeneutical Principles**

The following are those hermeneutical principles for interpreting Scripture and other literature that stem from this broad foundation.

(1) Clement finds truth in sources that are nonbiblical, and even in pagan stories. He places side by side as equally authoritative, as Scripture, passages derived from the Septuagint but not in the Hebrew text, from the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, from apocryphal additions to certain books (e.g., to Ezekiel), from non-canonical sources (e.g., the *Apocalypse of Eldad and Modad*), and from pagan or secular literature.

(2) Clement cites the Old Testament as "the Scripture" and as "it is written." Both of these denotations are lacking in his references to the New Testament and any other literature.<sup>47</sup>

(3) Clement's exhortation to the Corinthians is based almost totally in Old Testament Scripture with the words usually understood in their normal, ordinary sense. While the New Testament gives prior place to the Prophets or Pentateuch, Clement, like Hebrews gives prior place to Poetry.

Clement is convinced that all of Scripture pertains to and is written for his readers. He is "a born quoter."<sup>48</sup> Often he deliberately quotes Scripture with an introductory formula, but many times he simply cites it or alludes to it by weaving it into his sentences without formal acknowledgement. Hardly ever does he inform the reader where the Old or New Testament text is found. He assumes that the reader knows where it is. No doubt this phenomenon is due in part, at least, to his conviction that God is the author of Scripture and its human author (and thus location) is relatively unimportant.

Clement cites Scripture, or clearly alludes to it, in almost all of his sixty-five chapters. Only eighteen chapters lack such an appeal (chs. 1-3, 5, 7, 10, 12, 17-19, 25, 37-38, 40-41, 58, 64-65).

(4) Clement's approach to the Old Testament is Christological. He finds Christ throughout the Old Testament Scriptures. He parallels the New Testament in this matter. This Christological emphasis comes through in many ways. Several quotes are introduced

---

<sup>47</sup>This feature is in keeping with the rest of the Apostolic Fathers (Hagner, *Use*, 277).

<sup>48</sup>Hagner, *Use*, 21, quoting G. H. Rendall.

with introductory formulas which affirm that Christ is the one spoken of by the text. For example, the introduction to the quote of Isaiah 53:1-12 reads (1 Clem. 16.2): "Jesus Christ . . . was humble-minded, as the Holy Spirit spoke concerning him. For he says . . ."

Again, Christ himself is presented as the speaker in the Old Testament text. The introduction to the quote of Psalm 34:11-17 and 32:10 reads (1 Clem. 22.1): "Now the faith which is in Christ confirms all these things, for he himself through his Holy Spirit calls us thus:--'Come, Children, hearken to me, I will teach you the fear of the Lord.'"

(5) Clement finds additional meaning beyond the surface of the text of the Old Testament. This appears not only in his finding Christ by way of quotes and allusions, but also by typology (although he never uses this word). The clearest example comes from 1 Clement 12 where he uses Joshua 2 to find a type of Christ. It is an interesting passage for many reasons.

The entirety of chapter 12 is devoted to "Rahab the harlot" as the final example of "faith and hospitality." Clement begins with the example of Abraham (ch. 10) and moves next to Lot (ch. 13), and then Rahab. He devotes the same number of lines (30) to Rahab as he does to Abraham (but only 13 lines to Lot). He concludes his account of Rahab based in Joshua 2 with the words:

And they proceeded to give her a sign, that she should hang out a scarlet thread from her house, foreshowing that all who believe and hope on God shall have redemption through the blood of the Lord. You see, beloved, that the woman is an instance not only of faith but also of prophecy (1 Clem. 12.7-8).

The terms for "sign" and "foreshowing" are σημειον and προδηλον ποιουντες. Clearly, Clement intends that the Israelite spies are the ones who originate the "sign" and the "foreshowing." Yet Clement says that the woman is prophetic. He says that faith and prophecy have come to pass, have occurred, in the woman. The idea seems to be that the woman by her actions became prophetic. By her hanging out the scarlet thread or rope God prophetically pointed to the redeeming blood of Christ for all who believe and hope on God.

The verbal parallels with Hebrews 11:31 (his last named example) are several, including "faith," "Rahab the harlot," "perish," "received," and "the spies." This instance calls to mind Hebrews 11:19 where Isaac's "being received from the dead" is described as a "parable." Rahab is Clement's last example of faith and hospitality in a series that includes Enoch, Noah, Abraham, Lot, and Rahab (all of which, except for Lot, occur in Heb. 11).

While Clement does not here use the word "type" (he nowhere uses "type"), he creates what is in effect a type of the blood of Christ. The use of προδηλον occurs only elsewhere in 1 Timothy 5:24 ("The sins of some people are evident beforehand") and Hebrews 7:14 ("It is clearly evident that our Lord arose from Judah"). A cognate is δηλωω used in Hebrews 9:8-9a: "The Holy Spirit *signifying, indicating* this, that the way of the Holy of Holies was not yet revealed while the first Tabernacle had standing, which is

a parable for the present age." The Holy Spirit intended a meaning in the record of the sacrifices of the tabernacle of the Old Testament that their repeated offering was evidence that outward ritual could not perfect the conscience nor finally remove sin (vv. 9ff.). In Hebrews 12:27 the word is used to explicate the meaning of an Old Testament passage (Hag. 2:6).

Clement affirms that the actions of Rahab had a meaning that pointed to the death of Christ and its significance for those who have faith and hope in God. His use of this passage does not find a parallel elsewhere in Scripture. In other words, Clement invents a meaning for the scarlet cord without verbal warrant in Scripture, but he finds it intrinsic to the narrative in light of New Testament revelation of the death of Christ. This has all the earmarks of the way a type is usually defined.<sup>49</sup>

Other examples of typology are Clement's making the "gate of righteousness" (Ps. 118:19-20) to be that one opened "in Christ" (Clem. 48.2-4). He also takes Moses' instructions regarding the priesthood (Num. 12:7; ch. 17) as typological of church organization (Clem. 43.1ff.). Perhaps the use of Deuteronomy 32:15 in Clement 3.1 (where the "beloved" is applied to Christians) is also typological, as well as the reference to the "worthless" and "righteousness" being removed (Isaiah 3:5 and 59:14) in 3.3 and 3.4. Other examples of implicit typology may exist but Clement does not develop them.

Yet Clement's restraint here must be emphasized also. He generally takes Scripture in its normal, albeit Christian sense, accepting its historicity. Passages about Israel he simply transfers to the Church in the form of actual predictions. The number of deliberate types or allegories or instances of deeper meaning is remarkably few. He never engages in the kind of spiritualizing or allegorizing that we find in Philo or later church fathers.<sup>50</sup>

---

<sup>49</sup>See the standard works on typology including those by Goppelt, Longenecker, Johnson, Kaiser, Baker, Hasel, France, Davidson, Marsh, etc. Usually a type is defined as characterized by correspondence, historicity, predictiveness, and perhaps heightening.

Hagner, *Use*, 130f., takes the examples of Rahab's red cord (in 12.7) and the gate of righteousness (in 48.2ff.) as examples of allegory, but acknowledges that Clement is not fanciful like Barnabas is.

<sup>50</sup>His allegorizing is more like typology; he accepts the text as an historical account. Clement is not any more fanciful than what Paul does in Galatians 4:21-31; 1 Corinthians 10:1-11; or 9:7-12; or what Hebrews does regarding "rest" (Heb. 3-4) and Melchizedek (Heb. 7), etc. See my study, James B. De Young, "But As Then . . . So Even Now": Toward An Understanding and Reproduction of Paul's Allegory in Galatians 4:21-31," a paper presented to the Evangelical Theological Society, Santa Clara, CA, November 21, 1997.

Hagner, *Use*, 120-132, also draws attention to this restraint regarding typology and allegory. He discusses Clement's interpretation of the Old Testament under three key subjects: Christ, the Church (Clement identifies the Church with Israel), and the kerygma (redemption in Christ, the humility of Christ, resurrection). Hagner describes Clement's methodology in interpreting the Old Testament as "straight-forward and uninteresting" (125-126), as well as "interesting and unique" (128), since he basically interprets the Old Testament in its normal sense (applying the text directly to the Church without interpretation, often finding patterns or examples), and using little typology and allegory.

(6) Clement views the real author of Scripture as God. The additional meaning arises from his conviction that God is the source of all Scripture. Repeatedly Clement will say that God or Christ or the Holy Spirit is the speaker.

To introduce a divine source of Scripture, Clement employs about thirty-four different formulas used approximately sixty-two times. To introduce a human source, he uses about sixteen different formulas to introduce about sixteen quotations. Yet many of these simply repeat the Old Testament text, and represent Scripture's formulas, not Clement's. In addition, he cites six more Old Testament sources without formulas. There are at least three citations of non-canonical writings employing formulas akin to those introducing Scripture. The appendix lists all of the various formulas and citations found in Clement.

An example where a human author is explicitly cited as the author of Scripture occurs in 1 Clement 52.2: "For David the chosen says" (with the quotation of Psalm 69:30-32 following). The appendix (attached) shows that other human authors cited include Moses' Hebrew opponent in Egypt, Rahab and the spies, Adam, Abraham, Job, Moses, and David.

God is cited as the author of Genesis 1:26-28 (1 Clem. 33.5-6), Deuteronomy 9:12-14 (1 Clem. 53.2-3; cf. Exod. 32:7-10); and God as the Master of the Universe in cited as the speaker of Ezekiel 33:11 (1 Clem. 8.2, 4). In all these instances, however, God is also the original speaker in the Old Testament.

At times Christ is the speaker of Old Testament Scripture. Note the instance of 1 Clement 22.1 cited above where Christ is the source of the words of Psalm 34:11-17 and 32:10 ("Christ calls us through his Holy Spirit").

Other ways of introducing Scripture confirm this preference for divine authorship. Clement most frequently (nine times) uses the phrase "it is written" (1 Clem. 4.1; 13.1; 14.4; 36.3; 39.3; 46.2; 48.2; 50.4, 6). Next in frequency are the following phrases: "God says" (using *λεγει*, 10.2, 4, 6; 30.2, 4; 34.8); "he" or "God says" (using *φησιν*, 16.2, 15; 30.2; 33.5; 56.5); "he" or "God says" (using *λεγει*, 10.2, 4, 6; 30.2, 4; 34.8); "again he says" (10.6; 14.5; 36.5; 52.3; 56.6); "again" (15.3, 4, 5; 26.2, 3); "he" or "it says somewhere" (15.2; 21.2; 26.2; 42.5--"Scripture says somewhere"); "he said" (using *ειπεν*, 20.7; 33.6; 46.8--of Jesus); "in another place he says" (8.4; 29.3; 46.3); "the Scripture says" (34.6; 35.7; 42.5); "the holy word says" (13.3; 56.3); "the Master of the Universe spoke" (8.2, 4); and "the Holy Spirit says" (13.1; 16.2). These account for about forty-eight of the citations. The remaining introductory formulas are single occurrences.<sup>51</sup>

---

<sup>51</sup>The remaining introductory formulas (including ways of identifying Scripture) are: "the ministers of the grace of God spoke through the Holy Spirit" (8.1); "Scripture bears witness" (23.5); "by the word of his majesty" (27.4-5); "the writing says" (28.3); "the Scripture in which he says" (23.3); "he warns us" (34.3); "he exhorts us" (34.4); "the Master said" (36.4); "bishops and deacons had been written of" (42.5); "Moses noted in the sacred books" (43.1); "holy Scripture is given by the Holy Spirit" (45.2); "remember the words of the Lord Jesus, for he said" (46.8); "David the chosen says" (52.2); "you understand the sacred

It appears that Clement most frequently uses the phrases, "it is written" and "the Scripture says" for his citations of Isaiah. As pointed out above, Clement never uses such phrases as "it is written" or "the Scripture says" when he cites the New Testament.

(7) Clement emphasizes the role of the Holy Spirit, not a human being, as the speaker in the text. The texts cited above regarding such introductory formulas as "it is written" or "the Scripture says" demonstrate this. The Holy Spirit is the author, whether Clement cites the Psalms (1Clement 16.2; 22.1), Isaiah 53:1-12 (1 Clem. 16.2), or Jeremiah 9:23-24 (1 Clem. 13.1). In this last instance Clement writes, quoting Jeremiah 9:23-24: "Let us do that which is written (for the Holy Spirit says, 'Let not the wise man boast . . .')." His unconcern for the human author leads him to cite (in 1 Clem. 15.2) Isaiah 29:13 as follows: "For it (or, he) says somewhere" (*λεγει γαρ που*) (so also Pro. 20:27 in 21.2; Isa. 60:17 in 42.5). In Clement's view, the "ministers of the grace of God spoke through (*δια*) the Holy Spirit" (1 Clem. 8.1)--a somewhat surprising way to refer to Old Testament sources.

(8) Clement regards himself as living in the era of the fulfillment of the promises. Note how he cites Deuteronomy 32:15: "that which was written was fulfilled," i.e., "in you" (1 Clem. 3.1). Basically, Clement views the Church as Israel; that is, Israel and the Church are "a continuity."<sup>52</sup> However, the Lord will come to his temple (23.5), and the "visitation of the kingdom of Christ" seems to be future (50.3).

(9) The most pervasive trait of Clement is his contemporizing of Scripture. He repeatedly cites Scripture as written "for us" or "to us" (as the above introductory formulas show). He views the Old Testament as fulfilled in Christ or in Christians. Yet the reasons he cites or alludes to Scripture are even more informing.

Clement makes about fifty-nine direct, conscious appeals to Scripture (Old Testament and New) by quote or allusion. Sometimes he strings quotes or allusions together to back up an individual appeal.<sup>53</sup> Thirty-five times he uses "for" (*γαρ*) to introduce his appeals. Clearly, he viewed the Scripture, especially the Old Testament, as speaking to his contemporary age at Rome and Corinth.

His contemporizing of Scripture takes the form of several broad uses. It includes (1) discovering principles, sometimes illustrated by examples, (2) rhetorical use of language borrowed from Scripture, and (3) fulfillment, direct and indirect. Each of these deserves some treatment and illustration.

---

Scriptures" (53.1); "you have studied the oracles of God" (53.1; 62.3); "God said to Moses" (53.2); "the Lord said to Moses" (53.3); "the excellent wisdom says" (57.3).

<sup>52</sup>To use the words of Hagner, *Use*, 127.

<sup>53</sup>This explains the disparity between the number of appeals (59) and the number of total uses of Scripture (OT and NT), which is 395. In addition, the uses of Scripture, particularly the allusions, are woven into his own exhortations and didactic material so that there is no conscious appeal to Scripture.

(1) The discovery of principles is by far Clement's most frequent reason for using Scripture. He finds in the text of Scripture principles that are transcultural, that are as true for his readers as for the original recipients. It is a broad, loosely defined usage of Scripture. It is a usage that encompasses a multitude of purposes. For examples, he appeals to the text for the principle that envy destroys harmony, and furnishes examples of such (1 Clem. 4.1; 6.3; 9.2); he affirms the need to repent of envy (8.5); to turn from doubt and double-mindedness (11.2; 23.3); to be humble (13.1, 2, 3); to be kind and compassionate (14.4, 5). He affirms that peace is based in piety not hypocrisy (15.2, 3, 4, 5); that Christ is our example of humility (16.17); that peace and concord are demonstrated by the ocean and the whole universe (20.7); and that Christ's coming comes as quickly as fruit ripens (23.5). He gives many more principles.<sup>54</sup>

(2) Clement also contemporizes Scripture by simply appropriating and incorporating it in his language as he writes to the Corinthians. It is an unconscious use for the most part. Perhaps this is best illustrated by his extended prayer in 59.3-61.3. He prays to the "God of all" who "puts to death and makes alive" to "open the eyes of our heart." He asks God to "save the afflicted," "to ransom our prisoners," to let all "nations know you, that you are God alone" and that "Jesus is your child," and that "we are your people and the sheep of your pasture." He prays to God, the "merciful and compassionate" to "guide our steps to walk in holiness" and to "make your face to shine on us" in peace "for our good," and to be delivered by "your uplifted arm." He asks that "we might be obedient to our rulers and governors on the earth," "to be subject to them," and that "the King of eternity" would guide their counsel according to what is "good and pleasing before you." Finally, he confesses Jesus Christ as "the high priest and guardian of our souls." This is just one portion illustrating this rhetorical use of Scripture.

(3) Finally, Clement contemporizes Scripture by claiming the fulfillment of prophecy and promises made in Scripture, or by citing Jesus as the speaker in the Old Testament. This is done directly and indirectly. In the area of indirect fulfillment are

---

<sup>54</sup>Other principles drawn from Scripture include the following. He cites Scripture to show that we should be citizens worthy of Christ (21.1); to live holily (21.9); to exercise faith in Christ (22.1); that seed sowing and springing up, the Phoenix, and Scripture show that there is a resurrection (24.5; ch. 25; 26.1-3); that God's word establishes all (27.4-5-7); that none can escape from God (28.2-3); that pride is wrong (30.2); that deeds, not speech, should justify us (30.4); that we should do righteousness and truth through faith (31.2-4); that people are the most excellent of God's creatures (33.5); that we should be prompt in doing well (34.2); that angels are ready to do God's will (34.5); that those who do evil are hateful to God (35.6); that mortals are frail (39.3); that the sacrificial system illustrates obedience and the appointed times for it (40.1-5; 41); that offices of presbyter and deacon are justified (42.5); that the righteous will be persecuted by the wicked (45.6f.); that we should cleave to holy examples (46.1); that God will judge the schismatics (46.7-8); that we should turn from partisanship (47.1ff.); that reconciliation brings a "gate of righteousness" which is Christ (48.2); that love defies explanation (49.5); that those perfected in love will be revealed at the coming of the kingdom (50.4); that we are forgiven through God's love (50.6); that we should confess sin and not harden our hearts (51.3-4; 52.1ff.); that we should remember what the oracles of God said (53.1-2); that every place will receive a repentant sinner (54.3); that we should sacrifice self (55.4); that all should receive correction (56.2-3, 5, 6); that we should submit to presbyters (57.2f.); that we should remember the examples of the fathers (62.2; 63.1) and the oracles of God (62.3).

several examples of what we would call types of believers or Christ (although Clement never uses the term "type"). For example, a "sign of double-mindedness and doubt was made (note the passive) when . . . Lot's wife changed her mind . . . and became a pillar of salt until this day." Also, when Moses "signified in the holy books" the instructions for the priesthood (Num. 12:7), he was giving a type or example for the succession of people in the church offices (43.1ff.). Another typological use of the Old Testament occurs when Clement (48.2) identifies the "gate of righteousness" (Ps. 118:19f.) as Christ.

As shown above, the most famous example of "typology" occurs in 1 Clement 12. Here a whole chapter is devoted to the incident of Rahab's preservation of the spies of Israel (Josh. 2).

Another aspect of indirect fulfillment, at least, is Clement's taking language used of Israel in the Old Testament and applying it to Christians. Believers are God's "beloved" (1 Clem. 3.1 using Deut. 32:15); "the portion of his choice" (1 Clem. 29.1-2; 30.1 using Deut. 32:8-9); "your people and the sheep of your pasture" (1 Clem. 59.4 using Ps. 78:13; 94:7; 99:3); and a "peculiar people" (1 Clem. 64.1 using Deut. 14:2).

As examples of direct fulfillment, we have the claim by Clement (16.1-17) that the Holy Spirit spoke concerning Jesus in Isaiah 53:1-12 and Psalm 22:6-8, and then he quotes the entire passages. He concludes the section by observing that Jesus in this portion "was the example (υπογραμμος) [of humility] given (note the passive) to us." Also in this category belong those passages in which Clement assumes that believers are citizens of God's kingdom already (21.1--Pro. 20:27). While the referent of "citizens" is often unspecified, it surely must refer to the believers' heavenly citizenship and not their earthly one (which is never acknowledged). In 21.8 Clement says that believers are to live holily, and then proceeds to affirm that "faith in Christ confirms all this," for Christ "himself through the Holy Spirit calls us thus." He then (22.1-8) quotes all of Psalm 34:11-17 and 32:10 as addressed to believers in Christ. In 23.5 he claims that God's will shall be quickly accomplished, "as the Scripture also bears witness that 'he shall come quickly . . . the Lord shall suddenly come to his temple . . .'" (citing Isa. 13:22 and Mal. 3:1). Clearly he is thinking of Christ's fulfilling this promise.

Further examples of direct fulfillment occur. In 1 Clement 29.1-2 the author cites Deuteronomy 32:8-9 and 4:34; 14:2; Num. 18:27) as spoken to believers, who are "the portion of his choice for himself" (where the context refers to Israel). Believers are "the seed" of Abraham (32.2) and will "share in his great and glorious promises" (34.8). In 1 Clement (36.4, 5) the author represents God as the "Master" speaking "of his son" in the words of Psalm 104:4, Psalm 2:7-8, and those of Psalm 110:1, just as Hebrews (1:7, 5, 13) does. Clement (in 42.5) even claims that Isaiah 60:17 "had written about bishops and deacons" long before the present to give warrant to their offices. He cites Jesus' words which warn about offending "one of these little ones who believe in me" (Matt. 18:6) to warn about offending "one of my elect" (twice; 46.8). Finally, another clear prophecy fulfilled in Christ occurs in 1 Clement 50.4. Here Isaiah's words (26:20) promising a resurrection are spoken to those perfected in love who are among "the pious who will be revealed at the visitation of the Kingdom of Christ."

## SIMILARITY OF 1 CLEMENT AND HEBREWS

The strong dependence of 1 Clement on Hebrews justifies giving special attention to how these two epistles relate, both in regards to the phenomena of their usage of the Old Testament and to the hermeneutics involved.

Clement is more like Hebrews than any other New Testament book.<sup>55</sup> This is true, both with regard to his frequency of usage (next to the Psalms, he uses Hebrews by citation and allusion more frequently than any other book of Scripture, Old or New Testament),<sup>56</sup> and with regard to the nature of the two works. The following are the salient points of hermeneutics that align 1 Clement with Hebrews based on my previous study of the hermeneutics of Hebrews.<sup>57</sup> Many of these points have been demonstrated in the earlier portions of this study, and so they are simply cited here.

### Usage of the Old Testament

As far as portions of Old Testament Scripture are concerned, both Clement and the book of Hebrews show a similar usage. The following shows this statistically.<sup>58</sup>

---

<sup>55</sup>Also, no other writing from among the Apostolic Fathers uses Hebrews as clearly and frequently as Clement does (Hagner, *Use*, 287).

<sup>56</sup>While Hagner, *Use*, 353f., places Clement's use of Hebrews (12) after that of 1 Corinthians (16) and Romans (14), his detailed discussion (179-209) seems to favor Hebrews over 1 Corinthians (about 60 to 50 allusions). In addition, he states (31) that Clement's usage of introductory formula is more like that of Hebrews than any other New Testament author.

<sup>57</sup>For a critique of the hermeneutic of the Book of Hebrews, see James B. De Young, "The Writer to the Hebrews: A Pioneer in Postmodern Evangelical Hermeneutics? Or, Rediscovering Vulgar Interpretation," a paper presented to the Evangelical Theological Society, Philadelphia, PA., November 17, 1995.

<sup>58</sup>Again, these statistics I've calculated from the indices of the UBSGNT<sup>4</sup>. Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis*, 164-166, lists 38 quotes. His figures are: Psalms (18, or 19 if one counts Ps. 97:7); Deuteronomy (5), Genesis (3), Exodus (3), Jeremiah (3), Isaiah (2), 2 Samuel (1), Proverbs (1), Habakkuk (1), Haggai (1). By grouping the numbers are: Poetry (19), Pentateuch (11), Prophets (7), and History (1). These are quite similar to those of UBSGNT<sup>4</sup>: Poetry (17), Pentateuch (13), Prophets (6), and History (1). The different totals in Longenecker do not affect the comparisons I make.

Longenecker is probably more accurate. He finds an additional quote, Psalm 95:11, in Hebrews 4:5; he separates 7:17 from 7:21 and so finds two quotes of Psalm 110:4; he separates 10:16 from 10:17 to separate the quote of Jeremiah 31:33 from 31:34; he separates 10:30a from 10:30b to separate the quote of Deuteronomy 32:35 from 32:36; he omits Genesis 14:17-20 as a quotation in Hebrews 7:1-2; he omits Genesis 5:24 as a quotation in Hebrews 11:5; and he omits Genesis 47:31 as a quotation in Hebrews 11:21.

Longenecker's number of allusions for Hebrews is about 55 in the following order: Pentateuch (41), Isaiah (7), Psalms (2), Zechariah (2), and 1 each for Daniel, Hosea, and Proverbs. UBSGNT<sup>4</sup> has about 183 allusions, as shown in this study, with this order: Pentateuch (115), Psalms (23), Isaiah (12), Joshua (5), Jeremiah (4), with 2 Samuel, 2 Chronicles, Ezekiel, and Daniel each having 3, with Judges, 1 Samuel, 1 Kings, and 1 Chronicles each having 2, and Proverbs, 2 Kings, Hosea, and Zechariah each having 1.

### Usage in Hebrews

37 quotations + 183 allusions

Psalms 16+23=39  
Genesis 6+31=37  
Deuteronomy 4+12=16  
Exodus 3+32=35  
Isaiah 2+12=14

Jeremiah 2+4=6  
2 Samuel 1+3=4  
Proverbs 1+1=2  
Habakkuk 1+0=1  
Haggai 1+0=1

Leviticus 0+23=23  
Numbers 0+17=17  
Joshua 0+5=5  
Judges 0+2=2  
1 Samuel 0+2=2

1 Kings 0+2=2  
2 Kings 0+1=1  
1 Chron. 0+2=2  
2 Chron. 0+3=3  
Ezekiel 0+3=3

Daniel 0+3=3  
Hosea 0+1=1  
Zechariah 0+1=1  
Ruth 0  
Ezra 0

Nehemiah 0  
Esther 0  
Job 0  
Song of Sol. 0  
Ecclesiastes 0

Lamentations 0  
Joel 0  
Amos 0  
Obadiah 0  
Jonah 0

### Usage in 1 Clement

105 quotations + 88 allusions

29+15=44  
12+13=25  
9+3=12  
8+0=8  
10+8=18

1+5=6  
0+2=2  
7+1=8  
0

0

0+3=3  
6+10=16  
5+3=8  
0  
1+6=7

1+2=3  
0+1=1  
0  
2+0=2  
3+3=6

1+1=2  
0  
0+1=1  
0  
0

0  
0+3=3  
8+4=12  
0  
0+1=1

0  
1+0=1  
1+0=1  
0  
0+1=1

Micah	0		0
Nahum	0	0	
Zephaniah	0		0
Malachi	<u>0</u>		<u>0+2=2</u>
	37+183=220		105+88=193

The preceding table shows that both Hebrews and 1 Clement have a regard for the same portions of the Old Testament, namely Psalms, Genesis, and Deuteronomy. Hebrews has a higher use of Exodus over Isaiah, whereas Clement reverses this. The other difference is Hebrews' high usage by allusion to Leviticus, whereas this is lacking in Clement. Both show a high regard for Numbers and Joshua. Clement's high regard for Proverbs is lacking in Hebrews. In summary, 1 Clement uses two more books of the Old Testament than does Hebrews (25 to 23 books).

Remembering that Hebrews is about 85% as long as 1 Clement, it is clear that Hebrews makes much more total use of the Old Testament than does 1 Clement. It is about one and a third times more (adjusted to 259 for Hebrews, and 193 for Clement). Yet no author, including Hebrews, quotes passages as long as the ones that Clement cites.

The table shows that the two writers have a high preference for the same portions of the Old Testament. Allusions and quotations are most frequently made of the Pentateuch (Hebrews--128; Clement--64), the Psalms (Hebrews--39; Clement--44); and Isaiah (Hebrews--14; Clement--18). The order of preference here (Pentateuch--128 and 64, Poetry--41 and 65, Prophets--30 and 38) is in contrast to the order for quotations and allusions used in the whole New Testament (Prophets, Pentateuch, Poetry), including, in general, the order found in Paul's Epistles.<sup>59</sup> Indeed, Hebrews puts Poetry over the Pentateuch. By grouping, the *quotations* in Hebrews are ranked: Poetry (17), Pentateuch (13), Prophets (6) and History (1). This is paralleled by Clement, where the figures are: Poetry (44), Pentateuch (35), Prophets (17), and History (9).

In addition to Scripture, Hebrews and Clement show a similar regard for the Apocrypha. Hebrews cites or alludes to the Apocrypha 7 times, and Clement uses this and the Pseudepigrapha about 25 times.

### Shared Hermeneutical Concepts

Next, I wish to summarize the points that show the similarities of the hermeneutics shared by Hebrews and 1 Clement.

---

<sup>59</sup>Paul prefers the following order in his quotations: Pentateuch, 42 times (Gen.--16; Exod.--6; Lev.--5; Num.--1; Deut.--14); Prophets, 40 times (Isa.--28); and Poetry, 22 times (Ps.--20). These statistics are paralleled by those for allusions as well. Basically, uses of the Pentateuch and Prophets are about equal, with the Psalms coming a distant third.

This information suggests that Paul is not the author of Hebrews.

(1) Both cite only the Greek translation of the Old Testament. They do not know the Hebrew text. Yet 1 Clement can speak of the third division of the Hebrew Bible (1 Clem. 28.3; citing Ps. 139:7-9 as "the writing says"; and 57.3; citing Pro. 1:23-33 as "the excellent wisdom says"). Also, they clearly consider the LXX as authoritative for them.<sup>60</sup>

(2) Clement and Hebrews share special, even unique features involving introductory formulas.

(a) Both link various Old Testament quotes together by the device of repeating the phrase, "and again" (cf. Heb. 1:5-6; 2:12-13; and 1 Clem. 10.6; 14.5; 15.3, 4, 5; 26.2, 3; 36.5; 52.3; 56.6), as in a few other places in the New Testament (e.g., Rom. 15:10-12). They also use "in another place he says" (Heb. 5:6; 1 Clem. 8.4; 29.3; 46.3; cf. Acts 13:35); and similar introductory formulas.

Both authors engage in pearl-stringing (*gezurah shawah*)--citing passages because they have a common word in them. For example, Hebrews 1 strings quotes from Psalms 2:7 and 2 Samuel 7:14 by means of the word "son." 1 Clement strings several passages together by using such terms as "mouth" and "lips" (1 Clem. 15.2, 3, 4, 5; citing Isa. 29:13; Ps. 61:5; 77:36, 37; 30:19; 12:3-5), "raise" (26.2-3; citing Ps. 28:7; 3:5; Job 19:26), and "sacrifice" in word and concept (52.2-4; citing Ps. 69:30-32; 50:14-15; 51:17).

Rarely do both cite the human author of the Old Testament text. Everywhere else they affirm that God or Christ or the Spirit or he or it is the author. Often the phrase, "it is written," occurs (but never in Hebrews). Hebrews cites Moses as speaking in 9:20; 12:21 (in the flow of the narrative). Elsewhere, the closest Hebrews comes to identifying a human author is when he says that "God spoke *through* David" (to introduce Ps. 95:7-8 in Heb. 4:7; even here he avoided designating the human author when earlier, in 3:7ff., he introduced the entirety of Ps. 95:7-11 as what "the Holy Spirit says"). Interestingly, this is one of the few human authors that 1 Clement also explicitly cites when he says, "For David the chosen says," to introduce the quote of Psalm 69:30-32.

---

<sup>60</sup>The text of the LXX used by Clement is summarized by Hagner, *Use*, 77f. He points out that most of the quotations in Clement are in very close accord with the LXX text, with only slight variations. Here the text as found in Codex Alexandrinus is "essentially trustworthy and has not been thoroughly harmonized to agree with the LXX" (77). It is "virtually impossible to establish any general textual affinities with the major texts of the LXX" (77). Hagner views the text as Swete did, namely that: "(1) it occasionally agrees with that of NT quotations, but also shows independence; (2) 'while often supporting A, it is less constantly opposed to B than is the New Testament'; and (3) it occasionally agrees with Theodotion and Aquila against the LXX" (78). Hagner would state point (2) as "B is supported by Clement at least as often as is A" (78).

Regarding the slight variations from the LXX, these are Clement's own changes arising from his "concern for smoothness of style and clarity of expression" (78). Regarding the moderately variant quotations, Hagner believes that Clement may be "rendering the materials freely, actively reshaping them according to his own purpose or context, or perhaps quoting, not altogether accurately, from memory" (78-79). In the case of "composite quotations and 'non-septuagintal' or variant quotations," Hagner believes that they may derive from memory of the LXX or from non canonical sources (79), which Clement often uses.

(b) Regarding unique features, only these authors use explicitly indefinite phrases involving πού, such as, "he says somewhere" (Heb. 2:6; 4:4; 1 Clem. 15.2; 21.2; 26.2; 42.5). Neither Clement nor Hebrews uses the term "fulfill" (πληροῶ) in his use of the Old Testament. Yet Clement 3.1 uses "fulfill" from ἐπιτελεῶ for the fulfilling of Scripture, and elsewhere, like Hebrews (8:5; 9:6), uses it for completing a work or something (1 Clem. 1.3; 2.8; 20.10; 33.1; 35.5; 40.1, 3; 48.4; 55.3).

Another feature unique to both Hebrews and Clement is the use of formulas in which the Holy Spirit is said to speak directly from the Scriptures without mention of the human mediator. This occurs more than once in each book (Heb. 3:7; 10:15; 1 Clem. 13.1; 16.2).<sup>61</sup>

Closely related to the preceding point is the fact that these authors view God as the author of Scripture. Primary emphasis is on what God intended behind the human authors. Thus it is not surprising to find only Clement and Hebrews give special emphasis to the Holy Spirit as the direct speaker in or source of Scripture apart from a human mediator. In Hebrews 3:7 the author introduces the quotation of Psalm 95:7-11 with the words, "So, as the Holy Spirit says" (cf. 10:15). As one example in 1 Clement, the author writes (13.1): "Let us do that which is written, for the Holy Spirit says," and quotes Jeremiah 9:23-24 (cf. 1 Sam. 2:10).<sup>62</sup> Clement seems to have all Scripture in mind when he observes: ". . . the Holy Scriptures, which are true, and given by the Holy Spirit" (45.2). 1 Clement's greater emphasis on the Holy Spirit as the Author behind the human author in the giving of Scripture apparently reflects a development of this doctrine.

(3) Both writers give special place to the Holy Spirit. For example, Hebrews refers to the Spirit seven times (2:4; 3:7; 6:4; 9:8, 14; 10:15, 29), while 1 Clement has eleven references (2.2; 8.1; 13.1; 16.2; 22.1; 42.3; 42.4; 45.2; 47.3; 58.2; 63.2). In 58.2 the Spirit is mentioned in conjunction with God and Jesus Christ in what appears to be a conscious reference to the Trinity.

(4) Both often find a deeper or spiritual meaning in the text. This additional meaning of the text may take the form of types, a Christological meaning of the text, the discovery of an intention that exceeds the human author's (when he affirms that Christ or the Spirit is the speaker of the words in the Old Testament), or the actualizing of a passage in the present era.<sup>63</sup>

---

<sup>61</sup>I am indebted to Hagner, *Use*, 31, for this observation.

<sup>62</sup>Other instances in 1 Clement where he presents the Holy Spirit as the author of Scripture are: 8.1; 16.2; 22.1; 45.2; 47.3; 63.2.

<sup>63</sup>See De Young, "Hebrews," 5-6, for several examples in Hebrews. An example of a type in Clement is Rahab's red cord; an example in Hebrews is Isaac (Heb. 11:19). Clement 22.1 cites Psalm 34:11-17 as coming from Jesus: "he himself calls us thus" (cf. Clem. 34.3 where he cites Isaiah 40:10 as "he warns us"). Other examples are given above. Yet neither author uses the term "type" (τύπος).

(5) Both writers are self-consciously aware that they are interpreting Scripture (Heb. 5:11-14; 8:13; 9:8; 11:13-16, 26). Clement interprets Cain's sin and others' as jealousy and envy (chs. 3, 4, 5, 6, 9), that hospitality and faith saved Abraham, Lot, and Rahab (chs. 10, 11, 12), and that Christ is the example of humility found in Isaiah 53 (ch. 16). Clement seeks more often to "remind" the readers of what Scripture already means to them (yet also Heb. 12:5 speaks of the readers as "having forgotten the exhortation," citing Pro. 3:11-12).

(6) Both writers prefer the same blocks or sections of the Old Testament. 1 Clement, as Hebrews, prefers the Psalms above all other portions.

They even quote some of the same passages from the Old Testament (Gen. 5:24; 22; Ps. 2:7; 104:4; 110:1; Pro. 3:11-12). In addition, the two have in common larger contexts from which quotations are made, such as chapters (Gen. 2, 21, 22; Deut. 9, 32; Pss. 2, 22, 110, 118; Hag. 2). As others have pointed out, the quotes made of individual verses may indeed point to their larger contexts for meaning.<sup>64</sup> An even greater number of allusions are drawn from the same passages.

(7) Both authors believe that they write by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit. This is implicit in Hebrews (see 3:7; 6:4; 9:8; 10:15) but explicit in 1 Clement. The latter writes: ". . . we have written through the Holy Spirit" (63.2; cf. 56.1; 58.2; 59.1 where a claim of inspiration seems to be implicit). He affirms a similar thing of the Apostle Paul's writing of 1 Corinthians, that he charged them "with true inspiration" (επ' αληθειας πνευματικως) (1 Clem. 47.3).

(8) Clement follows Hebrews in its unique description of Christ as high priest (36.1). Clement, like Hebrews, also mentions the "Holy Place." It is the place to which Paul was taken at his death (1 Clem. 5.7). He also affirms that "the Holy of Holies shall come forth from that nation" (1 Clem. 29.3). Hebrews makes reference to both of these sections of the tabernacle (9:2, 3, 12, 24, 25). Both writers also draw upon the ritual of the sacrifices and tabernacle to teach contemporary lessons for church order and belief (1 Clem. 40-43; Heb. 9-10), and to explain the meaning of Christ's sacrifice.

(9) It is the chief concern of both writers to contemporize Scripture for their readers. Usually they do this by citing Old Testament texts as fulfilled in various ways in their days--the era of messianic times, the last days, the consummation of the ages, the coming age now is process of being realized or actualized (note Heb. 1:2; 2:4; 2:5; 3:7-12; 9:26; 12:5-6; 12:24-25; 13:6; and the overall approach to Scripture throughout Clement).

(10) Both embrace an eschatological perspective of the kingdom as both here and not here. Jesus is already crowned yet he is still to come. Believers have come already to God's city, yet await the kingdom to come (Heb. 2:8-9; 10:37; 12:22-24, 28; in 1 Clem. 2.8;

---

<sup>64</sup>This is the point of C. H. Dodd, *According to the Scriptures* (New York: Scribners, 1953), in his significant work. An interesting pursuit would be to see if his list of core Old Testament texts as used in the New Testament overlap with the texts Clement uses.

3.4; 21.1; 54.4, Christians already are citizens of the country or city of God). Yet they await the Lord's coming to his temple (23.5) with his reward (34.3), at the visitation of his kingdom (50.3). Both writers assume that believers in Christ are God's special people, at least an extension, if not replacement, of Israel (Heb. 8; 1 Clem. 64).

Yet a similarity of eschatological perspective is not really surprising when the two authors embrace a highly similar hermeneutic. I give further attention to Clement's eschatology in the excursus.

(11) Both books find authoritative truth beyond the canon. That is, they quote or allude to extra-biblical material from the Apocrypha or Pseudepigrapha, and even non-Jewish material (as shown above regarding 1 Clement). Thus these writers, especially Clement, find truth in general revelation (1 Clem. 23.3, 4, 5; 24.1, 3-4, 5, ch. 25 (the story of the Phoenix); 26.1-3; 27.1ff.; etc.). Hebrews cites the *Ascension of Isaiah* (11.37), Enoch (11:5), Sirach (6:14; 11:5, 12; 12:12), and Wisdom (11:5). In addition, Hebrews 9:16-17 appropriates secular, contemporary meaning ("testament") to add to the biblical meaning of "covenant."

(12) Both use later Scripture to interpret earlier Scripture. Hebrews demonstrates this most clearly in his discovery from Psalm 110:4 that Jesus is in the high priesthood of Melchizedek (Gen. 14) who thus is made like Jesus, the Son of God (note Heb. 5:10; ch. 7).<sup>65</sup> Clement reads the entire Old Testament in light of the revelation of Christ made in the New Testament, particularly in Hebrews and 1 Corinthians. As an example, he reads (1 Clem. 36.1-6) what Hebrews says of Christ in Hebrews 1:1-4 in order to find Christ in such Psalms as 104, 2, and 110--just like Hebrews did. His finding Rahab's cord as a symbol of Christ's blood comes about by reading New Testament truth back into the Old.

(13) The horizon of both writers affects the meaning that they find in the Old Testament. That is, the occasion of the epistle determines the texts each uses and the meaning he finds there.

(14) Both are strongly led by a Christological interpretation of the Old Testament. They find Christ everywhere: as speaker, in types, as spoken of, etc. Hebrews, chapters 1 and 2 alone, affirms that we see Jesus as the one spoken of in Psalms 2, 97, 104, 45, 102, 110, 8, 22; 2 Samuel 14; and Isaiah 8. Similarly 1 Clement finds Jesus Christ throughout the Old Testament. The two strongest assertions are that the Holy Spirit spoke of Christ in Isaiah 53 (1 Clem. 16.2), and that Jesus himself speaks of himself in Psalm 22 (16.15). Additionally, types and prophecies are fulfilled in Christ.

(15) Both epistles are self-conceived as exhortations, although this is shown in different ways. Hebrews 13:22 reads: "I exhort you to bear with this word of exhortation." "Exhortation" (or, "comfort") as a verb and noun occurs frequently (cf. Heb. 3:13; 6:18;

---

<sup>65</sup>See De Young, "Hebrews," 4-5, for additional examples of Hebrews' use of later Scripture to interpret earlier Scripture.

10:25; 12:5; 13:19, 22 (twice)).<sup>66</sup> On the other hand, while Clement prays for God to "comfort" the fainthearted (59.4), his "exhortation" takes the form of 70 instances of the hortatory subjunctive and 24 uses of the imperative mood, of various verbs, in addition to the force of citing quotations.<sup>67</sup>

However, there are some surprises regarding the omissions in Clement of things that appear in Hebrews. There is no new covenant. There is only one use of Psalm 110:1 whereas Hebrews uses it at least five times. There is no mention of Melchizedek. Of the thirty-five distinctive truths contributed by Hebrews,<sup>68</sup> only two or three seem to be repeated by Clement. No doubt the best explanation of this phenomenon is that Clement's purpose for writing, which is so different from Hebrews', is the major factor affecting his content. To reiterate, it is Clement's use of the Old Testament which makes him most like Hebrews.

Another question or two is in order. Why is it that 1 Clement is so similar to Hebrews? Why is he more dependent on it than virtually any other book? It suggests that Hebrews was addressed to Rome, or was written from Rome, and Clement is familiar with it. Yet historical evidence shows that Hebrews, after its initial reception in the West, was more readily recognized as canonical in the East and elsewhere before it was accepted in the West (i.e., Rome). In addition, Hebrews was part of the antilegomena (books contested) for the first few centuries. This suggests that Clement, by his heavy dependence on and use of Hebrews, may be consciously "promoting" the work as canonical in his community.

Indeed, Clement may not have believed that Hebrews is canonical. He speaks of Paul (47.3) as "charging"<sup>69</sup> the Corinthians in his first epistle "with true inspiration." Clement makes no such description of Hebrews. Rather, he may have thought that it had the kind of inspiration by which he writes to the Corinthians, "through the Holy Spirit" (1 Clem. 63.2), and which the extra-canonical books also possessed and which he cites (the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha). Yet these observations must be tentative, for Clement nowhere cites any of the New Testament with the words, "it is written" or "God says" or "the Holy Spirit says." Clearly, he esteems the Old Testament with a higher respect than the New Testament, perhaps because for him the canon of the New is even more in flux than that of the Old. Also, these observations must acknowledge that the occasion for Clement's epistle has determined the content of it.

---

<sup>66</sup>These are translations from παρακαλεω and its cognates.

<sup>67</sup>This count is from H. Dressler as cited by Hagner, *Use*, 7, note 1. 1 Corinthians also uses the same terms for "exhortation" 7 times.

<sup>68</sup>See De Young, "Hebrews," 11-12.

<sup>69</sup>Note that the same word for "charging" (επιστελλω) is used in Heb. 13:22: "By a few words I have charged you." This suggests that Clement viewed both 1 Corinthians and Hebrews as of the same character (inspired?).

In addition, Clement may have regarded Hebrews as especially representative of apostolic writings as a whole, as best representing the interpretation of the Old Testament, at least for the accomplishing of his reason for writing--to exhort an end to the sedition and respect for the church's leadership (which is another parallel with Hebrews; note 13:7, 17, 24).

## CONCLUSIONS

This study has shown that no other Christian writing of the first century quotes and alludes to other literature as Clement does. His usage of the Old Testament is unparalleled as far as the amount of material he cites and the frequency with which he cites it. His preference for the Psalms makes his usage unique, and is paralleled only by Hebrews. He often cites non-canonical literature in a way similar to his citation of Scripture, and even finds Christ symbolized in secular literature.

In this study, I set out to answer three questions. First, I asked: What is Clement's hermeneutic? This study has shown that there is sufficient use and interpretation of the Scriptures to derive a basic understanding of Clement's hermeneutic. His hermeneutic is a Christological one. His concern is not for the peculiarities of the Greek, nor for the forms of the words, nor for what the human author's intention may have been. Rather he is concerned to discover the intention of God--what God means in the text relative to Christ and the present age. He is convinced that he is able to find Christ and his people throughout the text. He views the Old Testament as a depository of principles and examples written for Christians. While his usage of the Old Testament is usually literal, he often finds a deeper or spiritual meaning. He seems to make no distinction between what the text means and application.

Second, I sought to answer: How does Clement's hermeneutic compare with the way the New Testament interprets the Old? In his hermeneutical method, Clement is quite similar to the method of the New Testament. In particular, Clement seems to pattern deliberately his use of the Old Testament after the way that Hebrews uses Scripture. He shares with Hebrews numerous and unique parallels.

Third, I asked: Is Clement a model for our hermeneutical approach to Scripture? In light of the preceding answers, it seems to be an inescapable conclusion that Clement is such a model for contemporary Christians. At least in all those ways that he has in common with the approach of Hebrews, his is a hermeneutic to be emulated.

We can state it another way. However we define the hermeneutic of the New Testament, Clement empowers us to realize that it is reproducible and ought to guide Christian interpretation. It is one that ordinary Christians can follow. It is inspired and able to be emulated.

Yet someone may ask: "Why should Clement with his Christological approach to Scripture be a model for us any more than Origen with his three levels of meaning (literal, allegorical, moral) or Augustine with his four levels (literal, allegorical, moral,

anagogical)?" Of course, we might answer that Clement, because he actually knew the Apostles, is presumably closer to their mind than are others who are later. Yet a better answer is precisely this. What Clement does emulates closely what the New Testament, especially Hebrews, does. We follow 1 Clement because he follows Hebrews. More significantly, he signals to us that he viewed the hermeneutics of Hebrews as authoritative or informing for his, Christian hermeneutic.

We do not follow Origen and Augustine and others who go beyond the model of the New Testament and regularly find other senses (particularly the allegorical, moral, and anagogical). The New Testament and Clement may engage in this on occasion but they do not do this as a matter of general approach. There is a difference between finding a spiritual, deeper meaning in the text and spiritualizing the text.<sup>70</sup>

How is it that 1 Clement follows more closely the approach of the New Testament and these others do not? The answer lies in how it is that Clement reproduces the biblical hermeneutic at all. It is because he embraces a biblical worldview concerning what constitutes reality, truth, and the good or moral. This worldview is centered in the kingdom as both transcendent and immanent. Origen and Augustine err precisely where they embrace elements derived from their contemporary worldview which are antithetical to a biblical world view. It is no wonder that Philo, the Jewish allegorist, has no future kingdom in history for he gives little place to history in his hermeneutic for interpreting Scripture.<sup>71</sup> Clement's biblical worldview has fashioned his concept of the kingdom.

It is precisely here that we moderns err also. When we embrace the elements of a modern worldview, or a postmodern worldview, which are antithetical to a biblical worldview, we err. For example, modernism, while giving us a strong sense of the rational and empirical method as a means to discover truth, errs when the approach is taken to extremes which deny miracle, supernatural revelation, or experience--when we approach a text as a scientific inquiry. Postmodernism, while raising the spectre of knowing from various sources and challenging "sacred cows" of scientific discovery, errs when the approach is taken to deny absolute truth or the existence of God as the source of such truth. Where elements of the modern worldview reinforce the biblical worldview we benefit from the discoveries of our age in applying them to hermeneutics.

As in the past, the remedy is to embrace a biblical worldview. After all, when the New Testament writers interpret the coming of Jesus, they interpret him in light of the Old Testament, which means, in light of the worldview of the Old Testament. They do not

---

<sup>70</sup>See Moises Silva, *Has the Church Misread the Bible?* Chapter one in *Foundations of Contemporary Interpretation* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996), 57-61, who notes the difference between a spiritual meaning in the text and spiritualizing the text. He suggests that a "rigorous definition of the allegorical method emphasizes its dehistoricizing, philosophizing, arbitrary, and elitist aspects" (60). He enlarges on each of these in the preceding pages.

<sup>71</sup>See my study on allegory and the distinctions between Paul and Philo in De Young, "But As Then . . . So Even Now."

interpret Messiah in light of current Greek or Roman thinking. They see, no doubt, some parallels between contemporary thinking (e.g., the dualism of Plato with its emphasis on the idea over the object). But, unlike Philo who embraces platonism almost wholesale to interpret Scripture allegorically, the New Testament authors keep true to the Old Testament. They embrace its worldview and do not seek to "correct" it in light of contemporary philosophy. Their view of reality affirms both the historical, temporal realm and the unseen, eternal realm.

The contribution of 1 Clement is precisely here. He continues the approach of the New Testament in its interpretation of the Old because he continues to embrace the worldview of the Old and New Testaments. He is a disciple of the Apostles and of Jesus in the fullest sense of the word.

Clement shows us that non-canonical writers such as himself can use Scripture and other sources by the ongoing guidance, the inspiration, of the Holy Spirit. He encourages us to follow a biblical hermeneutic and worldview. Moreover, he gives us guidance on how to do so. We can follow his example for using Isaiah 60:17 because it parallels how the New Testament uses the Old.

We can also emulate Clement's hermeneutic when he discovers universal truth in general revelation. The creation, secular literature, the nature of human beings, etc., are repositories of truth.

Indeed, Clement's use of literature outside our present canon (Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, apocryphal additions to canonical books, apocalypses, etc.) raises the question whether the canon is closed today if the New Testament authors and Clement do not have a closed Old Testament canon nor a closed New Testament one. If they are able to work with an open one, why should not we? However, if ours is closed, and I think it is, this reality is a powerful witness to the fact that the Holy Spirit has spoken to the Church outside the canon in the most authoritative way possible. This reinforces the Spirit's communication through non-canonical sources or apart from the canon.

In the light of the foregoing, it is time for a renaissance of appreciation for 1 Clement. The general neglect that Clement has endured in the West since the late Byzantine era and Middle Ages through the Reformation until recent times needs to be reversed.<sup>72</sup> To guide us in interpreting Scripture there is no better document from the earliest church fathers than 1 Clement.

## EXCURSUS

---

<sup>72</sup>See Grant and Graham, *First Clement*, 5-8.

# ESCHATOLOGY IN 1 CLEMENT

## Explicit Statements

I draw together here those references to Clement's view of the fulfillment of prophecy and the end times. While several of these have been mentioned in the preceding pages, it is fitting to make here a deliberate attempt to understand Clement's view of eschatology by bringing together the disparate passages of his epistle.

Eschatology is not a major, explicit issue in 1 Clement. There are relatively few, direct statements regarding the kingdom and matters of the endtimes. As in Scripture, there is no systematic presentation of eschatology. Yet there is a pervasive, underlying presumption that reveals his eschatology.

Part of Clement's eschatology can be grouped around three principle features: the coming of the Kingdom, the coming judgments, and the coming resurrection. Interestingly, all three of these features are connected by the use of a common term, "coming" (μελλω). The expressions are "there shall be a future resurrection" (την μελλουσαν αναστασιν εσεσθαι) (24.1), "the judgments to come" (των μελλοντων κριματων) (28.1), and that "the Kingdom of God is coming" (την βασιλειαν του θεου μελλειν ερχεσθαι) (42.3).

The first reference occurs in a protracted apology for the resurrection that includes appeals to general revelation and to special revelation (these are my categories, not the author's), which he seems to treat on an equal footing. After citing the resurrection of "the Lord Jesus Christ" as the "first-fruits," he appeals to general revelation that involves the witness of how day and night succeed each other (24.2-3), the succession of seeds being planted, decaying, and producing crops (24.4-5); and "the strange sign" (το παραδοξον σημειον) of the Phoenix bird (25.1-26.1). The bird shows "the greatness of his promise" (26.1). Then there follows three appeals to Scripture introduced by "for" (γαρ) connected by a term and its synonym common to them, namely εξαναστησεις and a synonym ("you will raise," 26.2, citing Ps. 28:7?) εξηγερθην ("I rose up," 26.2, citing Ps. 3:5 and 23:4), and αναστησεις ("you will raise up," 26.3, citing Job 19:26). Such "pearl stringing" (*gezurrah shawah*) occurs several times elsewhere. He then (ch. 27) appeals to the nature of God as one for whom it is impossible to lie (alluding to Heb. 6:12); that God has established all things by his word and should not be questioned (citing Wisdom 12.12); and that he will do all things as he wills and none of his decrees shall pass away since all is in his sight and within his counsel (here he cites Ps. 19:1-3). This then leads immediately into a discussion of "the coming judgments" (28.1), the second use of μελλω cited above.

The reference to the kingdom coming occurs in a very pivotal chapter (42) that cites Scriptural proof for the offices of overseer and deacon that had been under attack, apparently, at Corinth. It was this sedition arising out of pride and envy that had occasioned the epistle. The phrase την βασιλειαν του θεου μελλειν ερχεσθαι (42.3) seems to emphasize the nearness of

the kingdom, or the certainty of its coming, by using two infinitives of which kingdom in the accusative is the subject. Only one of these infinitives, it seems, would have been necessary to say, "the kingdom is coming" or "the kingdom is near."

The use of μελλω is another indication of the connection between 1 Clement and Hebrews. The term occurs ten times in Hebrews, and six of these have the sense of "to come" ("the world to come," 2:5; "the powers of the coming age," 6:5; "of the coming good things," 9:11 [although the variant γενομενων should perhaps be read here] and 10:1); "things to come" (11:20); and "the coming city," 13:14).

This affirmation about the kingdom coming is the author's summation of the apostolic preaching and the gospel. He says that the "apostles received the gospel" (using ευηγγελισθησαν) from the Lord Jesus Christ in 42.1. Then, after affirming the divine origin of Christ and the apostles' reception of commands from Christ and God (42.2-3a), Clement asserts that the apostles "went forth in the assurance of the Holy Spirit preaching the good news (using ευαγγελιζομενοι) that the kingdom of God is coming." At this place, then, Clement views the preaching of the kingdom coming as the gospel. This is basic to Matthew's understanding that the disciples were commissioned to "preach this message: the kingdom of heaven is near" (Matt. 10:7). It is also parallel to Luke's summation of Paul's preaching of the gospel (Acts 28:23, 31).

Clement also seeks to show that the coming of Christ will occur quickly. He compares it with the brief time needed for fruit to ripen (23.4). He then proceeds (23.5):

Truly his will shall be accomplished quickly and suddenly (ταχυ και εξαιφνες), as the Scripture also bears witness that "he shall come quickly (ταχυ ηξει) and shall not tarry; and the Lord shall suddenly (εξαιφνες ηξει) come to his temple, and the Holy One, whom you seek."

This quote of Isaiah 13:22 (LXX) and Malachi 3:2, with the addition of "the Holy One," is a messianic passage used in the New Testament to point to John as the forerunner of Christ (e.g., Matt. 11:9ff.), and the need for the Christian to persevere to receive the promise (Heb. 10:37). Clement derives his use of ταχυ και εξαιφνες from the two Old Testament passages which he designates as "Scripture."

Apparently Clement's term for the first coming of Christ is different. In 17.1 he calls upon his readers to imitate "those who went about 'in the skins of goats and sheep' (cf. Heb. 11:37), heralding the coming of Christ" (την ελευσιν του Χριστου). He identifies such heralds as Elijah, Elisha, Ezekiel, the prophets, and "the famous men of old."

Another oblique reference to Christ as the coming king occurs in 16.2. He speaks of the humility of "the scepter of the greatness of God, the Lord Jesus Christ."

An indication of the restoration of the temple in the end times perhaps occurs in 29.3. In speaking of God's choice of Israel as his inheritance and portion, he cites some source, perhaps apocryphal, that the "Holy of Holies shall come forth from that nation."

This reflects the promise of Ezekiel 48:9-12 that in the future division of the land a special portion will be sacred and will be a special gift to the Zadokites who were faithful to the Lord and "did not go astray as the Levites did when the Israelites went astray" (v. 11). In the center of this portion will be the sanctuary of the LORD (vv. 8, 10). However, Clement may simply be using the Holy of Holies as a type of Christ.

In 34.3-4 Clement exhorts the readers to be "prompt in well-doing: for all things are from him. For he forewarns us: 'Behold the Lord comes (no Greek word for "comes"), and his reward is before his face, to render to each according to his work.'" This involves several references to the Old and New Testaments, including Isaiah 40:10; 62:11; Proverbs 24:12; and Revelation 22:12. In the last reference, John has Jesus replacing "the Lord" who comes by quoting Jesus in the first person as saying: "Behold, I am coming soon! My reward is with me, and I will give to everyone according to what he has done." Clearly, Clement finds the Lord's warning as carried over to his own future.

Several passages are linked by a common concern that the readers should *persevere* in order "to share in God's great and glorious promises" (34.7). This is immediately given validation or support (34.8) by citing Paul's promise and implied exhortation in 1 Corinthians 2:9 ("Eye has not seen, and ear has not heard, and it has not entered into the heart of man, what things the Lord has prepared for them that wait (υπομενουσιν) for him"). The verse is introduced with the words, "for he says," which in light of the context before refers to God as the "he." Hence there is in this last statement of 34.8 an implicit equation of Paul's words with God's. Yet, as seen above, the author never cites any New Testament words as "it is written."

In the very next chapter Clement carries on the idea of perseverance until the coming of Christ. In 35.2 he cites "life in immortality" as one of the "blessed and wonderful gifts of God" (35.1). He then asks (35.3-4):

What, then, are the things which are being prepared for those who wait (υπομενουσιν) for him? The Creator and Father of the ages, the All-holy one, himself knows their greatness and beauty. Let us then strive to be found among the number of those that wait (υπομενοντων), that we may receive a share of the promised gifts.

In 36.4-5 Clement cites Psalm 2:7-8 but it is clear that he does so via Hebrews 1:5. In fact, all of chapter 36 is an allusion or citation of Hebrews 1. In 36.1, Clement identifies Jesus Christ as "the high priest of our offerings." Indeed, it is probably the use of υπομενω that led the author to cite Hebrews, for this book uses the verb form more than any other book of the New Testament (four of the eleven times: 10:32; 12:2, 3, 7), and uses the noun form two more times (of a total of 29 times in the New Testament: 10:36; 12:1). The words predominate in 12:1-3 where the thoughts of Hebrews are similar to those of 1 Clement 36.2 where it is written: "Through him we fix our gaze on the heights of heaven . . ." Then in 36.3 the author quotes from Hebrews 1:2-4, yet only selectively, compressing what are six lines in Hebrews into just over two lines. He writes: "Who, being the radiance of his majesty, is by so much greater than the angels as he has inherited

a more excellent name." Then, breaking with the order of Hebrews, Clement cites Psalm 104:4 as in Hebrews 1:7, Psalm 2:7-8 as in Hebrews 1:5a (who cites only Ps. 2:7); and Psalm 110:1 as in Hebrews 1:13. Characteristically, Clement skips over the non-psalms passages cited in Hebrews (2 Sam. 7:14 cited in Hebrews 1:5b; Deut. 32:43 cited in 1:6). However, he also does not cite Psalm 45:6-7 cited in Hebrews 1:8-9, and Psalm 102:25-27 cited in 1:10-12. So it appears that the concept of endurance led the author to Hebrews 12, then to chapter 1; or did the use of this concept as used in Hebrews lead Clement to develop it?

In light of our present concern to deal with Clement's eschatology it is interesting that Clement enlarges on the quotation of Psalm 2:7 by also citing verse 8 which Hebrews does not. It is verse 8 that enlarges on the kingdom concept by having: "Ask of me, and I will give you the nations for your inheritance and the ends of the earth for your possession."

This additional connection of Clement with Hebrews supports our earlier findings for such a connection. It also supports the idea that Clement's eschatology parallels the concept of the kingdom as found in Hebrews.

Perhaps one of the clearest passages expressive of the author's view of the kingdom is 50.3. Clement has sought to show the inexpressible perfection of love (chapter 49), and then entreats his readers to "beg and pray by his mercy that we may be found in love" (50.2). For those "who were perfected in love by the grace of God have a place among the pious who shall be made manifest at the visitation (*επισκοπη*) of the Kingdom of Christ" (50.3). Clement then immediately defends this statement by citing Isaiah 26:20; Ezekiel 37:12: "For it is written, 'Enter into your chambers for a very little while, until my wrath and fury pass away, and I will remember a good day, and will raise you up out of your graves'" (50.4). Again, the parallel with Hebrews occurs here, for Hebrews 10:37 cites the LXX of Isaiah 26:20; and combines this with Habakkuk 2:3-4 (LXX) in 10:37-38. In Hebrews 10:36 the term *υπομονης* again occurs.

Other brief references to eschatology occur. In 61.2, Clement says regarding God: "the heavenly Master, king of eternity, has given to the sons of men glory and honor and power over the things which are on the earth." This reflects the concepts of Hebrews 2:8-9: "For in subjecting all things to him he left nothing unsubjected to him. But now we do not yet see all things subjected to him. But we do see Jesus having been made a little lower than the angels because of the suffering of death crowned with glory and honor." In 61.3 the author prays that "glory and majesty" [same term as he used in 36.2] be to God through Jesus Christ.

There is further evidence that Clement believed that the kingdom is already present. It occurs in his statement that the "Master has given the power of the kingdom" (*εξουσιαν της βασιλειας*, 61.1) to "our rulers and governors upon the earth" (60.4).

In his last chapter, Clement extends a final blessing and doxology. He prays that there be to God through Christ "glory, honor, power and greatness and eternal dominion [θρονοῦ], from eternity to eternity" (65.2).

## **Christians as Heirs of the Promises**

These are the explicit indicators of the eschatology of Clement. What is even more significant, however, is the author's assumed, implicit belief that Christians are the recipients of the promises made to Israel in the Old Testament. His whole mentality embraces the promises as belonging to contemporary believers. They are assumed to be God's people, and all his promises apply to them.

That believers are God's special choice is stated and then defended by appeals to Scripture. For example, in 29.1 Clement affirms that the Father "has made us the portion of his choice for himself." Immediately he adds (29.2): "For thus it is written," and quotes Deuteronomy 32:8-9. He then makes a second direct appeal to Scripture by writing (29.3): "And in another place he says," and uses various portions of Scripture (Deut. 4:34; 14:2; Num. 18:27; 2 Chron. 31:14; Ezek. 48:12) to support his contention that believers are God's special people and heirs of all his promises.

The idea that believers are heirs of God's promises is stated in the very first, explicit quotation of the Old Testament (Deut. 32:15). He introduces the quote by claiming fulfillment in the readers (3.1): "All glory and enlargement was given to you, and what was written was fulfilled."

Clement's references to "citizenship" (forms of πολιτεία and its cognates) demonstrate Clement's conviction that Christians belong to another realm in addition to the physical. Before sin and sedition entered the community he could say that, "being adorned by your virtuous and honorable citizenship you completed all things in the fear of God" (2.8). Their sin, however, led them "to no longer live as citizens worthily of Christ" (3.4). He exhorts the readers to follow the example of those "who live holy lives" (6.1) and to take heed to do good deeds "being citizens worthy of him" (21.1) who "do good service" (44.6). They should "live in fear and love" (51.2), being willing to suffer torture themselves rather than their neighbors. Finally, the attitude of self-sacrifice characterizes the "conduct of those who without regret live as citizens in the city of God" (54.4). No doubt these references are pointing to their heavenly citizenship which they already experience. These words remind one of Hebrews 12:22-24, that believers "have already come to the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem," that they "are receiving an unshakeable kingdom" (12:28).

For Clement, Christians are possessors of all the promises made to Israel in the Old Testament.<sup>73</sup> These promises include the prophecies of the coming King and his Kingdom.

---

<sup>73</sup>Lawson, *Apostolic Fathers*, 61, writes:

Following our Lord, and the New Testament writers in general, the Church is for S. Clement essentially the New and True Israel, the spiritually reconstituted ancient People of God. The

They are accomplished for believers now or in the future. For Christ has come and will come again to judge, to reward, and to rule.

## Summary

The following represents a summary of the points of the eschatology in Clement. (1) There are coming (future) events: the kingdom is coming (42.3); the judgments are coming (28.1); the resurrection is coming (24.1); the Lord is coming quickly and suddenly to his temple (23.5); and the Lord is coming to reward each one who perseveres (34.3-4).

(2) There will be a future (perhaps figurative) temple (24.5; 29.3). (3) Christ is God's scepter (16.2). (4) Perseverance is the condition for receiving the fulfillment of the promises (34.7), and such gifts as life in immortality (35.1). (5) Christ will inherit the nations and the ends of the earth (36.4-5). (6) Christians perfected in love will be revealed at the visitation of the kingdom (50.3), and will be resurrected (50.4). (7) God is king of eternity and people are his representatives to exercise glory, honor, and power, the power of the kingdom, over all (16.1). (8) God is the blessed one whose throne is forever (65.2).

Clement seems to make no reference to a millennial reign of Christ for a thousand years but his words suggest that there will be an intermediate Kingdom before eternity. He says nothing of a rapture before the Kingdom arrives. Christians are already experiencing the reality of the kingdom of God and represent their King. Yet there is another, greater experience of this reality that is yet to come.

To what do we attribute the eschatology of Clement? It flows out of his worldview and his hermeneutic that embraces a "here but not yet here" (or, "now but not yet") paradigm. There is a heavenly, eternal reality alongside the earthly, temporal one. His eschatology embraces a hermeneutic that finds an additional level of meaning beyond the normal or historical sense.<sup>74</sup> This hermeneutic enables him to discover throughout the Old Testament the meaning for the New Testament Church.

---

Gentile Church for which he speaks is one company with the true Hebrews of old, and is the rightful heir to all the promises made to Israel. The Church and her doctrine, Ministry, and Sacraments are prefigured and typified in the Old Testament.

Grant and Graham, *First Clement*, 55, similarly write: "God has elected both the old Israel and the new (cf. 1 Pet. 2:9) or, it would be better to say, there is only one Israel, culminating in the 'flock of Christ.'" They add: "The Church is the true successor of 'Jacob' and 'Israel' in the Old Testament" (25).

Whether Clement views promises pertaining to the future as lacking any fulfillment for Israel he does not say. In other words, Clement seems to allow for the idea that Israel as it comes to embrace Christ receives the ancient promises in Christ.

<sup>74</sup>James A. Kleist, *The Epistles of St. Clement of Rome and St. Ignatius of Antioch* (New York: Newman Press, 1946), 113, n. 134, writes regarding Clement's use of Psalm 17:26-27 in 46.3:

Clement here accommodates the words of the Psalmist to another sense. The words of Holy Scripture are so sacred, so meaningful, and couched in such pregnant language, that they were

As with his hermeneutic, his eschatology suggests a model for contemporary Christians to follow. We would be enriched to embrace it.

## APPENDIX

### Use of Introductory Formulas

The following presents the various formulas used by Clement to introduce quoted material. Since he rarely uses formulas to introduce New Testament sources, almost all of the following introduce Old Testament or apocryphal literature. Yet none are used to introduce what we call the "Apocrypha." The following are grouped according to the most frequently occurring term in common to each group, and are arranged according to the order that they occur in Clement.

#### (1) Formulas involving some form of γραφω or γραφη

το γεγραμμενον: 3.1; 13.1

γεγραπται γαρ: 4.1 (+ ουτως); 14.4; 17.3 (without γαρ, + ουτως); 29.2 (+ ουτω);  
36.3 (+ ουτως); 39.3; 48.2 (+καθως); 50.4, 6

συνεπιμαρτυρουσης και της γραφης: 23.5

λεγει γαρ που το γραφειον: 28.3

λεγει γαρ η γραφη: 34.6; 35.7

ουτως γαρ που λεγει η γραφη: 42.5

εγγραπτο περι επισκοπων και διακονων: 42.5

#### (2) Formulas involving φησι

φησιν γαρ ο αγιος λογος: 13.3; 56.3 (+ ουτως)

φησιν ("he says"): 16.2, 15 (+ παλιν αυτος); 30.2; 56.5 (+ γαρ)

φησιν ο θεος: 33.5 (+ ουτως ψαρ)

#### (3) Formulas involving ειπεν

παλιν ειπεν ο θεος: 10.4

ειπεν ο θεος: 18.1; 53.2 (+ προς αυτον)

ειπεν: 20.7 (+ γαρ); 33.6; 46.8 (+ γαρ; see below)

ουτως ειπεν ο δεσποτης: 36.4

---

often applied in a so-called accommodated sense. This use runs through the writings of the Fathers and the liturgy of the Church. See Romans 15.4.

It is worth quoting Romans 15.4: "For everything that was written beforehand, was written to teach us, in order that through endurance and the encouragement of the Scriptures we might have hope." This is similar to other statements of Paul (1 Cor. 9:10; 10:6, 11; Gal. 3:8).

(4) Formulas involving λεγει

εν ετερωι τοπωι λεγει: 8.4 (+ ουτως); 29.3  
λεγει γαρ: 10.2; 30.4; 34.8  
παλιν λεγει: 10.6; 14.5; 15.4; 36.5; 52.3; 56.6  
λεγει γαρ το πνευμα το αγιον: 13.1  
λεγει γαρ που: 15.2; 21.2; 26.2  
και παλιν (with λεγει understood): 15.3, 5  
προλεγει γαρ ημιν: 34.3  
παλιν εν ετερωι τοπωι λεγει: 46.3  
ουτως γαρ λεγει η παναρετος σοφια: 57.3

(5) Formulas of various forms

οι λειτουργοι της χαριτος του θεου δια πνευματος αγιου περι μετανοιας  
ελαλησαν: 8.1 [elaborated by the formula in 8.2]  
ο δεσποτης των απαντων περι μετανοιας ελαλησεν μετα ορκου: 8.2  
καθως το πνευμα το αγιον περι αυτου ελαλησεν: 16.2 [elaborated by the following  
φησιν γαρ in 16.2]  
γαρ αυτος (χριστος) δια του πνευματος του αγιου ουτως προσκαλειται ημας:  
22.1  
ως επαγγειλαμενου του θεου: 32:2  
προτρεπεται ουν ημας: 34.4;  
μνησθητε των λογων του κυριου Ιησου: 46.7 [introducing ειπεν γαρ of 46.8]

(6) Formulas used in the narrative of Scripture and/or pointing to the human author<sup>75</sup>

εν τωι ακουσαι αυτον απο του ομοφυλου: 4.10  
το ρηθεν υπο του πατρος ημων Αδαμ: 6.3  
επισταθεντων δε των παρα του βασιλεως και λεγοντων: 12.4  
η δε απεκριθη: 12.4  
και ειπεν προς τους ανδρας: 12.5  
και ειπαν αυτη: 12.6  
λεγει [Αβρααμ]: 17.2  
αλλ αυτος [Ιωβ] εαυτου κατηγορει λεγων: 17.4  
αλλ ειπεν [Μωυσης]: 17.5  
και παλιν λεγει: 17.6  
αλλα και αυτος [Δαυιδ] λεγει προσ τον θεον: 18.2  
και παλιν Ιωβ λεγει: 26.3  
Μωυσης τα διατεταγμενα αυτωι παντα εσημειωσατο εν ταις ιεραις βιβλοις . . .  
και ειπεν: 43.1, 4

---

<sup>75</sup>I am indebted to Hagner, *Use*, 28, for this and the following categories.

φησιν γαρ ο εκλεκτος Δαυιδ: 52.2  
και ειπεν κυριος προς αυτον: 53.3  
και ειπεν Μωυσης: 53.4

(7) Formulas used to introduce non-canonical writings:

και παλιν λεγει: 17.6 [unknown source]  
πορρω γενεσθω αφ ημων η γραφη αυτη, οπου λεγει: 23.3 [unknown source]  
εν λογωι της μεγαλωσυνης αυτου συνεστησατο τα παντα, και εν λογωι  
δυναται αυτα καταστρεψαι: 27.4 [seems to introduce the quote of Wis. 12.12  
in 27.5]  
γεγραπται γαρ: 46.2 [unknown source]

(8) Passages quoted without formulas

3.4 [of Wis. 2.24]  
22.8 [Ps. 31:10 attached to the preceding citation]  
56.4 [Pro. 3:12 attached to the preceding citation]

(9) Passages with introductory connectives

δια τουτο: 15.5 [to introduce Ps. 30:19]  
ει: 27.7 [to introduce Ps. 18:2-4]  
γαρ: 52.4 [to introduce Ps. 50:19]; 54.3 [to introduce Ps. 23.1]