
A table of contents for *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php

THE

BIBLIOTHECA SACRA.

ARTICLE I.

CLEMENS ROMANUS: AN APOLOGETICAL STUDY.

BY DR. D. W. SIMON, BERLIN, PRUSSIA.

I. Life and Epistle of Clement of Rome.

§ 1. *Life of Clement.*

All that can be said, with any show of probability, regarding the life of Clement, is, that he was acquainted with and esteemed by the apostle Paul, as we learn from Philippians iv. 3; that he lived and labored, for a time, at Philippi; that he became the third bishop of Rome, and held that office after Linus, between A.D. 92 and 101; that he wrote the First Epistle to the church at Corinth, in the name of the church at Rome; and that he was held in universal esteem by the Christians of his day. No confidence whatever can be placed in the romantic account of his descent, conversion, labors, and sufferings given by the Clementine Homilies and other writings of the class. Various deductions, too, from expressions of his own, as for example that he was a Jew by birth (vid. cc. 4, 31, 55), are equally uncertain.

§ 2. *The Genuineness of the First Epistle.*

That Clement wrote an epistle to the Corinthians seems undeniable. The only questions are: Is the present Epistle

to the Corinthians that epistle? And do we possess it in an authentic shape? Both these questions are susceptible of so satisfactory an answer that Thiersch felt justified in saying, "with the exception of the books of the primary Canon (Urkanon), no ancient work is so well accredited as this"; words which are quoted with approval even by Hilgenfeld.[1] The first supposed reference to it has been discovered in the Epistle of Polycarp; but the coincidences noted by Hefele do not seem to us to have much weight. The testimony, however, of Irenaeus, Clemens Alexandrinus, Origen, Eusebius, Cyril of Jerusalem, Epiphanius, Jerome, and other later writers, can only be deemed inadequate by those who either have a preconceived theory to serve, or make unreasonable claims on historical evidence. Do we possess the epistle now in its original form? Several writers, as for example, Jer. Bignon, Ed. Bernard, Clericus, Mosheim, have maintained that parts of the epistle are spurious; but their subjective reasons do not stand ground against the objective evidence to the contrary and the arguments of Grotius, Wotton, and many others.

§ 3. *Early Opinions regarding Clement and his Epistle.*

The epistle, as well as its author, was held in high esteem by the ancient church. Clemens Alexandrinus even styles Clement an apostle. Irenaeus speaks of the epistle as *ἱκανωτάτη γραφή*; Eusebius, as *μεγάλη τε καὶ θαυμασία*; to its having been publicly read in churches on Sunday, testimony is borne by Dionysius of Corinth, Eusebius, Jerome, and Photius. Several modern writers, too, have bestowed high encomiums on its style. Some passages have a flow and breadth worthy of all recognition; but, like the other productions of the so-called apostolic Fathers, the unity of the epistle is more that of an exhortation than of a treatise.

As the second epistle that bears Clement's name is acknowledged to be spurious, no use has been made of it in the course of the present inquiry.[2]

[1] See Hilgenfeld, "Die Apostolischen Väter, etc."

[2] The prolegomena to Dr. Hefele's valuable edition of the apostolic Fathers

II. Contents of the First Epistle to the Corinthians.

From some cause or other, violent discussions had arisen in the church of Corinth, and this letter was written, in the name and at the instance of the church of Rome, to the church of Corinth, to exhort to the termination of a state of things both opposed to the good name of the Corinthian Christians and prejudicial to the cause of the Christian religion in general. The supposition that they were a revival of the disputes referred to in Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians, ch. iii., would seem to be unsustained by Clement's words in c. 47. Clement himself gives no particulars regarding the cause of the quarrel. All that can be gathered from the nature of his exhortations is, that there were some, one or two in particular, who had contentiously risen in opposition to, and caused the removal of, officers of the church, who had been duly elected by the people and had discharged the duties of their position blamelessly (c. 44).[1] The exhortations bearing on this state of things

and Prof. Dr. Hilgenfeld's work, "Die Apostolischen Väter, etc.," contain an exhaustive examination of the arguments for and against the points touched upon in the foregoing outline.

[1] Various views have been taken of the disturbances which gave rise to the present epistle. Rothe and Thiersch think it was a dispute about the episcopate; Schenkel, a revival of the controversy referred to by Paul in his Epistle to the Corinthians; Hilgenfeld thinks the disturbers were men who made pretension to peculiar wisdom and spirituality, and on that ground were haughty and indisposed to submit to any authority, however reasonable. Much that the last-mentioned writer advances is quite to the point, but he fails to explain several features. To our mind, the nearest approach to an explanation of the entire matter is furnished by disputes that have repeatedly occurred in Congregational churches.

Several points seem directly to warrant the supposition that the constitution of the Corinthian church was essentially identical with that of the Independent churches of the present day: 1. The words *συνευδοκησάσης τῇ ἐκκλησίας πάσης*, which imply the co-operation of the church to an extent allowed by none but Independents. That there was not a complete identity we allow; but why? because the first churches were still in the hands of inspired apostles, or of those whom they had appointed. If the apostles were to appear again, Independents would concede them the same privilege. 2. The word *ἀποβάλωμεν*. How could there have been a casting out, a setting aside, a forced resignation, if the church had not had a democratic constitution? It is worthy too of note, that

constitute the connecting link of the Epistle; but Clement takes occasion to inculcate general principles, and to adduce high examples, by the way. This circumstance, while giving it a digressive character, adds to its interest, and furnishes an insight into the mind both of Clement and the church of his day. Any attempt to introduce a precise method miscarries, owing to passages like those which treat of the resurrection, in cc. 24 to 26. The train of thought is briefly the following. In the first three chapters he describes the good name previously possessed by the Cor-

Clement does not blame the ἀποβάλλειν in itself, but merely the ἀποβάλλειν τοὺς λειτουργήσαντας ἀμέμπτως τῷ ποιμνίῳ Χριστοῦ; not that they had required and effected the resignation, but that they had driven away men who had served the flock of Christ blamelessly. 3. Clement speaks throughout as to brethren — to erring and faulty brethren, — not *ex cathedra*; which is most natural on the supposition we are supporting. 4. His references to the reverence and obedience due to the ἐπίσκοποι or πρεσβύτεροι are just such as might and do occur in connection with Congregationalists, but are not so fully in harmony with other theories.

We will now describe such a dispute: It not infrequently happens that among the members are some who lay great stress on the doctrine of election; who are thoroughly convinced of their own election; who in consequence are proud and overbearing, especially in their language; whose high pretensions are not confirmed by corresponding deeds; who claim to have a higher holiness and wisdom, while in reality they are very narrow, and often slaves to the flesh; who condemn every one not believing exactly what and as they do; and who on the least occasion go about stirring up mischief. These members are especially hard on the πρεσβύτεροι if they do not give the prominence to their favorite theme which they deem necessary; are particularly indignant if he exhort them to charity and good works; easily forget all respect and order, all the kindness they once showed and always owed; and not seldom succeed in driving away the τοὺς ὁσίως προσέχοντας τὰ δῶρα τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς.

If a sister church were to interfere, as sometimes happens, its warnings and exhortations would not be in an *ex cathedra* tone; it would admonish to φιλοξενία, in the wider sense, towards the πρεσβύτεροι; it would remind the disturbers of the true characteristics of the elect; would exhort to humility, penitence, submission to God; would say "we are all members of Christ," and it is better for you to go away than to disturb and rend the church, and so forth.

If this picture be compared with the hints, warnings, and exhortations of Clement, numerous points of coincidence will be discovered. In fact, while sketching from the church life of the present day, we have in most instances quoted Clement's own words. Some such quarrel, therefore, may have given rise to the present epistle. The more prominent features are contained in the following passages: cc. 35, and 12. 38. 46. 49. 47. 48. 51. 54. 57. 3. 29.

inthian community, and the sad state into which it had now fallen. Chapters four to six adduce various older and more recent examples of the evil effects produced by that quarrelsome and envious disposition (ζῆλος) which had been at work among them. Next follows an exhortation to penitence, sustained by assurances of God's readiness to forgive, and a reference to the examples of Enoch, Noah, Abraham, Lot, and Rahab, who found favor with God, through opposed conduct, through faith, obedience, hospitality (cc. 7 – 12). He then especially enjoins humility, and entreats the Corinthians to obey God rather than the authors of the sedition, to adhere to those who love peace in reality and not merely in appearance (cc. 13 – 15); seeing that Christ (c. 16), the saints, especially Job, Moses (c. 17), and David have set us an example of this virtue (c. 18). Imitating them, therefore, we ought to seek peace (c. 19), especially as the harmony of the world, and the glorious order of nature show that it is loved by God (c. 20). If we follow evil-doers rather than God, the divine blessings will be a source of condemnation (c. 21). To such conduct Christ exhorts us by his Spirit in the Old Testament (c. 22). God will accept those who come to him with simplicity of mind; but at the coming of Christ all shall be punished who are of a doubtful spirit and are puffed up by God's glorious gifts (c. 23). Chapters twenty-four to twenty-seven contain a digression on the resurrection, apparently suggested by the idea of Christ's second coming. Inasmuch as God sees all things, we ought to eschew sin, and approach him with sanctity of heart (c. 29). Seeing that we are the portion of the Holy One, we should seek what is holy, put on concord, abstain from quarrels, and seek to justify ourselves rather by works than words (c. 30); our praise should be from God, and not from ourselves. Such alone, and not the bold and proud, are blessed of God. For these reasons were the Fathers accepted by God, though, as they owed all to the grace of God, so too we are justified, not by any wisdom or piety or works of our own, which we may perform in sanctity

of heart, but *by that faith by which God has justified all from the beginning* (c. 32). But shall we therefore cease from good works? No, for God sets us an example thereof (c. 33). On the contrary, the reward of good works with God is great, and we shall obtain it by doing justly, walking in the way of truth, and renouncing all iniquity (cc. 34. 35). Here Clement sets forth in the strongest terms how it is through Christ, *the brightness of God's glory, that we attain salvation* and every blessing (c. 36). He is our Head, we are members of his body; we ought, therefore, like good soldiers and members, each to seek the other's good (cc. 37. 38). Seeing that all gifts are from God, we have no ground for being puffed up. Let us then observe the order instituted in the church; for, as under the old economy, so under the new, certain officers have been appointed for certain offices: Christ sent the apostles, and the apostles set over us overseers and deacons (cc. 39 – 42). It is not a new thing that opposition should arise against the constituted authorities, for even Moses had to allay a strife of the kind (c. 43). The apostles foresaw that dissensions would arise, and took measures accordingly; and it is wrong to set aside presbyters who have been duly elected and have discharged their functions blamelessly (c. 44). If you study the scriptures, the oracles of the Spirit, you will find that formerly it was the wicked alone who vexed the righteous, whom God glorified with exceeding glory. To these latter, to the just, we ought to cleave; they are the elect of God; but woe to those who rend the one body of Christ (c. 47). Your present dissensions are worse than those rebuked by Paul in his divinely inspired Epistle. Put away these things, then, quickly, return to the Lord, and walk again as before, remembering that to be useful to the brethren is more noble than the best gifts (cc. 48 – 49). Pray, then, that ye may live in charity (c. 50); and let the disturbers confess their sins (c. 51); for such confession is required by God. Consider how Moses loved Israel, how he was ready rather to perish himself than to see his people perish (c. 53). He,

therefore, who has true love will rather give way and leave, than disturb the peace of the church (c. 54). With a general exhortation to submission, and the usual benediction, the epistle closes.

III. The Doctrinal Views of Clement.

§ 4. *General Character.*

The Epistle of Clement shares the general character of the other writings commonly ascribed to his age — it attempts no formal treatment of doctrine as such; what of doctrine it contains is in the way of allusion, is advanced for a directly practical purpose, and not for its own sake. This is even more completely the case with Clement than with Ignatius or Barnabas. His references to what he deemed facts or conditions of spiritual life and redemption are plain enough; but his treatment of them is either not at all, or very slightly doctrinal. By this circumstance our doctrinal deductions must be guided. We must be on our guard against pressing his language in any one direction, whether for or against the orthodox system. At the same time, in view of the general character of his mind and of the position he occupied (to which we shall refer more fully hereafter), we must also guard against treating his words too lightly. We must allow that he felt in a broad manner the force of the terms he uses, even if we deny them to be the outflow of distinct doctrinal reflection. For though, as a man of a thoroughly practical turn, and living at a stage of the history of Christianity when there had as yet no palpable necessity arisen for a philosophical discussion of its doctrines, he advances his thoughts without scientific aim or precision, the culture, harmony, and masculine good sense which mark his epistle, force us to suppose that he, at all events, understood what he was about, and felt the weight of what he taught. Nor may we forget that, though the immediate successors of the apostles found no necessity for, and evinced no inclination to, theological speculation as

such, the fact of their standing in practical antagonism to Judaism on the one hand, and heathenism on the other, would compel them to weigh well the substance of the thoughts and the nature of the facts which they advanced, even where there was an absence of formal precision. Guided by these considerations, we will now examine the main doctrinal features of the Epistle of Clement.

§ 5. *Its Representations of the Person of Christ.*

Clement's references to the person of Christ may be classed under three rubrics: those which affect,

1. His relation to God,
2. His personal character and endowments,
3. His relation to men.

1. The references to Christ's relation to God.

The most important passage bearing on Christ's relation to God is contained in the thirty-sixth chapter. Translated, it runs as follows: "This is the way, beloved, in which we found our salvation, Jesus Christ, the High Priest of our offerings, the protector and helper of our weakness. Through him we gaze up to the heights of the heavens; through him we look as in a mirror on his [God's] faultless and most excellent countenance; through him the eyes of our heart are opened; through him our stupid and darkened understanding shoots up into his wonderful light; through him the Lord willed that we should taste of immortal knowledge; who being the brightness of his majesty is by so much greater than the angels as he hath inherited a more excellent name. For it is written thus: 'He who maketh his angels spirits and his ministers flames of fire'; but concerning the Son, the Lord spake on this wise, 'thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee; ask of me and I will give thee nations for thine inheritance and the ends of the earth for thy possession.' And again he saith to him: 'Sit at my right hand till I make thine enemies thy footstool.' Who then are the enemies? The wicked and those who oppose the will of God." The most weighty portion of

this remarkable passage is identical with part of the first chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews, and is, in all probability, a quotation from it. For our present purpose, however, it is a matter of indifference whether Clement be supposed to be quoting or not. Nor is it of consequence to justify his use and application of the passages from the Old Testament interwoven with his own words. All we have to do with, is his own conception of Christ, conveyed through the medium of quotation, or in his own language, as the case may be. Jesus Christ is *μείζων ἀγγέλων, τὸ ἀπαύγασμα τῆς μεγαλοσύνης* of God, Son of God, begotten by God, and his enemies are the enemies of God.

a. Christ is greater than the angels. In c. 34 he exhorts the Corinthians to "consider the entire multitude of the angels of God, how they do his will"; and in c. 29 he represents the boundaries of the nations as fixed "according to the number of the angels of God"; from which it would appear that he deemed them to be in some way superior to men, to stand nearer to God. And yet Christ is greater than the angels, greater in the measure in which he has inherited a more excellent name than they. But what other more excellent name can there be than that of angel, a term designating a very high, nay the very highest, order of created beings? The answer is given by Clement in the following words, quoted from Psalm ii., "thou art my Son."

b. Christ is God's Son, begotten by God. Angels, though higher than men, are yet still but servants; Christ is, by contrast, Son. What precise significance Clement attached to this term might be difficult to unfold, but we may be aided by the following considerations: It cannot designate a merely moral sonship, moral unity. If Christ had merely been, in Clement's estimate, a perfectly pure man, who for his eminent godliness was designated Son of God, why should he place him above the angels? It is true he approves, in c. 39, of the expression from Job iv.: "he charges his angels with folly;" but that he understood it

in an hyperbolical sense, and not as implying actual sin, is evident both from the words *ἁγίων ἀγγέλων*, in the same chapter, and from the praise bestowed on them in c. 34, where he contrasts them with men, and sets them before men as an example of obedience and harmony. Further, the employment of the word *γεγέννηκα*, "I have begotten thee." However indisposed we may be to press such a word as this, we can scarcely avoid supposing that Clement must have felt, to some extent, its force. Concerning man, in c. 33, he speaks, most distinctly, as *made*, *ποιήσωμεν*, *ἔπλασεν*; and in the passage above referred to, in c. 39, angels are ranked with the rest of creation; the sole difference between them and men being their purity and obedience. Conjoining, then, the two words *υἱός* and *γεγέννηκα*, and bearing in mind the considerations just advanced, we are forced to conclude that Clement, as it were spontaneously, if not with a full comprehension of what he was doing, placed Christ in, what we may term, a blood-relationship to God, such as pertains to no creature, not even to that "most excellent creature, man" (c. 33), nor to that still higher creature, the angel. It is very improbable that Clement had any notion whatever of the eternal generation of the Son, which was subsequently based upon, if not deduced from, the words *ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε*,[1] though some writers have maintained it.

c. We may further notice, also, the expression *κεκληρονόμηκεν* in connection with Son. Christ has *inherited* the name — the name which indicates the nature, the name of Son, Son of God, born, not merely made. That which we inherit is ours by right, is ours by natural relationship; and to predicate of Christ a natural relationship to God of this kind, what is it but to make him divine?

d. There are still three remarkable phrases to be noticed in this passage: In Christ we look upon God's faultless countenance; we, who are ourselves the impression of the

[1] See Origen; and, in modern times, Treffrey on the "Eternal Sonship," and Clark on Luke i. 14.

image of God (c. 33), see in Christ God's faultless and most excellent face, i.e. the perfect expression of the inmost essence of God.

Again, he is the *ἀπαύγασμα τῆς μεγαλοσύνης αὐτοῦ*. Man is the "character (*χαρακτήρ*) of his image," i.e. of Christ: Christ is the "bright reflection of his majesty." Clement seems really to have sought out the strongest terms he could find, in order to express how fully Christ represents God to us, without exactly styling him God.

And lastly, we read that the enemies of Christ are the enemies of God, which enemies God promises to bring into subjection to Christ. This is a further identification of Christ and God, which, taken together with the entire passage, must be allowed to be weighty. In short, it is impossible to examine this thirty-sixth chapter without acknowledging that whatever stress may be laid on particular terms, Clement felt no hesitation in putting Christ into a position so close to God, that he only failed to style him God and divine. He has interwoven with his own words the strongest expressions from (probably) the Epistle to the Hebrews, indicating, by the fact of selection, that it was distinctly his design to set forth Christ with the utmost possible glory short of absolute identification with God himself.

The remaining clauses of this chapter we shall advert to in another connection.

e. The next passage that claims notice is the somewhat obscure one in the sixteenth chapter: "The sceptre of the majesty of God, our Lord Jesus Christ, did not come with pomp and boastings, nor with arrogance, although it was in his power, but in lowliness of mind." From the use here of the impersonal term "sceptre," it might be concluded that Christ stood to God in the relation of a mere instrument. At first sight it seems to be employed in analogy to the word "rod," in Isaiah x. 5: "Ah! the Assyrian, the rod of mine anger"; that as the Assyrian was God's rod, so Christ is the sceptre of his majesty. But apart from the

inanity of such a use in this connection, there are several positive grounds against it: (1) There is no instance in the Old Testament, on which Clement greatly leans, and from which he evidently derived the figure, in which a creature is called the "sceptre of God"; and that for a very natural reason. Sceptre is the permanent, distinctive symbol of regal authority and power, in their totality. Another may be a monarch's sword, or rod, or right hand, but not his sceptre, without having, *de facto*, the monarch's own power, without being, so far as possible, the monarch himself. In the Old Testament to take away the sceptre, is to reduce the holder thereof to the rank of subject from that of ruler. For example, in Zech. x. 11 we read "the sceptre of Egypt passes away."

(2) Men who are God's "rod" or "sword" or other instrument, are so designated in virtue of some one particular work or office intrusted to them for a particular time; whereas Christ is spoken of here as "sceptre," independently of any particular work, as though it were his natural, permanent position. And he who was and is the sceptre comes to redeem, humbling himself by undertaking his mission in the form of a servant. The dignity of God's messengers consists precisely in their being his messengers, whatever may be the outward circumstances of their activity. The fact that Christ "might have come in pomp and dignity," and that his not coming thus was an humiliation, implies clearly that he had a dignity arising from the sceptre, apart from even so glorious a mission as that of redemption.

The term has also been explained in analogy to δωδεκάσκηπτρον in c. 31, and σκῆπτρον in c. 32. These words are there equivalent to φύλη, as in several passages of the Old Testament, שֵׁבֶט signifies tribus. And as in c. 29 Jacob, to whom pertained the δωδεκάσκηπτρον, that is, from whom the twelve tribes, or σκῆπτρα, came, is called God's heritage, so Christ too is called God's σκῆπτρον, or heritage. Were this analogy admissible at all, the idea would have to

be considerably modified in view of the words of c. 32, where the derivation of the Lord Jesus from the flesh is adduced as one of God's marvellous gifts. Plainly, if an honor were conferred on God's heritage Israel, by the mere casual descent of Christ; and if, at the same time, Clement meant to represent Christ as God's heritage in employing the word σκῆπτρον, it must be in an extraordinary sense. Israel was privileged above all men, was God's son; and yet he is honored by the mere fleshly descent of Christ: Christ must then, surely, be God's Son, God's heritage, in an absolute sense. We are thus, by another route, led to a conception of Christ as lofty as could be desired, short of styling him God. But it is very unlikely that Clement should have employed the terms in this sense. Either his thought would have been similar to that just expounded, and that is very improbable, or he would have spoken with a confusedness which the general tone of his epistle does not warrant us in attributing to him. The most natural explanation is the one suggested by a preceding remark, that "sceptre" is the essential, permanent symbol of regal power and authority. Clement viewed Christ, accordingly, as the personal symbol, vehicle, organ, embodiment, representative of the majesty and authority of God, without whom God can no more be truly thought of, than a monarch without sceptre. Such a conception would be quite in harmony with the representations of the New Testament; for example, with Col. i. 16: "By him were all things created." If, then, Clement held Christ to be clothed with divine regal power, it is quite intelligible that he should have been able to appear in pomp; that his dignity was not derived from his mission; that he *could humble* himself in the manner described. We have here, in another independent form, the same thought as is expressed in Philippians ii. 6 – 8: "who being in the form of God humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross."

f. The next point bearing upon Christ's relation to the

Father, is Clement's use of the word κύριος, as a designation of Christ as well as God. It occurs in a great variety of connections. As a general rule, it is true, he uses the term δεσπότης of God, and never applies it to Christ; which might seem to imply that κύριος was a mere title of office, or was used loosely, as we use master, lord. But a more careful examination shows that he uses κύριος and δεσπότης interchangeably of God, and that consequently, in view especially of other circumstances, his application of κύριος to Christ is surprising, save on one supposition. That he draws no such precise distinction between the two words is sufficiently evident from cc. 33, 53, and 54, among many others. In c. 33, we read ὁ δεσπότης ἀγαλλιᾶται ἐπὶ τοῖς ἔργοις αὐτοῦ; and he subsequently says, plainly referring to the same subject, ὁ κύριος, ἔργοις ἑαυτὸν κοσμήσας, ἐχάρη. Now, either δεσπότης and κύριος are to Clement identical in force and meaning, or, supposing Christ to be κύριος, that creative activity which in the one case is predicated of God, is predicated in the other of Christ.

Again, in c. 54, also, κύριος is either used of God, or the earth and its fulness are said to be Christ's; which would be a plain transference of one of God's main characteristics to Christ. Further, the identity of κύριος and δεσπότης is clear from a comparison of cc. 36 and 53. In the former, quoting the Old Testament, he says, εἶπεν ὁ δεσπότης; whereas in the latter, quoting from the same source, he says, εἶπεν ὁ κύριος. It is, lastly, sustained by the circumstance that, in introducing his quotations from the Old Testament and in speaking himself of God, he generally, though, as we have shown, not invariably, uses δεσπότης (cc. 24, 33, 36, 40). If he had any definite reason at all for this procedure, it was a desire to secure variety of expression; for, with his general tendencies, it is exceedingly unlikely that he meant to be more accurate than the Old Testament. Nor have we any reason for thinking that δεσπότης was required by the usage of the time.

Now this application of the same term to Christ as is

applied to God in the Old Testament, which Clement deemed inspired, is of itself striking enough; but especially so when the two are designated κύριος almost in the same breath, as in cc. 13 and 16. From the "Martyrium Polycarpi," c. 8, where Polycarp is represented as refusing to say κύριος καῖσαρ, it would appear that, by the Christian church of that day, κύριος was regarded as, at all events to some extent, a distinctive title of Christ, a title indicative of his divine dignity. Taking this circumstance in connection with Clement's usage and the usage of the Old Testament, whose authority he recognized, divine dignity would appear to be ascribed to Christ.

There is a further incidental identification of God and Christ in c. 2, where we read, "content with the viaticum of God, and giving diligent heed to his words . . . . . and his [God's] sufferings were before your eyes." That Clement here had in view the sufferings of Christ, there can surely be no question; if so, is it not perfectly obvious that, even if in no precisely formulated shape, he must have connected Christ with God much as the orthodox church has always done? In all ages it has been common, in a popular way, to say interchangeably, "God has suffered," "Christ has suffered"; but solely because Christ was believed to be so one with God that what he did was done by God.

Other passages, as for example the doxologies in cc. 20, 50, 58, 59, might be adduced under this rubric, which, though not very important by themselves, all point in the direction of the clearer declarations just discussed.[1]

2. Christ's pre-existence, character, and endowments.

a. The existence of Christ prior to his appearance on earth is directly implied in c. 22, where he is represented as exhorting us, through the Holy Spirit, in the words of Psalm xxxiii. 11–18; and there is no reason whatever for

[1] The words τὸ κατὰ σάρκα, according to the flesh, in c. 32, are also significant. As to the flesh, he was descended from Israel; as to the spirit — as to his higher nature — from whom? The most natural reply is, from God. In what sense? Not as men may be said to be descended from God; otherwise, where the contrast, what the distinction, between Jesus and other Jews?

supposing, either that Christ had spoken these words on earth, or that Clement arbitrarily put them into his mouth. He clearly believed him to have spoken in Old Testament times. Here, too, is a conjunction of God and Christ of a remarkable character, seeing that the Old Testament scriptures are, throughout, represented as the word of God (see, for example, cc. 13, 45, 53); the word of Christ and the word of God are treated on the same footing.

The words *τὸ σκῆπτρον τῆς μεγαλοσύνης οὐκ ἦλθεν ἐν κόμπῳ καίπερ δυνάμενος κ. τ. λ.*, from the sixteenth chapter, already referred to, contain also a hint of his pre-existence. For, to speak of his being able to appear on earth otherwise than he did, if he then first came into existence, would be absurd; especially so, to say that he thus humbled himself. How could he humble himself, if he had not previously held a higher position?

b. There are several scattered allusions, from which we can very naturally deduce that Clement regarded Christ as sinless; this, at all events, is their most obvious explanation.

In c. 36 we are said to gaze, *in him*, on the *faultless* and most excellent countenance of God; and how could this be the case if Christ, even regarded merely as a medium, were imperfect? According to c. 39, even the angels are not beyond the reach of blame when compared with God; yet Christ is greater, higher than the angels. Again, in c. 16, the words of Isaiah liii. are applied to Christ: "there was no guile in his mouth; he suffered for *our* sins; he bore *our* sins, not *his own*," and so forth. Whatever view may be taken of the original application of these words, it is enough for our purpose to know that Clement deemed them to have been realized in Christ; and he could scarcely have indicated his perfect innocence and purity in stronger terms. Further, we are said to be "sanctified through our Lord Jesus Christ" (c. 1); he is "the gate of righteousness, and they are blessed who enter into it, and are found walking in holiness and righteousness." But he who was

himself sinful could never, surely, be styled the "gate of righteousness" to others. His righteousness is evidently conceived of as of the highest order and degree. Further, such expressions as, your *εὐσέβεια* is *ἐν Χριστῷ* (c. 1), *πολιτεύεσθαι κατὰ τὸ καθῆκον τῷ Χριστῷ* (c. 3), seem to involve, to say the least, a subordination of our moral state and life under his, that amounts to something very like sinlessness. Naturally, too, all the points referred to under the first rubric, and that will be brought forward under the next, point in the same direction.

3. The relation of Christ to men.

Clement's epistle contains a great variety of utterances bearing on this point. In the most natural way, and as if the matter were too obvious to admit of doubt, he represents men as dependent on Christ for every species of spiritual good. Grace is spoken of, in cc. 1, 8, 30, 31, 50, as *χάρις ἀπὸ Θεοῦ* or *χάρις Θεοῦ*; in cc. 16 and 59, on the other hand, we read *ὑπὸ τὸν ζυγὸν τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ* [*Χριστοῦ*], and in c. 59, *ἡ χάρις τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*; so that he was deemed by Clement to be, along with God, the source of *χάρις*; that is, to all appearance, of the same *χάρις*. Again, in c. 1 he is set forth as the medium through which men receive *χάρις*: *χάρις ὑμῖν ἀπὸ Θεοῦ διὰ Χριστοῦ*. The expression in the sixteenth chapter, *εἰ γὰρ ὁ κύριος οὕτως ἐταπεινοφρόνησεν τί ποιήσομεν ἡμεῖς οἱ ὑπὸ τὸν ζυγὸν τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ δι' αὐτοῦ ἐλθόντες*, "we who come, *through him*, under the yoke of *his grace*," is worthy of note. He brings us under his own dominion, under the dominion of *his own* grace, and is not merely the instrument or agent of bringing us under the dominion of God's grace; and yet, as we see from other passages, this same *χάρις* is identical with the *χάρις ἀπὸ Θεοῦ*. Again, in c. 20 a similar thought is expressed in different words: *ὁ μέγας δημιουργὸς — εὐεργετῶν τὰ πάντα ὑπερεκπερισσῶς δὲ ὑμᾶς . . . . . διὰ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Χριστοῦ*. Through Christ we are sanctified (c. 1); he is the *ὁδὸς ἐν ᾗ εὕρομεν τὸ σωτήριον ἡμῶν — ὁ προστάτης καὶ βοηθός* (c. 36); *ἡ ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ πύλη ἐστὶν ἡ ἐν Χριστῷ* (c.

48); there is *μία κλῆσις ἐν Χριστῷ* (c. 46); we are *κληθέντες ἐν Χριστῷ* (c. 32); *ἐκλελεγμένοι ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ* (cc. 50, 58); we are all members of each other and *τὰ μέλη τοῦ Χριστοῦ*; nothing, however, being clearer than that Clement does not mean that Christ bears the same relation to us as do our fellow men; we are *τὸ ποίμνιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ* (cc. 44, 54, 57); Christ is *κύριος ἡμῶν* (c. 20, et pass.); Christ's is the *βασιλεία* (c. 50); our *πίστις*, our *παιδεία*, our *ἀγάπη*, our *ἐλπίς*, are each and all *in Christ* (cc. 21, 22, 49, 57). Besides these, there are other allusions to the practical relation of Christ to humanity, which, though not of great significance in themselves, harmonize well with, and therefore acquire force from, the other features of the picture sketched by Clement.

In the passages just adduced, Clement plainly puts Christ into a relation to the spiritual redemption and life of man, such as no merely human being could occupy. Individual expressions might, indeed, be used respecting men, and sometimes are, relatively to external matters; but if we were to substitute the name of a human being, even though idealized, for Christ's name, wherever the latter is referred to, the incongruity would at once become obvious; it would at once be plain that the Christ of Clement was not a mere man. To discuss in detail every one of these utterances would lead us too far; nor is it necessary. What has been advanced by such writers as Gess, relatively to the teachings of the same class in the New Testament is applicable to the words of Clement, so far as they coincide therewith; and to a very large extent they do coincide.

Let us now sum up Clement's utterances regarding Christ, and see what conclusion we are warranted in drawing.

In the *first* place, Christ is placed in a relation to God such as neither angels nor men occupy, and is designated by names which are elsewhere used of God; in the *second* place, he pre-exists and is sinless; in the *third* place, he is assumed to be both the source and the medium of the highest spiritual, divine blessings. Evidently then, in

Clement's eyes, Christ stood nearer to God than is possible for any creature; so near that the outlines of the one fade away into those of the other. He does not, indeed, distinctly identify him with God; he does not, in so many words, style him divine; there is no good reason for believing that he held any definite *doctrine* regarding Christ's nature and attributes; but still Christ fills almost the whole of his horizon, and he implies a unity between him and God, such as can only be satisfactorily expressed in some such formula as that of the church. We are justified, then, in maintaining that if Clement had been compelled by antagonists to make the subject a matter of special logical reflection, he would unhesitatingly have adopted the doctrine held by the church throughout the ages. The reasons for the indefiniteness which marks his expressions regarding the person of Christ we shall have occasion to notice in another connection.

§ 6. *The Personality and Work of the Holy Spirit.*

Clement's allusions to the Holy Spirit are tolerably numerous, considering the length and design of his epistle; they are characterized, however, by the previously-noticed vagueness in a doctrinal point of view.

The expression *πνεῦμα ἅγιον* occurs, in all, eight times; in one instance we read *πνεῦμα κυρίου* (c. 21).

(1). His personality in general, and personal existence prior to the coming of Christ, seem to be implied in cc. 13, 16, 22, and 45, to which we shall refer separately. In the thirteenth chapter, a quotation from Jeremiah is introduced by the words *λέγει γὰρ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον*; similarly also, in c. 16, a quotation from the prophet Isaiah. Now, in cc. 8, 10, 18, 33, and elsewhere, God is represented as thus speaking, or Jesus Christ; what, therefore, can lie nearer than to suppose that as they are personal, so the Holy Spirit, to whom the same act is ascribed, is personal? It is true, the bare expression *τὸ πνεῦμα λέγει* would prove little by itself; for we read in c. 13, *φησὶν γὰρ ὁ ἅγιος λόγος*, which, from a

comparison of c. 56, there can be little doubt is equivalent to *ἡ γραφή*, i.e. *φησὶν* (cc. 34, 35), or to *τὸ γραφεῖον λέγει* (c. 28); and it might be argued that as a personal act is attributed to *ἡ γραφή*, which is obviously impersonal, the attribution of a personal act to *τὸ πνεῦμα ἅγιον* does not prove it to be personal. But there are two other circumstances to be taken into consideration. The ascription of the same *τὸ λέγειν* to both *πνεῦμα* and *γραφή* neither requires both to be impersonal, nor both personal. That would be proving too much; for then we might argue that *Θεός* and *Ἰησοῦς* were also impersonal. Now it is, *a priori*, obvious that *γραφή* is impersonal; but it is by no means so certain that *πνεῦμα* also is impersonal. The question then arises: Are there any presumptions to the contrary? A personification of *ἡ γραφή* is intelligible enough, for it has a clearly-defined external existence; but as a mere personification *πνεῦμα* would lack all reality. What is this *πνεῦμα*? we should have to ask. That Clement should use spirit in any pantheistic sense is utterly improbable. Is *πνεῦμα*, then, another term for God or Christ — the Spirit of God, as we say the spirit of man? If this had been his meaning, it is likely that, with his realistic turn of mind, he would have said *τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ Θεοῦ* or *Ἰησοῦ*. His addition of *τὸ ἅγιον* strengthens the inadmissibility of this supposition. Further, when he writes "the holy scripture saith," he means that "God or Christ saith," because he regarded scripture as God's word; but what of *τὸ πνεῦμα*? especially of *τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον*? If it mean anything, it must mean either God or the third person of the Trinity; and as we can see no reason why he should not have said God or Christ, as in other places, it is probable, particularly in view of the passages next to be noticed, that, even if in a vague way, the Holy Spirit hovered before his mind as a personal being. In c. 22 Jesus is represented as exhorting us through the Holy Spirit, in the words of Psalm xxxiii. The Holy Spirit is here conceived as Christ's agent in relation to man, in perfect agreement with the New Testament and the doc-

trine of the church. In c. 46 we find the remarkable words, "have we not one God and one Christ, and one Spirit of grace which is poured out upon us?" To conclude, here, that as God and Christ are personal, so also is the Spirit, would not surely be putting too great pressure on Clement's words; on the contrary, the conclusion seems necessary. That the personality of the Spirit may have been indistinctly present to his mind, is suggested also by his use of *πνοή* in c. 21, instead of *πνεῦμα*: "for God is a searcher of the thoughts and desires; whose breath is in us; and when he wills he takes it away"; for he says *πνοὴ αὐτοῦ*, and not *τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτοῦ*. The passage *τὰς ἀληθεῖς. ῥήσεις πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου* is not quite so clear as some already referred to, but still points in the same direction. Such expressions as *ἔκχυσις πνεύματος ἁγίου*, in c. 2, though apparently impersonal, are, rightly understood, not inconsistent with the church doctrine of the Spirit. Further evidence that Clement viewed the Holy Spirit as a person is derivable also from the operations attributed to him.

2. Three operations are ascribed to the Spirit: the *inspiration* of the scriptures, the influencing of *sinners*, and the strengthening of *believers*.

The passages quoted above, from cc. 8, 13, 16, 45, plainly teach that he inspired the writers of the Old Testament. In c. 22 Christ is described as remonstrating with and persuading men to seek the Lord, through the Holy Spirit — a decided hint towards the doctrine of the Spirit's work in the conversion of sinners. And in c. 42 the apostles are said to go forth to their work of evangelization with the full certainty of the Holy Ghost. Now, notwithstanding the vagueness which must be allowed to be characteristic of Clement's allusions to this subject, what impression do we receive on the whole? The answer will depend considerably on the point of view of the individual inquirer; but still one thing must be conceded, that his utterances are thoroughly compatible with a recognition of the personality of the Holy Spirit in the church's sense: nay more, that

they permit us to suppose that, had occasion called for it, he would have received the church's doctrine as the substantial expression of his own unformulated thoughts.

For the late Dr. Baur's assertion, that the Son of God, so far as the apostolical Fathers speak of him as a pre-existent being, is identical with the Holy Spirit, there is not a shadow of reason, at all events in Clement's Epistle. One might with much greater propriety maintain that the Spirit is identical with Jesus Christ; though neither position is tenable.

It is unnecessary to add that, if the acts attributed by Clement to the Spirit in Old Testament times involve his personality, they equally involve Clement's belief in his pre-existence. In short, his manner of alluding to the subject harmonizes best with the supposition that he held, in a concrete form, the church's view of the person and work of the Holy Spirit.

§ 7. *The Trinity.*

Our judgment as to whether there be any distinct preparations for, or anticipations of, the doctrine of the Trinity as subsequently developed in the history of the church, will depend on the conclusions arrived at relatively to the two points last examined. If Christ be really represented by Clement as the pre-existent Son of God, who discharges divine functions and performs divine works; and if the Holy Spirit be personal and pre-existent; then the foundation is clearly laid for the doctrine of the Trinity, however far Clement may be from a formal recognition thereof; and we may reasonably say, as in previous cases, that, had he found opportunity, he would have accepted the church's doctrine as the natural, if not fully satisfactory, expression of his own belief. There is only one passage which can be deemed, in any sense, to hint at the doctrine of the Trinity; it is in c. 46: *Ἓν οὐχὶ ἕνα Θεὸν ἔχομεν καὶ ἕνα Χριστόν; καὶ ἓν πνεῦμα τῆς χάριτος τὸ ἐκχυθὲν ἐφ' ἡμᾶς;* but it is too slight a foundation on which to build; though it would be a very

natural course to refer to the New Testament baptismal formula as furnishing an analogy to, and perhaps an explanation of, Clement's words.

§ 8. *The Atonement of Christ.*

An impartial examination of his epistle can leave little doubt that Clement believed the death of Christ to have effected for men something outside of them, as well as produced a spiritual effect in them. The strongest words bearing on this subject are found in cc. 7, 16, and 49. They run as follows: c. 7, "Let us gaze intently on the blood of Christ, and let us see how precious to God is his blood, which, having been shed for our salvation, has brought the grace of repentance to the entire world;" c. 49, "Because of the love he had towards us, Jesus Christ our Lord gave his blood on our behalf by the will of God, and his flesh for our flesh, and his soul for our souls;" in c. 16 the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah is quoted as a prophecy of Jesus Christ and his sufferings, and is plainly considered to express their significance. As Dr. Dorner remarks in his Christology, regarding one of these passages in conjunction with others to be adduced afterwards: "Every explanation is forced which does not find in them the idea of substitution, and that both in a subjective and objective sense — subjective in Christ's substitutionary spirit or disposition, and objective in that his substitutionary spirit and deed had their correspondent objective result." Several other more or less distinct allusions to the efficacy of the blood of Christ occur. For example, in c. 12 the red thread hung by Rahab in the window of her house, as a sign to the invading Israelites, is treated as a type of the redemption to be wrought out by the blood of Christ for all who believe and hope in God. Whatever opinion we may entertain as to the typical value of this thread of Rahab's, Clement's view of the death of Christ is plain enough. Again, in c. 21 we read: "let us pay heed to Jesus Christ, who was given for us"; in c. 2 the Corinthians are praised for keeping

the sufferings of Christ before their eyes, to wit, not merely as an example, though this is included, but as a principle of self-sacrifice in them, and a source of great blessing. Further, in cc. 36 and 58 Christ is designated our high-priest, a term which first acquires full force, especially as taken in connection with *βοηθός*, *προστάτης* and the remarks made above, when we apply it in the sense of the church. The death of Christ would thus seem to have been regarded by Clement as having taken place to redeem men from penalties otherwise inevitable, and to bring to them blessings otherwise inaccessible. A clearly worked-out doctrine there is not; but there certainly is a recognition of that concrete basis on which the church subsequently built its doctrine of the atonement.

§ 9. *Justification by Faith.*

Clement's clearest utterance concerning the nature and significance of faith is contained in c. 32, where we read: "All these, then, were honored and magnified, not through themselves or their works, or the just deeds which they wrought, but through his will. We also, therefore, called by his will in Christ Jesus, are not justified by ourselves, nor by our wisdom or intelligence or piety or works which we have wrought in sanctity of heart, *but by faith*, by which the omnipotent God hath justified all from the beginning." Nothing can be more distinct. We are justified by faith, not by works. The coincidence with the fourth and fifth chapters of the Epistle to the Romans is very obvious and complete.

Clement alludes to faith as a moral and spiritual force, in eight passages. In four passages God is plainly its object; in one clearly, and in three others it may, perhaps, without force be maintained to refer to Christ. In c. 3 we read: "each quits the fear of God, and is dim-sighted in his faith;" in c. 10: "for his faith and hospitality a son was given to Abraham in his old age"; in c. 12 the faith and hospitality of Rahab are praised; and in c. 31 we read that

Abraham was blessed because he wrought righteousness and truth through faith, that is, in God. Of these passages, the last is the only one that can be said to have any special force; and the context forbids basing any definite judgment on it. Clement's immediate object seems to have been to enumerate *αἱ ὁδοὶ τῆς εὐλογίας*, and he apparently ranks faith as one mode among others of attaining to blessing. Abraham wrought righteousness and truth *διὰ πίστεως*; Isaac, *μετὰ πεποιθήσεως ἡδέως ἐγένετο θυσία*; Jacob, *ἐξεχάρησεν μετὰ ταπεινοφροσύνης*. In this case, however, any seeming inconsistency is attributable to the practical character of what he writes, and to vagueness in the use of language. The section in which the above expressions occur, finishes with the strong declaration regarding the nullity of everything but faith quoted above; as though Clement had intended by the close to obliterate any ambiguity occurring in the course of his exhortations. We must here observe the rule of explaining obscurer by clearer passages. Where Clement meant to treat of the relative value of different principles, he leaves no doubt as to the position due to faith. We must further remember that owing to the purely practical purpose of his epistle, Clement naturally gave full prominence to each particular moral or spiritual force as it came into view.[1]

Clement never quite distinctly teaches that we are justified by faith in the blood of Christ; but that a connection existed for his mind between faith and the death of Christ in the justification of sinners may be concluded on various

[1] This is a very simple principle, which has been greatly neglected by too many interpreters of our canonical scriptures. The sacred writers were not so fearful of speaking strongly, now in one direction, and then in another direction apparently incompatible with the first, as we are now. We stand in constant awe of being misunderstood by some weak brother or sister. Thoroughly examined, there is scarcely a proof of the inspiration of scripture stronger than these formal, logical inconsistencies; for the man of spiritual insight feels and sees these very inconsistencies to be living truth — truth drawn directly from the everflowing wells of life, and given to the thirsty without being first disintegrated and recompounded, and thus deprived of freshness and vigor. Life is light, and light is life.

grounds: first, from the universal significance attributed to πίστις in c. 32; secondly, from such expressions as πίστις ἐν Χριστῷ in c. 22; thirdly, from the words referring to Isaac in c. 31, where he is said to have freely become a sacrifice, *knowing what was to come*, to wit, what Christ would do; and lastly, in connection with the foregoing, from the stress elsewhere laid on Christ's death as the salvation of the entire world and the source of such virtues as repentance. For with his ethical and practical tendencies, Clement must have conceived salvation to have been appropriated through the medium of some such human act or organ as faith. In the light of c. 32 it is impossible to suppose that Clement should have recognized any other principle by which this salvation is mediated, save faith. The words βεβαίαν πίστιν ὑμῶν in c. 1 may also be taken to involve the presupposition of Christ as the object and content of faith, particularly as viewed in connection with the next clause τὴν ἐν Χριστῷ εὐσέβειαν.

Roman Catholic writers, indeed, endeavor to show that Clement places works and charity on the same level with faith, as principles of acceptance before God. But the passages on which they rely for proof are, to say the least, very feeble. One is contained in c. 30, where we read: "let us put on concord, being humble-minded, continent, removing far from all whispering and slander, *justifying ourselves by works, and not by words.*" That the opposition here lies between *works* and mere *words*, and not between deeds and faith, as a principle of justification, is as plain as possible, especially from what follows: "He who speaketh much shall hear in reply, Does a man of many words think to be just? Do not be great in words!" The contrast is between reality and pretence, not between works and faith, which are equally realities and equally important in their relative positions, in Clement's estimation. The other passage is c. 50: "Blessed are we, beloved, if we have fulfilled the commands of God in concord of love, in order that our sins may be remitted to us through love (δι' ἀγάπης)." The following

considerations will set aside any difficulty that may be occasioned by these words: first, that as it would be unwarrantable to base a doctrine of justification by faith on any single passage, in face of a number of other passages of a different tendency, some very clear and some indistinct; so in the present instance. Secondly, Clement never uses the strong and decided language regarding love that he uses regarding faith. Thirdly, his *experience*, we do not say his *conception*, of faith was not of that dead thing to which Roman Catholics oppose love; to him, faith was the root of love, love the ripe outcome of faith. Fourthly, the idea of love as a source of merit before God would clash with the passages quoted above, and with the present context. Fifthly, δι' ἀγάπης here signifies, probably, "through love," i.e. in God or Christ, and not "on account of love," which would be δι' ἀγάπην. This meaning is suggested to an unprejudiced reader by the very next words: "for it is written, Blessed are they whose sins are covered." And, lastly, as we have observed in another connection, Clement's practical tendency led him to lay strong emphasis on each spiritual principle or virtue as it presented itself to his view. In short, the foundation supplied to Catholics by Clement is as feeble as that supplied by the writers of the New Testament.

§ 10. *The Resurrection.*

On this point Clement's testimony is more clear and precise than on any other. He devotes to it three entire chapters, cc. 24, 25, and 26, and alludes to it in cc. 27 and 42. He assumes, first, the fact of the resurrection of Christ; speaks of his resurrection as the first-fruits, to be followed by ours; and refers, in illustrative support thereof, to the fable of the phoenix and to various analogies of nature. In c. 26 he quotes the words of Job xix.: "Thou shalt wake up my flesh again," in confirmation of the resurrection. Into the mode and time of our resurrection, and other questions connected therewith, he does not enter at

all. From his use of the words of Job, however, he would appear to have assumed the resurrection of the body. So that his references to this point, though clearer than usual, contain little or nothing of a properly doctrinal character. That his allusions to the resurrection should be unusually distinct, is plainly attributable to its being something tangible and objective; besides, that was most probably (see c. 42 where the apostles are said to have been inspired with confidence by the resurrection of Christ) the chief support of Christian belief, and the main argument in the conviction of heathen.

Such, then, are the main features of the theology of Clement, so far as we may speak of his having a theology at all. The question next to be considered is: What relation does the theology of Clement's epistle bear to the theological views current in the Christian circles of his day? Does Clement here fairly represent the state of theological thought, both as to form and substance? Our answer is, Yes; and on the following grounds:

§ 11. *The Position and Character of Clement.*

1. Clement occupied a position which gave him ample opportunity of becoming directly conversant with the theological thought of the church of his day. He was acquainted with the apostle Paul (Phil. iv. 3), even if he did not accompany him on his journeys, as some have supposed. Origen, Eusebius, Epiphanius, Jerome, and other early writers testify to his being the same as the one mentioned in the passage just quoted. He was probably a citizen of Philippi, and after his conversion to Christianity labored there, in conjunction with others. This must have been prior to A.D. 63 or 64; and from that time onwards till about A.D. 92 to 101 he continued, so far as we know, to serve Christ, either in Philippi or other cities. Between A.D. 92 and 101 he held the office of bishop of Rome, and, as the high value set on the epistle which bears his name sufficiently proves,

was greatly esteemed by the Christian churches in general. Now a man of his age and intellectual and moral character, even though he had held no prominent official positions, must have contracted a wide acquaintance with the belief of his contemporaries; much more if he had held the positions commonly ascribed to Clement.

2. His intellectual and moral qualities fitted him for reflecting the general average thought of his contemporaries. So far as we can judge from his epistle, and it reads like a true expression of his inner being, Clement's mind was precisely of that order from which we expect and receive the most accurate testimony.

He was of a practical, unspeculative turn; his judgment was sober and well balanced; he evinces culture and susceptibility to beauty in nature and style; and while not possessed of striking force, cannot by any means be charged with feebleness.

To his predominantly practical turn of mind, we have had frequent occasion to refer. The entire epistle bears testimony thereto: there is not a single feature of an opposite character.

That his judgment was sober and well balanced appears from his mode of treating the entire dispute in question; from the absence of extravagant ascetical ideas and exaggerated notions about martyrdom; from his abstinence from allegory and from his treatment, to single out one matter, of the fable of the phoenix. There is scarcely an exhortation, a practical judgment, a general observation, that is not as applicable now as it was then. With what wisdom does he commence his exhortations! With what mingled severity and tenderness does he treat the offenders! In praise he is not too full; in blame, not too harsh. And he seeks throughout to accomplish his design rather by warning examples of contention and encouraging examples of concord and obedience than by direct exhortation and reproof. How wise and discriminating are the following words from c. 38: "Let not the strong man neglect the weak, but let the weak

esteem the strong; let the rich give to the poor, and let the poor thank God that he hath given him one through whom his wants are supplied. Let the wise evince his wisdom, not in words, but in good works. He who is humble should not bear testimony to himself, but should leave testimony to be borne by others. He who is chaste as to the flesh, let him not be puffed up, knowing that another hath given him the gift of continence."

Who that reads his praise of the Corinthians, in c. 2; his description of the concord and harmony of the universe, in c. 20; his impassioned encomium of charity, in c. 49; and notes the spirit of love and harmony which breathes through many other passages, can call in question his culture and his sense of beauty?

And, finally, though not distinguished for force, his mind is by no means chargeable with weakness. Sometimes he exhibits considerable energy, as, for example, in c. 46; his mode of treating the matters he touches, though in a formal respect very loose, is substantially firm and self-consistent; sometimes, through sheer, earnest common sense, he approaches to a broad philosophical view, as for example, of faith as a spiritual force, in c. 32; in c. 49 we have an independent expansion of a thought derived from the apostle Paul.

In short, an unprejudiced examination of the epistle reveals an author whose mind is marked by the sobriety, practicalness, harmony, freedom from idiosyncracies, which warrant the expectation that his references to matters of belief and life, will be a fair reflection of the spirit of his age.

§ 12. *The Circumstances and Character of the Epistle.*

1. The epistle is addressed, according to the salutation in chapter 1, by the church in Rome to the church in Corinth; and, according to Eusebius,[1] was written by Clement in his official capacity as bishop of Rome. Here, then,

[1] Eusebius, Hist. Eccl. III., 16, 38.

we have a double testimony: 1. to the authority enjoyed by Clement; 2. to the authority of the epistle itself.

An official communication from one church to another would naturally touch only such points and urge such considerations as were generally accepted. Whatever, therefore, occurs in it, may be safely assumed to have been commonly recognized as constituent elements of Christian belief.

2. Throughout the epistle there is no attempt whatever to demonstrate any doctrine, or prove any fact;[1] all is taken for granted. And further, doctrines and facts are introduced in the way of allusion — two peculiarities, which consist alone with the supposition that the Epistle reflects truly the substance and form of theological thought in Clement's day. As to substance, anything new or peculiar would have demanded proof, even between churches; especially when written by one individual in the name of a community. As to form, had it been customary to employ a more ratiocinative form, we must surely have found traces thereof even in an official letter. In similar letters written at a later period there is a marked difference in this respect, due unquestionably to the different character of the thought of the age.

This character of Clement himself, and of his epistle, viewed in connection with other considerations, is further a strong testimony to his having labored and written at the era we have supposed. Had he lived later, from the prominent position he occupied, we should have expected a tone and turn of mind more after the type of later writers, such as Justin Martyr, Clemens Alexandrinus, Tertullian, and others. And a few years later, an epistle that abstains so completely from theological controversy, that is occupied so exclusively with the practical aspects of Christianity, and that breathes so convinced, so harmonious, so peaceful a

[1] Roman Catholic writers might say that this was because Clement wrote authoritatively, as the head of the Church on earth. But there is no trace whatever of such authority in the epistle. Clement writes as a brother to brethren, and all his reproofs and appeals bear this character.

spirit, could not have been written from a Western to an Eastern church. The scanty and vague reference to points of ecclesiastical order are natural enough, if our supposition be correct; completely unnatural, on a contrary view. If Clement had held the more distinct and developed ideas set forth, for example, in some of the epistles commonly ascribed to Ignatius, there was occasion enough for advancing them.

We conclude, then, from the mental and moral characteristics of Clement that he was fitted to represent to us the form and substance of the theological thought of his day, and that, from the tone of his epistle, he actually does it.

§ 13. *Contemporary Christian Writings.*

In support of the testimony thus borne by Clement's epistle, we may adduce, further, the other works ascribed to his age; whether truly ascribed, or not, does not greatly affect the present argument. We refer to the epistles of Ignatius (particularly the shorter recension), of Barnabas, of Polycarp. These all bear the same general character as the epistle of Clement, though they betray, in a higher degree, the idiosyncracies of the several writers. At the same time, however, we must observe that these idiosyncracies relate principally to practical questions, such as martyrdom and church government, while in relation to doctrine all are substantially at one.

The circumstance that no writings of any very decidedly different character were ever attributed to the orthodox circles of the post-apostolic age, is a confirmation, *e silentio*, of the position that the extant works were then written, and that the belief and life of the church were then substantially such as we have indicated. Whether we accept the generally assumed age of the writings in question or not, this is certain, that antiquity believed the post-apostolic age to have been such as we have assumed; and until good positive reasons are adduced to the contrary, this consideration must have weight. It is true the Tübingen school has

labored to spread the canonical and other early Christian writings over the first and part of the second century, in order thus to show that the general character of the so-called post-apostolic age was by no means that which such productions as the epistle of Clement would imply. But the arguments adduced are either exceedingly feeble or purely negative, and owe their existence entirely to the necessities of their general philosophical theory of history. But we shall return again to this matter.

§ 14. If such, then, were the character of the immediately post-apostolic age — on the one hand non-speculative, non-productive in an intellectual point of view, almost exclusively devoted to great practical questions; and yet, on the other, actually possessed of a rich store of lofty and, for the time, unusual thoughts relating to the highest questions of existence, both speculative and practical, all set forth with a directness, certitude, and an informality, to say the least, remarkable — what conclusion are we, not merely warranted, but compelled, to draw respecting the age which preceded? We answer, first, that age must have been marked by great, startling productiveness, both in thought and deed. The historical phenomenon that numerous, and in some instances large, communities of men, themselves not at all remarkable for culture, and whose leaders give no signs of having been productive, should hold, and that too so firmly, a number of thoughts and principles which, whatever judgment we may form as to the abstract truth of many of them, are distinguished by a grand and moral beauty hitherto totally strange to the greater part of the world, requires some explanation. If these first Christians had been comparatively few in number, and possessed of high culture, then we might deem it possible that they were the outcome of a slow and gradual spiritual movement, whose initiator was Socrates, and main factors Jesus, Paul, Peter, and John. But as the first Christians were mostly heathens of the lower classes, we see no mode of accounting for the existence of the facts adduced, but by assuming that the

preceding age had been marked by unusual, or as we believe supernatural, productiveness. Secondly, an age of this remarkable character must have *immediately* preceded the phenomenon in question. For this assumption there are both historical and general grounds. Those who live and work under the direct impression of such thoughts and deeds as had then been produced, are seldom capable of entering into speculative investigations; they are too much possessed by them reflectively to dream of possessing them. But when the second generation has passed, reflection begins; the thoughts and facts have to be communicated to those whose interest can only be awakened by reflection; doubts arise, objections have to be met; and so the teachings assume a totally different stamp — they become indirect and ratiocinative. This latter is the general character of the ages of Christianity which succeeded that of the apostolic Fathers. We find also a similar course of things, even if in a less degree, during the entire history of the church. When there has been a great revival of Christian life, those who have written under the direct impression created by it, have produced, for the most part, works bearing a concrete, direct, practical character. So far as they have borne a different character, it is attributable to the difference of circumstances; to wit, in the latter case, we have to do with a revival of truths to which contemporaries have become relatively hostile or indifferent; in the former case, totally new truths are brought into direct contact with a generation groping after light. But the law, in its general features, holds good. We find too, as a matter of fact, that later writers never did, because they never could, treat Christian doctrine and fact in the same assumptive, undemonstrative manner; though in proportion as Christian books have been the direct outflow of revived life and manifest divine interferences, in that proportion have they been of the same stamp as the epistle of Clement.

§ 15. In the canonical writings we have the record of deeds and thoughts precisely such as account for the phe-

nomenon in question. Any one candidly and carefully observing the phenomena of the post-apostolic age, even supposing he knew nothing whatever of the canonical scriptures, must be forced to ask: In what have they taken their rise? The men themselves are not, in any sense, their originators, for they appeal to something already existing and recognized; they make no attempt to justify what they advance, as they must if it were new. If to such an observer the canonical scriptures were presented, and he were told: These record the deeds, thoughts, and life of men who immediately preceded the age you are studying, he would reply: Yes, here are the roots, here is the obvious explanation; the two are correlatives. And to deny such events their appropriate practical results, would be equivalent to denying their reality; and practical phenomena of the kind under consideration are inexplicable save by such events.

If this be the case, then the coincidences between this epistle of Clement and the other writings of the apostolic Fathers on the one hand, and the several books of the New Testament on the other, even where not distinctly stated to be such, may be deemed quotations; and we are thus supplied with a strong argument for the truth and authority of the canonical scriptures.

§ 16. *Recent Objections to these Views.*

Against the supposition that the Christian contemporaries of Clement have in him a fair representative; that, both formally and materially, his epistle reflects the state of theological thought among them; that the church then must be described as exclusively devoted to the practical aspects of Christianity, holding its facts and doctrines in a concrete, immediate, non-reflective form; and that consequently, in a scientific point of view, they not only did not continue, but to a certain extent went back from, the productive process of their predecessors,—against this supposition, the loudest protest has been raised by the school of Dr. Baur in Tübingen. Such an evident interruption in the theoretical develop-

ment of the "idea" as the ordinary view of the immediately post-apostolic age involves, conflicts too strongly with their general theory of history, and is too favorable to the supernatural origin and character of Christianity to be left unassailed. Accordingly, all the weapons of history, criticism, and theory have been brought to bear on this particular era. No stone has been left unturned, no nook has been left unsearched, in order to effect a reversal of the long-formed judgment of the Christian church. Heretical works have been raised to the position of true representatives of the state of belief; the orthodox works have been assigned to a later period and an inferior position; and, finally, the canonical books have been distributed over a time nearly double that usually allotted for their production. If, as is maintained, the first form of Christianity were Ebionism; if it then threw off its Judaistic limitations in Paul; and if, at the commencement of the second century, it first rose to its full philosophical height in the Gospel of John, which was the result and reconciliation of the antagonism between the Pauline and Petrine parties — then undoubtedly the ordinary view of both the apostolic and immediately post-apostolic writings must be false. But the evidence is inspired by the *a priori* theory, instead of the theory being constructed on the evidence; and in consequence the evidence is, naturally enough, to say the least, very far-fetched and feeble. For example, Dr. Baur's own treatment of Clement and other apostolic Fathers, both in his work on the Trinity and elsewhere, is scandalously defective, considering the attention he bestows on others of far less importance. Our intention here is, not to discuss the critical questions at issue; this has been done, in a masterly manner, by such writers as Dr. Dorner.[1] But we shall add a few general observations designed to show that the theory of the Tübingen school is opposed to, while the ordinary view harmonizes with, both the genius and mission of Christianity and the usual course of human history.

[1] See his Entwickelungsgeschichte der Lehre von der Person Christi. Vol. I. on Clement.

1. The primary aim of Christianity is practical; it seeks first of all to influence the life, the conduct; its action on the intellect, as such, is secondary, and, though inevitable, not a necessity of the first order. This was particularly the case at its first appearance. The Jewish and heathen worlds were sunk in utter corruption, and cried out, not so much for new intellectual activity, as for a new moral life. The first Christians, therefore, with the correctness of instinct, devoted their thoughts and labors to Christianity as a redemption from sin and as the principle of a new, righteous social order. They themselves had found deliverance, peace, harmony, and their first impulse was to propagate these blessings in the enslaved, troubled, and discordant world around them. Christianity can never be introduced on a wide scale, or get firm footing among men, unless it be first viewed and proclaimed in its purely practical features. To take its theoretical aspects as the starting-point is equivalent, in fact, to a complete reversal of its essence and mission. If this be the case, then Clement and his contemporaries deserve the praise of having done precisely the work which required immediately to be done — a praise they would not have merited had they been productive in the manner deemed necessary by the Tübingen school.

2. Christianity is undoubtedly intended to assume the form of a system of truth in the intellect of man; but it can only do so by first taking root in his moral and spiritual nature. Even now it is not communicable as a mere intellectual system, apart from certain spiritual conditions; and yet we have grown up under its influence, and it has determined both the form and substance of our thought. He who would truly understand — intellectually, scientifically understand — the Christian system, must have felt the power of Christ's redeeming love. Till then he stands outside of it; and, as such, may perhaps have some inkling of its inner beauty and self-consistency; but a vital comprehension, never. How much truer must this have been at its first appearance in the world! What folly to have pre-

sented it as a system of truth glorious though it be, to the corrupt and sceptical contemporaries of the apostles! The way to its intellectual appreciation lay through the heart and life. Not only was it natural, therefore, that those who had experienced the power of the new Gospel should be absorbed in the praise, meditation, and diffusion of its practical effects; but even in relation to the development of the truths of Christianity as an intellectual, as a scientific, matter, their course was the only one appropriate to the circumstances of the case. Any such immediate attention to the doctrinal aspects of Christianity as is demanded by the Tübingen school would have defeated its own ends. Instead of a generation of men being prepared for taking up the work in a living manner, the existing thinkers would have wasted their efforts on each other, and, like all systems predominantly and permanently theoretical, Christianity would shortly have become a dead letter, instead of being a living power in the world.

3. If the central feature of Christianity be Christ and the deeds he wrought for the redemption of men, then we can fully account for both the vagueness as to form, and the loftiness as to substance, of the utterances regarding Christ and other matters contained in the apostolic and post-apostolic writings. The doctrinal distinctness we now demand would have been unnatural. How was it possible for those who had come into personal contact with Christ, and had experienced his marvellous saving power, to enter at once into those investigations which are presupposed by a formal doctrine? They all — and for our present purpose we may include the generation to which the apostles preached — believed in the person whom they had felt and handled; their conversion to Christ had been brought about by personal contact or by news from the lips of such as had themselves seen. They had not, like us, previously received cold, formal instruction; the gospel came, simultaneously, as news for the head and news for the heart.

In illustration of these remarks, let us adduce one point:

Was it to be expected that all who had lived with Christ and heard of his life, as a human being, should at once be prepared distinctly to designate him God? His immediate disciples and their converts — for example, Clement — did indeed employ the most manifold terms to exalt him and express his dignity, short of styling him God. We find, however, in confirmation hereof, that precisely those books which were written latest, bear the strongest traces of a doctrinal, a speculative, estimate of the person of Christ; and why? because as time elapsed, the direct, personal impression wore off, and the mind became more free to inquire into the nature and constitution of the marvellous being who had revealed God and redeemed their life from death. We have here only repeated in another form, what theologians long ago expressed, to wit, that though the canonical books contain all the concrete materials out of which the doctrines of the church may be fairly formed, they do not give us the doctrines themselves, as such. And this holds as completely good of the post-apostolic writers.

From this point, also, light is thrown on the question of Ebionism, of which so much has been made by the Tübingen school. They assert, namely, that Ebionism was the first form of belief regarding the person of Christ, and that the higher forms of belief are the result of the conflict, marriage, and development of the original and of new elements. It may be true that it was one of the first forms of belief, especially after reflection had begun; but it is by no means so clear that it was the only form, or the truest form. That some of the first disciples might have been, or at any rate became, Ebionites, may be safely allowed by him whose impression of the glory of the only begotten of the Father is even now as profound as possible; and for the following additional reasons: The disciples of Christ were content at first simply to believe in him who had lived before their eyes; he had occupied the highest possible position in their minds; few if any of them had found it necessary to undertake a more precise definition of his position in rela-

tion to God and man; in other words, they had formed no doctrine of his person. But in course of time, especially when it became incumbent on them to give reasons why others should believe in Christ, who had never seen him, many found it necessary to come to some decision. The simple-minded would then, as now and ever, rest satisfied with saying, I have experienced this and that. Those of higher intellectual force and culture would divide into two classes: such as were of a more spiritual, meditative, speculative cast of mind, would take the step recognizing Christ to be the Son of God — a step logically and practically inevitable to all who fairly weigh the facts and have proper insight into their own needs; such, on the contrary, as were of a colder, more matter-of-fact cast of mind would at first desire to remain where they were, but afterwards fall back, recognize merely the man in Christ, and thus constitute the Ebionitical party.

4. It is in harmony with the ordinary course of history that the development of religious life and thought under the apostles should be unusually full and varied, and that there should be a comparative falling off immediately afterwards.

Great eras in the history of mind are seldom such in merely one aspect. The rich life that has been accumulating manifests itself in many directions almost simultaneously. So was it at the age of Socrates; so at the age of the Reformation: poetry, philosophy, art, theology, suddenly attained a height to which the majority of men have never since been able to climb. Indeed, every nation that has borne a part in the culture of humanity has had its golden age; in other words, an age when it evinced unusually profound and varied productiveness, and gave an impulse to coming generations.

Why, then, should it be otherwise at that great crisis in the religious history of humanity, the appearance of the Son of God on earth? It is true, neither this nor any other golden era has appeared without preparation; but all experience is against the Tübingen position, that the work done

in less than one century must have extended over nearly double the time; and experience is equally favorable to the supposition that, within the life of the first apostles, seeds of systems were sown, antagonisms were brought to light, and reconciliations effected, for whose full development long centuries would be necessary. Had it not been the case, we might fairly doubt whether a new divine life had been really poured through the perishing organism of humanity.

History, too, equally teaches that such extraordinarily fruitful eras are usually followed by periods of comparative calm and sterility. It is so in the inner life of every earnest thinker and earnest believer; he has his times of sudden manifold growth and expansion, followed by times of dearth and seeming relapse. There is not a real falling-off in either case; but time is required to bring the great mass of humanity up towards the point which its heroes have reached, as it were at a single bound; this, in fact, is the specific mission of such heroes; they appear, not for their own sake, but for the sake of others. In other words, a productive, is, and must ordinarily be succeeded by, a digestive and reproductive age. But for this the history of humanity would present the spectacle of a series of brilliant flashings forth of intellectual and religious life, but would not be marked by a steady progress of all classes from a lower to a higher state.

Religious revivals, also, are generally followed by seasons of apparent relapse; but the relapse is not real. The suddenly-received convictions and life have to be incorporated with the entire man, and the new power for influence acquired has to be brought to bear on others; both which are slow and gradual processes. Humanity as a whole may be likened to a traveller wandering towards the highest point of a mountain-range. Sometimes he plainly and rapidly rises, for the scenes on which he looks back grow suddenly wider and grander. At other times he pursues his path along level plateaus, or even descends into vallies, and then it is as though he were losing ground and going back; but

this is only seeming; for in reality he is constantly progressing; and, once arrived at the goal, he will see how the sudden ascents, the repeated descents, and the even plains were each and all so many steps lying between him and the summit he had purposed to surmount.

The sudden and, as the Christian church to its consolation and strength believes, supernatural leap taken by the apostles produced at once great practical results; but these results have required, and will still require, many, many ages for their intellectual appreciation. And we can only rejoice that their successors carried on the work begun, not indeed in the manner which the wise of this world deem glorious and good, but still in the very manner necessary to the salvation of men and the glory of God.

Let us now briefly recapitulate. Our object has been to draw from the Epistle of Clement an indirect argument for the reality of the events, and the authenticity of the books, on which the Christian church bases its existence. The following are the steps in our argument:

1. The Epistle of Clement is a work whose authorship and authenticity are critically established.

2. Its teachings, notwithstanding their formal vagueness, are substantially identical with all the orthodox creeds and with the canonical writings.

3. The character of its author, its own tone, and the tone of similar writings ascribed to the same period, warrant the belief that these teachings reflect, both as to form and substance, the spirit of the then church.

4. If such be the case, when we consider, on the one hand its intellectual unproductiveness, and on the other its grand ideas and deeds, we are compelled to assume that an age of unusual life and activity immediately preceded.

5. On examining the canonical writings, we find just such deeds and thoughts as furnish a key to the phenomena of the post-apostolic age.

6. We accordingly conclude that these deeds were

wrought and these thoughts recorded at the time and in the manner commonly supposed.

7. We have, lastly, added a few observations intended to meet the latest objections to the church's view of the apostolic and post-apostolic ages.

ARTICLE II.

THE FIRST ELEVEN CHAPTERS OF GENESIS ATTESTED BY THEIR CONTENTS.[1]

BY PROF. HORATIO B. HACKETT, NEWTON, MASS.

A DISTINGUISHED writer, Max Duncker, begins his excellent History of Antiquity with a general remark respecting

[1] The following Article consists mainly of a free translation of a portion of Professor Auberlen's "Die göttliche Offenbarung: Ein apologetischer Versuch." Erster Band, pp. 123–163. The volume which contains this extract was published in 1861, and is regarded as the ablest production of that eminent scholar. The second volume has just come to hand, entitled "Zur Lehre vom Menschen als religiösem Wesen," but proves, alas! to be a fragment only, in consequence of the death of the author, and appeared as a posthumous work, in July of the last year. A friendly hand has prefixed to the unfinished treatise a brief sketch of the writer's life and character. It is a beautiful picture, and portrays to us a man who was thoroughly in earnest, whose religious convictions were heartfelt, who had received the word of God into his soul as a source of life and power, was a faithful worker for the cause of his Lord and Master, and when the last hour came could say, with a full consciousness of its solemnity: 'God be thanked, of death I have no fear; the Lord Jesus is my light and my song'; and in the joy of that faith passed quietly away.

It is proper to state that some parts of the essay, as presented here, are an abstract of the original, rather than a version. It was the more necessary to be thus free in some passages, because the author's style is unusually terse and idiomatic, and has so many expressions borrowed from the philosophical phraseology of the Germans. A few additional notes and references have been inserted and two or three paragraphs abridged, but nothing, of course, has been added or omitted which affects in any way the argument or ideas of the writer. After having been occupied so much, in the course of recent criticism, with the historical and philological grounds on which the claims of the Pentateuch are vindicated, it may be profitable, and serve to augment the force of other considerations, if we turn our thoughts to the internal argumen[illegible] has so ably unfolded in the pages here laid before the read[illegible]