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CHAPTER I

THE LIFE AND IMPORTANCE OF CLEMENT OF ROME

Providence, in different ways, has guarded the memories of the holy men and women who well deserve this in the Christian church. Of some, it has preserved the outward appearances of life, the story of their deeds and sufferings; of others, the writings. The latter is the case with the man we now contemplate. He stands in the rank of "Apostolic Fathers," or men next to the Apostles' times, whose writings are, in age, nearest to the New Testament Canon. His outer life is little known to us, but in his writings, especially the one affirmed positively to be his, his Christian mind leaves us its testimony.

Clement, called Romanus, to distinguish him from Clement of Alexandria, was connected by birth with the family of the Caesars. His father Faustus was a near relative and a foster brother of the reigning emperor (T. Flavinus Sabinus), and had married one Mattidia, likewise a woman of a prominent family in Rome. Two elder sons, Faustinus and Faustinianus, who were twins, were born to this union and later Clement, who was born many years after his brothers. Clement is alone in the world at the time when he first comes to our notice. Years before this, when he was still an infant, his mother left home to escape dishonorable advances from her husband's brother, and had
taken her two elder sons with her. Not wishing to reveal his brother's shameful wickedness to Faustus, lest it should bring disturbance and dishonor to their family, she pretended to have a dream which warned her to leave home for a time with her twin children. He accordingly planned to send them to reside at Athens, for the greater convenience of their education. She then set sail for Athens and on the way a storm arose at sea, the vessel was wrecked on the shores of Palestine, and she was separated from her children, whom she supposed to have been drowned. Thus she was left a lone woman dependent on the charity of others. Pirates captured the two sons and sold them to Justa, the Syrophoenician woman mentioned in the Gospels, who educated them as her own children, giving them the names Aquila and Nicetes. As they grew up, they became fellow-disciples of Simon Magus, and later were brought under the teaching of Zacchaeus; and through his influence, they attached themselves to St. Peter, whom they accompanied from that time forward on his missionary circuits.

Hearing nothing of them, though he sent messages on purpose every year, their father Faustus determined, after many fruitless inquiries, to go in search of them himself. Accordingly, he sailed for the East, leaving at home, under the charge of guardians, his youngest son Clement, then a boy of twelve years. Clement heard nothing more of his father from then on
and suspected that he had died of grief or had been drowned in the sea.

Thus Clement grew up to manhood a lonely orphan. From his childhood, he had pondered the deep questions of philosophy, until they took such hold on his mind that he could not shake them off. On the immortality of the soul especially, he had spent much anxious thought to no purpose. The prevailing philosophical systems had all failed to give him the satisfaction which his heart craved. During the reign of Tiberius Caesar a rumor reached the imperial city that an inspired teacher had appeared in Judea, working miracles and enlisting recruits for the kingdom of God. Immediately Clement was led to sail to Judea, but was driven by a wind to Alexandria, and landing there, he fell in with one Barnabas, and from him received his first lessons in the Gospel. From Alexandria he sailed to Caesarea, where he found Peter, to whom he had been commended by Barnabas. He attached himself to his company, and attended him on his subsequent journeys.

At the moment when Clement made the acquaintance of St. Peter, the apostle had arranged to hold a public discussion with Simon Magus. Wishing to know something about this false teacher, Clement was referred to Aquila and Nicetes, who gave him an account of Simon and of their previous connection with him. In the midst of the public discourse, Simon escaped secretly from
Caesarea. St. Peter followed him from city to city, providing the antidote to his baneful teaching. On the shores of the Island of Aradus, St. Peter encountered a beggar woman, who had lost the use of her hands. In answer to his inquiries, she told him that she was the wife of a powerful nobleman, that she had left home with her two elder sons for reasons which she explained, and that she had been shipwrecked and lost her children at sea. For a time, St. Peter was put off the track by her giving feigned names from shame, but the recognition was only delayed. Clement found in this beggar woman his long-lost mother, and the Apostle healed her ailment.

Meanwhile, Aquila and Nicetes had preceded the Apostle to Laodicea. When St. Peter arrived there, they were surprised to find a strange woman in his company. He related her story and they were astounded and overjoyed. They declared themselves to be the lost Faustinus and Faustinianus, and that she was their mother. While they were rejoicing in their reunion, St. Peter entered into conversation with an old man whom he had observed watching the proceedings in secret. St. Peter's suspicions were aroused by the story. He asked this friend's name, and found that he was none other than Faustus and the husband of Mattidia. Thus Clement recovered the last of his lost relatives, and the Recognitions are complete.

This romance of Clement's life was published within two
or three generations of his death. It is embodied in two extant works, the Clementine Homilies\(^1\), and the Clementine Recognitions, with insignificant differences of detail. Yet it has no claim to be regarded as authentic; and we may even question whether its author ever intended it to be accepted as a narrative of facts.

The reputation of Clement was so great that even in antiquity numerous legends grew up about him, and apocryphal writings were circulated under his name. We are here, however, concerned only with the few authentic facts about him that are known through ancient authors.

I shall not mention anything of what is reported by some concerning his noble birth and family, of his studies at Athens, and of the occasion and manner of his conversion to Christianity, which they tell us was wrought by St. Peter, whom he met with Barnabas at Caesarea, and who there first declared to him the doctrine of Christ and inclined him to a good opinion of it. All this is very uncertain, and justly doubted by many authors. Rather, I will observe that whatever his condition was before he became a Christian, he was held in no small reputation after, but merited such a character from the ancient fathers as

is hardly given to any besides the Apostles.

The first part of his life, after his conversion, is unknown except that, as we are told in the general, he was St. Peter's disciple; so it may be probable that for some time he followed his leading, and was subject to his direction.

Whatever he was, or wherever he labored before, in this, I think, antiquity is absolutely agreed, that he at last became Bishop of Rome, and was placed in that See, by the express direction of one or both of the Apostles, St. Peter and St. Paul. Whom he succeeded, or at what time to fix his entrance on that great charge, is a point of great dispute. 2

The earliest witness on this point is Hegesippus, who remained for some time at Corinth, and who seems to have instituted particular inquiries into the divisions that had taken place there. We know also that in his work he mentions the letter sent by the Roman Church to the Corinthian Church, 3 and the words in which Eusebius announces this, after some things said by him with regard to the letter of Clement, would incline us to believe that he did mention Clement, but the description of the letter may possibly have been Eusebius' own. 4 Hegesippus

---

3Eusebius, History Ecclesiastical, IV. 22.
gives us therefore no statement with regard to Clement, but we learn from him that the circumstances which called forth the Roman letter took place in the reign of Domitian. On this information, we shall be warranted in believing that Clement flourished at that time, if we get satisfactory testimony to his authorship of the epistle. The first witness to this is Dionysius, an overseer of the Corinthian Church. Thus the testimonies of Hegesippus and Dionysius combined warrant the belief that Clement was living in the time of Domitian.

Whenever Clement is mentioned by most of the other writers, it is in regard to the place he held in the line of the overseers of the Roman Church. Irenaeus being the most important, his words are: "The Blessed Apostles Peter and Paul, having founded and built up the Church, gave the office of oversight to Linus. This Linus Paul has mentioned in his letters to Timothy. He is succeeded by Anencletus. After him, in the third place from the Apostles, Clement obtains the oversight, who also saw the Apostles themselves and conversed with them, and who still had the preaching of the Apostles ringing in his ears, and their doctrine before his eyes." The minute accuracy of these statements is open to question. Everything must depend

5Ibid., 98.
on the critical faculty of Irenaeus, which unfortunately was not great. The assertion that St. Paul and St. Peter founded the Roman Church and built it up is very questionable. We know from his Epistle to the Romans that St. Paul did not found it, and that St. Peter had very little connection with it is also a matter of certainty, indeed it is probable that he had no connection with it at all. Besides this, according to the statement of Irenaeus, there is extreme unlikelihood that there was only one overseer in the Roman Church at a time. The Corinthian Church had more than one, most of the churches of which we know anything had more than one, and we may rest assured that the Roman Church no doubt also had more than one.

The most precise information we have is in Eusebius. He quotes Irenaeus, and elsewhere gives the same succession as he gave, stating that Clement succeeded Anencletus in the twelfth year of the reign of Domitian, 93 A.D., and died in the third year of the reign of Trajan, 101 A.D. On what authority Eusebius fixed these dates we do not know, but we can be quite sure that he was fairly careful; and, on the whole, this is the most satisfactory information we can now obtain on the subject.

The tradition with regard to the position of Clement in the line of succession from the Apostles was by no means

6Eusebius, History Ecclesiastical, III. 15, 34.
uniform. Eusebius had access only to the Greek form of it given in Irenaeus. Tertullian is known to have regarded Clement as the immediate successor of Peter. He attacks the churches of the heretics by challenging them to show "the order of their overseers so running down by succession from the beginning, that the first overseer had some one as his ordainer and predecessor who was either an Apostolic man who lived with the Apostles or an Apostle. For the Apostolic Churches hand down their rolls in this way, as the Church of the Smyrneans relates that Polycarp was placed by John, and the Church of the Romans that Clement was ordained by Peter." The implication of these words, that Tertullian regarded Clement as the first overseer of the Roman Church, is not positively certain. His argument would be more sound, and stronger, if Clement were only the third from the Apostles, for then the Roman Church could show, not merely one, but several Apostolic men in its roll. Still it has been almost universally accepted to indicate that Tertullian believed Clement to be the first, and at least the greatest probability is that such was his belief. Jerome makes the statement that most of the Latins represented Clement as the successor of Peter. It is supposed by Schliemann that this belief owed its origin to the

Clementines, who introduce Clement as the disciple of Peter. He substantiates this by finding a passage in Origen confirming this idea, for Origen, in quoting from The Recognitions, describes the writer as "Clement the Roman, a disciple of the Apostle Peter." The testimony of Origen is not of great help here because he merely asserts that Clement was a disciple, which he may have been even had he been third in the succession. It is extremely doubtful therefore whether we can with security give the description of Clement in the Philocalia to Origen, for nothing is more common than for an ancient editor to put in explanatory remarks such as that which occurs in Chapter XXII of this same Philocalia in relation to the same Clement. Here he is called "a Bishop of Rome," an expression entirely unknown to the time of Origen. There is no doubt, however, that the Clementine stories were used by later writers as historical, and from the preface of Rufinus to the Recognitions we learn that many based the belief in Clement's immediate succession of Peter on the letter of Clement to the Apostle James, where we find not only that Clement was constituted Bishop by St. Peter, but with what formality the whole affair was transacted. It tells us that the Apostle, aware of his approaching dissolution, presented Clement before the Church as a fit person to be his successor.

8 Loc. cit.
9 Ibid. 94.
Clement, however, with all possible modesty declined the honor. St. Peter in turn, in a long discourse, urged it upon him, giving in detail the particular duties both of Ministers in their respective orders and capacities, and also of the people. Having finished, he laid his hands upon him, and compelled him to take his seat.

In all probability, the fact was that none of them knew anything about the matter. Writers after the time of Eusebius made endless conjectures and opinions, some placing him first, second and some fourth, and some trying to bring together all these various opinions. Of the different attempts at reconciliation, two may be noticed more as characteristic of the mode in which these later writers dealt with such matters than as likely to give light to our investigation. Rufinus,\(^{11}\) in his preface to the *Clementine Recognitions*, tries to solve it by the supposition that Linus and Anencletus were overseers of the Roman Church while Peter lived, and after his death it fell to the lot of Clement to become the overseer. This supposition does not have any testimony to support it as Rufinus did not feel the need of it. It seems to be true in one respect as it frees Peter entirely from the oversight. It is very unlikely that either Peter or Paul was an overseer in any church. Epiphanius\(^{12}\) has the

\(^{11}\)Ibid., 64,147. \(^{12}\)Ibid., 67,169.
other explanation. This is only one of his conjectures on the subject. He supposes that Clement received his appointment as overseer from St. Peter, but that he did not fill his office while Linus and Anencletus were alive. This conjecture is based solely on the words of Clement in the Epistle to the Corinthians. These words are an exhortation by a person filled with love saying, "if on account of me there are division, strife, and schisms, I go out of the way, I retire."

In regard to the many statements given about Clement, there is one which has attracted considerable attention. Is he the person mentioned in the Epistle to the Philippians? The first mention of it occurs in Origen, who identifies him with the Clement mentioned by St. Paul writing to the Philippians (chapter IV:3) as among those "fellow laborers whose names are in the Book of Life." 13 This was a very obvious solution. As Hermas the writer of The Shepherd was identified with his namesake who appears in the salutations of the Epistle to the Romans, (chapter XVI:14) so in like manner Clement the writer of the Epistle was assumed to be the same with the Apostle's companion to whom he sends greeting in the Epistle to the Philippians. (chapter IV:3). That others may have made this same identification before Origen is not improbable. At all events, after his time, writers are unanimous in representing him as the person,

13 Ibid., 22.
and Eusebius oftener than once thus speaks of him. That the
Clement mentioned was a Philippian is probable enough, but there
is no reason why a Philippian should not find his way to Rome
and hold a high position in the Roman Church, nor is there any­
thing in the letter of the Roman Church inconsistent with the
idea that the writer of it was a disciple of Paul. In fact the
letter informs us that the writer knew at least some of the
writings of Paul.

Whether the writer of this Epistle was of Jewish or
Gentile origin is a question which has been frequently discussed
and answered in many different ways. On the one hand, critics
have pleaded that the writer betrays his Jewish parentage when
he speaks of "Our Father Jacob," "Our Father Abraham" (chapter
31 of the Epistle to the Corinthians); but this language is
found to be common to early Christian writers, whether Jewish
or Gentile. On the other hand, it has been inferred from the
order "Day and Night," that he must have been a Gentile; but ex­
amples from the Apostolic writings show that this argument also
is quite invalid, or again, that he must have been a Gentile has
been drawn from the mention of "Our General," by which expression
the writer is supposed to indicate his position as before all
things a Roman born. Any Hellenist Jew who was a native of Rome
could equally use that language. Setting aside these special ex­
pressions however, and looking to the general character of the
letter, we can hardly be mistaken in regarding it as the natural outpouring of one whose mind was saturated with the knowledge of the Old Testament. Like the author of the Book of Wisdom, the writer here has a certain amount of classical culture (Sections 20, 25, 33, 37, 38, 55 of the Epistle to the Corinthians). The thoughts and diction alike are molded on "the Law and the Prophets and the Psalms." His knowledge is very thorough and intimate of the Septuagint Version, but shows no acquaintance with the Scriptures in their original tongue. Therefore we may well class him as a Hellenist. He quotes profusely, and sometimes his quotations are obviously made from memory. He is acquainted with traditional interpretations of the sacred texts (Sections 7, 9, 11, 31). He borrows many words and phrases from the Greek Bible, even where he is not directly quoting it. From constant study, his style has taken on a strong Hebraistic tinge. All this points to an author of Jewish or proselyte parentage, who from a child had been reared in the knowledge of this one book.

Concerning the death of Clement, there is no less controversy among learned men than there has been about the order and time of his succession to his Bishopric. The Epistle to the Corinthians (Section 7) sufficiently shows us that he lived in expectation of martyrdom, and was ready to have undergone it if it would be necessary, but that he underwent such suffering, as some have declared, is a matter of some doubt. Rufinus, who died
in 410 A.D., was the first to call him a martyr. Another follower of this thought was Cotelerius, who gives us a lengthy detail of the martyrdom of Clement in the first volume of the "Patres Apostolici." Clement was banished by Trajan to Chersonesus, and afterwards drowned in the Black Sea. On reaching his place of exile, he found 2000 Christians condemned to work in a marble quarry. As the water they used had to be brought six miles, Clement caused a spring to break forth close to the quarry. This miracle led to the conversion of a great multitude in the province, and the building in one year of 75 churches. This in turn, led to Clement's martyrdom. An anchor was fastened to his neck, and he was cast into the sea. The people, bewailing him, prayed God to reveal his remains to them. In answer to their prayer, the sea receded, and the people, going in on dry ground, found the body of the martyr buried with the anchor in a marble tomb, but were not permitted to remove it. Every year, on the anniversary of the martyrdom, the sea repeats this miracle of receding for seven days; but neither Eusebius (who is usually very exact in his observations on such things) nor any of the Fathers still nearer his time, (Irenaeus, Alexandrinus, Tertullian), take any notice of it.\textsuperscript{14} As to the account which some others have more lately given us of the manner of his death, it is probable

\textsuperscript{14}Eusebius, op. cit., 18.
that it may have been due to their confusing Flavius Clemens, the Roman Consul, with Clement, Bishop of Rome, who suffered martyrdom for the Faith about the time of which they speak, and some other parts of whose character, such as his relation to the emperor and banishment into Pontus, they ascribe to him.

Whatever may have been the mode of his death, he may none the less be considered one of the Church's faithful witnesses, for amid great suffering and persecutions he preserved that frame of mind which resembles a martyr. This frame of mind is especially evident in the letters which Clement wrote to the Church at Corinth. Dissensions were very prevalent even in St. Paul's time. The schism, in wider and more aggravated form, it seems, broke out anew, setting itself against the authority of the Church. Clement, in hearing of it, exhorted the Church to unity, humility, to obedience and patience.

The newly elected emperor, Marius Ulpine Traianus, who was very zealous for his religion, and on that account a severe enemy to Christians, enacted several laws. He published one whereby he forbade the societies or colleges, erected up and down the Roman empire where men were accustomed to meet and pretended to discuss great matters of business, sustenance of mutual love and friendship, which the Roman state still beheld with a jealous eye as hotbeds of treason and sedition. Under these unlawful combinations, the Christian
assemblies were looked upon by their enemies for being con-
federated under one common president and constantly meeting at
their solemn love-feasts, and especially for being of a different
worship than the religion of the Empire. The Christians, in
turn, thought they might proceed against them as illegal socie-
ties, and contemners of the imperial constitution, wherein, St.
Clement, as head of the society at Rome, was sure to bear the
deepest share. Indeed, it was no more than what he himself had
long expected, as appears from his Letter to the Corinthians
(Section 7), where having spoken of the torments and sufferings
which the holy Apostles had undergone, he tells them that he
looked upon himself and his people as ἀυτῷ τῷ σκάμματι, set to
run the same race, καὶ ὁ ἄντις ὑμῖν ἄγων ἔπικειται, and that the
same fight and conflict was laid up for them.

Clement, however, was not left without witness for he
was honored at Rome by a Church erected in his memory. Jerome,
writing in 392 A.D., after referring to the death of Clement,
adds, "a Church erected at Rome preserves to this day the memory
of his name," or as Lightfoot translates it, "protects to this
day the memorial chapel built in his name," since "memoria" is
frequently used to denote the small oratory or chapel built over
the tomb or otherwise commemorative of martyrs and other saints.\[15\]

\[15\]Lightfoot, op. cit., 91.
Pope Zosimus mentions it a quarter of a century after this date, when he held a court here to consider the case of Caelestius the Pelagian. Some generations later, we find Gregory the Great delivering more than one of his homilies in this building, and in the succeeding centuries it occupies a position of prominence among the ecclesiastical buildings of Rome.

A truer and nobler monument of Clement, even than these architectural remains, is his extant Letter to the Corinthians. This letter will be considered from other aspects in later chapters. We are only concerned with it here, in so far as it throws light on his character and position in literature.

The first Epistle, bearing the name of Clement, has been preserved to us in a single manuscript only. Though very frequently referred to by ancient Christian writers, it remained unknown to the scholars of Western Europe until discovered in the Alexandrian manuscript. This manuscript of the Sacred Scriptures (known and generally referred to as Codex A) was presented in 1628 by Cyril, Patriarch of Constantinople, to Charles I., and is now preserved in the British Museum. There are two writings, which are a supplement to the books of the New Testament contained in it, described as the Epistles of one Clement. Of these, that now before us is the first. It is passably perfect, but there are many slight gaps in the manuscript, and one

16Ibid., 176.
whole leaf is supposed to have been lost towards the close. These gaps, however, though numerous in some chapters, do not generally extend beyond a word or syllable, and can for the most part be easily supplied.

The date of this Epistle has been the subject of considerable controversy. It appears from Chapter Five to be later than the persecution in the time of Nero, and from Chapters Forty-two and Forty-four it is clear that the age of the apostles is regarded as past. It can, therefore, scarcely be older than 75 to 80 A.D. On the other hand Chapter Forty-four speaks of presbyters who were appointed by the Apostles and were still alive, and there is no trace of any of the controversies or persecutions of the Second Century. It is, therefore, probably not much later than 100 A.D. If it be assumed that Chapter One, which speaks of trouble and perhaps of persecution, refers to the time of Domitian, it can probably be dated as 96 A.D.; but we know very little about the alleged persecution in the time of Domitian, and it would not be prudent to decide that the Epistle cannot be another 10 or 15 years later. It is safest to say that it must be dated between 75 and 110 A.D.; but within these limits there is a general agreement among critics to regard as most probable the last decade of the First Century.

It is necessary, I believe, to make an analysis of the contents of the one genuine Epistle in order that we might be
acquainted with what he wrote when we come to analyze in detail his style, that is, how he wrote.

The Church of Corinth has been led by a few violent spirits into a sedition against its rulers. No appeal seems to have been made to Rome, but a letter was sent in the name of the Church of Rome by St. Clement to restore peace and unity. He begins by explaining that his delay in writing has been caused by the sudden calamities which, one after another, had just been happening to the Roman Church. The reference is clearly to the persecution of Domitian. The former high reputation of the Corinthian Church is recalled, its piety and hospitality, its obedience and discipline. Jealousy had caused divisions; it was jealousy that led Cain, Esau and others into sin; it was jealousy to which Peter and Paul and multitudes with them fell victims. The Corinthians are urged to repent after the example of the Patriarchs, and to be humble like Christ Himself. "Let them observe order, as all creation does." A curious passage on the Resurrection is somewhat of an interruption in the sequence; all that creation provides proves the Resurrection and so does the Phoenix, which every five hundred years consumes itself, that its offspring may arise out of its ashes (Section 23:6). "Let us, Clement continues, forsake evil and approach God with purity, clinging to his blessing, which the Patriarchs so richly obtained, for the Lord will quickly come with his rewards; let us look
to Jesus Christ, our high priest, above the angels at the right hand of the Father" (Section 36). "Discipline and subordination are necessary as in an army and in the human body, while arrogance is absurd, for man is nothing. The Apostles foresaw feuds, and provided for a succession of bishops and deacons; such, therefore, cannot be removed at pleasure. The just have always been persecuted. Read St. Paul's first Epistle to you, how he condemns party spirit. It is shocking that few should disgrace the Church at Corinth. Let us beg for pardon; nothing is more beautiful than charity; it was shown by Christ when He gave Himself for us; by living in this love, we shall be in the number of the saved through Jesus Christ, by whom is glory to God forever and ever, Amen." (Section 58).

If anyone disobey, he is in great danger; but we will pray that the Creator may preserve the number of His elect in the whole world. Then follows the beautiful Eucharistic prayer.

We have no explicit information as to the result of Clement's affectionate concern and instruction regarding the Corinthians, but the greatest hope, coming from indirect sources, would be that it had been effectual. Hegesippus visited Corinth on his way to Rome more than half a century later and thus became acquainted with the condition of the Church at both places. The feuds at Corinth in the Age of Domitian and the letter written by Clement are mentioned together. To this he added, "and
the Church of Corinth remained steadfast in the true doctrine 
\( \epsilon \zeta \mu \epsilon \mu \varepsilon v e n . . . \varepsilon \nu \tau \iota \omicron \rho \omicron \theta \omicron \lambda \omicron \gamma \omicron \phi \) till the Episcopate of Primus in 
Corinth. 17 From this we may well conclude that the Corinthian 
Church was restored to its integrity by Clement's rebuke and 
consultation, and continued true up to the time of his own visit. 
This is further confirmed by the fact that Clement's letter was 
read regularly on Sundays in the Church of Corinth and it was 
held in very great esteem by the early church. The account given 
of it by Eusebius (History Ecclesiastical, III. 16) is as fol­
lows: "There is one acknowledged Epistle of this Clement (whom 
he has just identified with the friend of St. Paul), great and 
admirable, which he wrote in the name of the Church of Rome to 
the Church at Corinth, sedition having then arisen in the latter 
Church. We are aware that this Epistle has been publicly read 
in very many churches both in old times, and also in our own 
day."

The Epistle before us thus appears to have been read 
in numerous churches, as being almost on a level with the Canoni­
cal Writings, and its place in the Alexandrian Manuscript, im­
mediately after the inspired books, is in harmony with the posi­
tion thus assigned it in the primitive church. There does, how­
ever, appear to be a great difference between it and the inspired

17 Eusebius, History Ecclesiastical, IV. 22.
writings in many respects, such as the fanciful use sometimes made of Old Testament statements, and the fabulous stories which are accepted by its author, but the high tone of evangelical truth which pervades it, the simple and earnest appeals which it makes to the heart and conscience, and the anxiety with which its writer so constantly seeks to promote the best interests of the Church of Christ, still imparts an undying charm to this precious relic of later Apostolic Times.

Polycarp, who wrote early in the second century, appears to have been acquainted with the letter for his extant Epistle presents many striking coincidence of language. It is less certain that the passage in Ignatius Polycarp V, εἰ τις ὀδύναται ἐν ἀγνείᾳ μένειν εἰς τιμὴν τῆς σαρκὸς τοῦ κυρίου, ἐν ἀκ- αυχησίᾳ μενέτω, is a reminiscence of a passage in Clement's Epistle (chapter 38), though this is not improbable says Lightfoot. 18

Many parallels have been found to the Epistle of Barnabas, but these are unconvincing; and even if they were so close as to suggest a historical connection, it would still remain a question whether Clement was not indebted to the Epistle of Barnabas rather than conversely. In chapter 1 βλέπω ἐν υἱῶν ἐκκεχυμένον ἀπὸ τοῦ πλούσιου τῆς ἀγάπης κυρίου πνεῦμα ἐφ' ὃμας

the language is very similar to Clement (chapter 46) ἐν πνεύμα τῆς χάριτος τοῦ ἐκχυθέν ἐφ' ύμας, but the outpouring of the Holy Spirit is a common expression.19 Again the words in chapter 17 έλθεις μου ὁ νοῦς καὶ ἡ ψυχὴ τῆς επιθυμία μου μὴ παραλειπέñαι τοῦ ἀνηκόντων εἰς σωτηρίαν resemble Clement's exhortation to his readers (chapter 45) to be ζηλωταί περὶ τῶν ἀνηκόντων εἰς σωτηρίαν, but the expression might have occurred to both writers independently. Once more the language used in describing the appearance of the Lord to Moses on the Mount by Barnabas (Sections 4, 14), closely resembles that of Clement relating to the same occurrence (Section 53), especially in the reduplication of the name Μωυσῆ, Μωυσῆ, which is not found in the Old Testament, from which event it is taken. These parallels, however, though they appear similar, cannot be considered decisive. It would only be natural that the two writers, having occasion to discourse on the same topics, the evil times in which they live, the approaching end of the world, and the attitude of believers at this crisis, and to refer to the same passages in the Old Testament, would use a similar language. The reputation of Clement as a letter writer among his contemporaries may be inferred from the passage in the Shepherd of Hermes, πέμψει οὖν

κλίμας εἰς τὰς ἔξω πόλεις, ἔχειν ψαφ ἐπιτέτραπται. 20

The testimonies in the ages immediately following are more precise and definite, and come from the most diverse places. We have seen in what manner this Epistle is mentioned and quoted by Hegesippus of Palestine. To this witness we might well add Tertullian of Carthage, 21 for in one passage where he is speaking of the Resurrection he uses the same arguments as Clement (Sections 24, 25), appealing first to the succession of night and day, of winter and summer, and then to the marvelous reproduction of the Phoenix. Theophilus of Antioch also seems to have copied from the earlier part of this same passage. In like manner an expression in Clement's Epistle (chapter 43) is found in Justin Martyr, where Moses is called ὁ μακάριος καὶ πιστὸς θεράπων θεοῦ, which suggests that it was known to this writer also. 22

The influence of Clement presents many interesting features for study. Notwithstanding his position as a ruler and his prominence as a writer, his personality was obscured in the West by a veil of unmerited neglect. His genuine Epistle was never translated into the Latin language, and therefore became a dead letter to the Church over which he presided, when that

20 Lightfoot, Epistles, 3.
21 Ibid., 93.
22 Ibid., 134.
Church ceased to speak Greek and adopted the vernacular tongue. His personal history was forgotten, so entirely forgotten, that his own Church was content to supply its place with a fictitious story imported from the Far East. Even his order in the Episcopate was obscured and confused, though that Episcopate was the most renowned and powerful in the world. His Basilica, however, kept his fame alive in Rome itself, giving its name to one of the seven ecclesiastical divisions of the city and furnishing his title to one of the chief members of the College of Cardinals. A few of his successors in the Papacy adopted his name too, though nearly a whole millennium passed before another Clement ascended the Papal throne, and then one (it is said) who was consecrated outside of Rome, and he only occupied it for a few brief months. This second Clement was the 147th Pope, and reigned on the eve of the Norman invasion. Yet in this interval there had been many Johns, many Stephens, many Benedictcs and many Gregories and Leos. Frequently his name appears outside of Rome, in the dedications of Churches.

While in the West he was deprived of the honor which was due to him, the East by way of compensation gave him a fame to which he had no claim. His genuine letter was written in Greek and addressed to a Greek city, though a Roman colony. Its chief circulation therefore was among Greek-speaking peoples, not in Greece only, or in Asia Minor but in Syria and the farther
east. It was the most elaborate composition of its kind which appeared in these primitive times. Therefore we may account for the attribution to Clement of many fictitious or anonymous writings.

The earliest of these literary ventures was very bold. A writer living about the middle of the second century wanted a hero for a religious romance, and no greater name than Clement's could be suggested for his purpose, so the Clementine fiction arose, having for its plot the hero's journeys in search of his parents, which brought him in contact with St. Peter. The work is not extant in its original form, but we have two separate early revisions -- The Homilies and The Recognitions, -- but as the writer and his immediate readers were far removed from the scene of Clement's actual life, he could invent persons and incidents with all freedom. Thus this Clementine story is the last place where we should look for any trustworthy information regarding either the life or the doctrine of Clement.

This early forgery may well have suggested a similar use of Clement's name to later writers. The device which served one extreme might be employed with equal success to promote the other, for the true Clement was equally removed from both. The author of the Clementine Romance laid stress on the importance of early marriage in all cases. Likewise it occurred to another writer, who was bent on exalting virginity at the expense of
marriage, to justify his views by an appeal to the same great authority. The Epistles to Virgins, written in Clement's name, are extant only in Syriac, and contain no certain indications which may enable us to assign a date to them.

The Apostles in the Apostolical Constitutions are pictured as communicating to Clement their ordinances and directions for the future administration of the Church. The Apostles describe him as their "fellow minister," their "most faithful and like-minded child in the Lord." (VI 18:5) Rules are given relating to manners and discipline to the various Church officers, their qualifications and duties, to the conduct to be observed towards the heathen and towards heretics, to the times of Fasting and of Festival, to the Eucharist, and other matters affecting the worship of the Church. Clement is the mouthpiece of the Apostles to succeeding generations of Christians. As a rule, he is mentioned in the third person (VI 8:3, VI 18:5, VIII 10:2); while the Apostles themselves, notably St. Peter, speak in the first, but in one place (VII 46:7) he comes forward in his own person, "I Clement."

Three distinct groups of spurious writings attributed to Clement have been described, but these do not nearly exhaust the literary productions with which he has been credited. There is the so-called Second Epistle to the Corinthians. Unlike the works already mentioned, this is not a fictitious writing. It
does not pretend to be anything but what it is, and its early attribution to Clement seems to be due to an accidental error.

This enumeration would be incomplete, if we failed to mention the Canonical writings attributed to Clement. The Epistle to the Hebrews has been attributed to Clement because of the fact that the Roman Clement shows familiarity with this Canonical Epistle and borrows from it. However, the differences between the two writings are far greater than the resemblances. We miss in Clement, except where he is quoting from it, the Alexandrian type of thought and expression which is eminently characteristic of this Canonical Epistle. Eusebius describes the part of Clement in a different light. He mentions the fact that certain persons regard him as the translator of this Epistle, the author being St. Paul himself.23

If then we seek to describe in few words the place which tradition, as interpreted by the various forgeries written in his name, assigns to Clement, we may say that he was regarded as the interpreter of the Apostolic teaching and the codifier of the Apostolic ordinances.

We may now sum up in a few words the results of our investigations, both as to Clement and the letter. We have most distinct evidence with regard to these two facts that disputes

23Eusebius, History Ecclesiastical, III. 37.
among the Corinthians arose in the time of Domitian, that the Roman Church then sent a letter to the Corinthians, and that at that time Clement held office in the Roman Church. We also have good testimony for believing that Clement had heard some of the Apostles preach. This is all we know.
CHAPTER II
THE THEORY OF CLASSICAL RHETORIC

Rhetoric, the use of language in such a manner as to impress the hearers and influence them for or against a certain course of action, is as old as language itself and the beginnings of social and political life. It was practised and highly esteemed among the Greeks from the earliest times. The birthplace, however, of rhetoric as an art was the island of Sicily, and Empedocles is said to have been the inventor. Then follow the names of the real founders, Corax and Tisias of Syracuse, Gorgias and the Sophists. Of the Attic orators, Isocrates is of the most importance, as his rhetorical discourse and political pamphlets contain considerable discussion of literary style and composition.

In Plato, and especially Aristotle, we find a philosophical treatment of rhetoric. In Plato, this criticism is to be found for the most part in the Gorgias and Phaedrus. In the Gorgias the discussion mainly turns upon the meaning of the term: the nature of rhetoric, not its value, and various definitions proposed are critically examined, amended, or narrowed down. Rhetoric is the artificer of persuasion, and its function is to persuade the unintelligent multitude in the law courts and
public assemblies in regard to justice and injustice. The re-
sult of such persuasion is not the acquisition of knowledge; it
merely produces belief, which is sometimes false, sometimes true,
whereas knowledge is always true. The time at the speaker's
disposal is not sufficient for the thorough discussion of such
important subjects leading to truth. Nevertheless, the prac-
ticed rhetorician will be more successful than the expert in
persuading his hearers on any subject whatever, even such mat-
ters as the building of walls and dockyards, although he knows
nothing about them. It is sufficient for him to have acquired
the power of persuasion, which will enable him to convince an
ignorant audience that he knows more than those who possess real
knowledge.\textsuperscript{1} The \textit{Phaedrus} is a philosophical theory of rhetoric
as it ought to be, if it is to justify its claim to be considered
a true art. Nowhere in Plato is the connection between rhetoric
and literary criticism more clearly seen than in the \textit{Phaedrus}.
Another great conception in this book is that every discourse
should be like a living thing, with body, head, and feet of its
own, and with all its members adapted to one another and to the
whole; a literary drive, the compelling instinct of authorship,
should make each speaker or writer shape the several parts of
his discourse into the organic and vital unity of an artistic
\textsuperscript{1}John H. Freese. \textit{The Art of Rhetoric}. "Aristotle."
Harvard University Press, 1939. 18,19.
composition. The most important point is that the foundation of true rhetoric is psychology, the science of mind (soul), as already hinted in the definition here accepted by Plato (Ψυχικά για σια λογων) "winning men's minds by words," as contrasted with the vague πειθος δημιουργος εστιν ἡρητορική. The true rhetorician is assumed to have already settled the question whether all mind is one, or multiform. If it is multiform, he must know what are its different varieties; he must also be acquainted with all the different forms of argument, and know what particular forms of it are likely to be effective as instruments of persuasion in each particular case. A merely theoretical knowledge of this is not sufficient; he must have practical experience to guide him, and must be able to decide without hesitation to which class of mind his hearers belong and to seize the opportune moment for the employment of each kind of discourse.

Likewise, in Aristotle, we find a philosophical treatment of rhetoric. The three books of Aristotle's Rhetoric have been described as an expanded Phaedrus. The first book deals with the means of persuasion, the logical proofs based upon dialectic; the second with the psychological or ethical proofs, based upon a knowledge of the human emotions and their causes and of the different types of character. The questions of style

2Ibid., 21.
and arrangement (which are only hastily alluded to in the Phaedrus, in reference to the superiority of oral to written instruction) are treated in the third book. A brief analysis of this work will greatly help to define the theory of classical rhetoric. Aristotle begins by saying that rhetoric is the complement of logic. It is the art of persuasion formulated by investigating the methods of successful address, and its object is to promote a habit of discerning what in any given case is essentially persuasive. These consist of proofs, which are artificial and artificial. The latter are of three kinds: first, ethical, derived from the moral character of the speaker; secondly, emotional, the object of which is to put the hearer into a certain frame of mind; and thirdly, logical, contained in the speech itself when a real or apparent truth is demonstrated. Thus rhetoric serves as a general public means of maintaining truth and justice against falsehood and wrong, of advancing public discussion where absolute proof is impossible, of cultivating the habit of seeing both sides and of exposing sophistries and fallacies, and of self-defense.

In book two, he relates how the orator must not only try to render the argument of his speech demonstrative and worthy of belief; he must also make his own character look right

---

3 Ibid., 22.
and put his hearers, who are to decide, into the right frame of mind. In regard to his own character, he should make his audience feel that he possesses prudence, virtue and goodwill. In regard to each emotion, we must consider the states of mind in which it is felt, the people towards whom it is felt, and the grounds on which it is felt. From these three points of view the following emotions are examined and defined: anger, calmness, friendship, enmity, fear, confidence, pity, indignation, envy, emulation.

In book three of the *Rhetoric*, the main subject is style followed by a shorter section on the arrangement of the parts of a speech; for, as he says, "it is not sufficient to know what to say; we must also know how to say it." The two chief excellences of style are clearness and propriety. The first is attained by the use of terms in their proper sense; the other contributes to elevation and ornamentation. Classical rhetoric as a whole assumes a fivefold division: first, the gathering and analysis of the material; secondly, the arrangement, sequence, or movement in the large; thirdly, the diction, or the choice of words and their combination in phrases, clauses, and sentences, or the movement in detail; fourth, delivery, or elocution; fifth, memory.

From this point to Dionysius of Halicarnassus, first century B.C., we possess little or no Greek literary criticism.
It is possible that the lost New Comedy contained some literary criticism. In the work of Dionysius, the great representative of a later school of criticism, we meet for the first time a wealth of rhetorical terminology. In his numerous writings, we find freely used a fully developed vocabulary which is completely adequate for the purposes of the professional rhetorician and the broad literary critic. Figures of speech and comparisons abound in his works.

Many other Greek authors may be mentioned in whose work we find a great many rhetorical terms, but I will mention only one more. The treatise περὶ ἐρμηνείας, attributed to Demetrius, is extremely rich in rhetorical terms, and possesses a very technical critical vocabulary. Some old terms are used in a new sense, while new and expressive words have been invented.

For every student of the ancient Greek world, the theory and practice of Greek speaking and writing must always have a special interest and value. To be sure, diction plays a vital part in giving color and detail in the lines of composition, but choice of words is, after all, not the only important factor in determining the style of a Greek author. Rather, it is upon the arrangement of the words in addition to the selection that the all-important persuasion, charm and literary power of the Greek writer depends. The New Testament employs just such
persuasive and literary power to realize its ends. Therefore, a need arises to make a more careful consideration of the literary and rhetorical element which shapes the composition of each New Testament writer and Apostolic Father. A rhetorical study of such a nature, has rather been neglected in the past.

This neglect is due, perhaps, to the erroneous idea that the era generally contemporaneous with the time of the writing and forming of the New Testament Canon was a barren period in the field of Greek literature. For example, the late Professor Olmstead,\(^4\) asking the doubting question: "where are the examples from any part of the Roman World of literary works written in the Greek tongue and still in existence which one might bring as a parallel to the New Testament, between Strabo near the beginning and Dio Chrysostom and Plutarch near the end of the first century?" In other words, who are the writers and scholars of the first century A.D. who wrote in the literary Koine Greek? We have but to turn to the Stuart Jones edition of the Standard Greek English Lexicon,\(^5\) which lists sixty-one Greek writers of the first century after Christ. This figure does not include any New Testament writers, Philo, or any writer

\(^5\)Stuart Jones, \textit{Standard Greek English Lexicon}, Liddell and Scott, 1940.
whose period overlaps either the first century before Christ or the second century after. Note the following authors and their works, who used the literary Greek as their prose medium of expression: Dioscorides, whose great work on Materia Medica stands like a beacon in its field; it was written in 77-78 A.D. containing five books on the art of medicine. Onosander, a Greek philosopher who wrote a commentary, now lost, on Plato’s Republic and a work on the art of war entitled Strategicus. Though, all these literary works are not extant today and many of them alluded to only by title, they overwhelmingly show that the New Testament writings arose in an age which was by no means unlearned and lacking in culture. These literary achievements quoted above reveal a highly developed, alert, sensitive, appreciative Greek civilization, very active in the field of science, medicine, rhetoric, education, theology and religion. This provided an ideal soil, broad, tolerant and inquiring, for the literary expression of the new Christian faith.

The Greek-speaking world of New Testament times is further exonerated from the charge of literary illiteracy by three indisputable facts. The first is the great number of Greek literary papyri copied in that century to be read by the people then living. The second is the enormous libraries which were built in the first and second centuries; at Alexandria, for instance, there were 400,000 rolls. Thirdly, every considerable house in Greco-Roman times contained a library room.
The age of the New Testament, to be sure, was almost saturated with literature on all subjects written in the literary Koine. Of course, this does not warrant the conclusion that all the writers in New Testament times in equal measure were the shining literary lights of their day and renowned exponents of the accepted cultural standard of the literary Koine. It does, however, indicate that the rich literary background of the New Testament period is potentially a greater influence upon the style and language of the Apostolic Fathers, as well as the New Testament Authors than has been heretofore imagined.

The early Church Fathers did not hesitate to express their opinion about and their admiration for the literary merits of the New Testament, especially the letters of St. Paul. St. John Chrysostom, himself one of the greatest Christian orators, states that it was precisely because of his power of rhetoric that Paul was admired among Christians, Jews and heathen, a power which will find a response in the hearts of men to the end of time.

St. Augustine, himself a good rhetorician, appreciated the rhetorical elements in St. Paul. He sets forth the view that the Apostle used the rhetorical to produce the effect

---

6Jennrich, op. cit.
7Ibid., 32.
that he desired: that its use, in other words, was always conscious. In support of his view, Augustine cites Romans 5:3-5 as an example of Paul's use of the figure called by the Greeks "climax" and by the Romans "gradatio." He commends St. Paul's use of this figure because it allows the thought to ascend to completeness by short and simple steps and thus renders it easy. Though the opinions of the Church Fathers may differ in their judgment of St. Paul's conscious use of the world's formal rhetoric, yet their very remarks on this subject do show that they were keenly aware of the literary efforts which Paul displayed in his epistles.

In general, it has been recognized that in style and language St. Luke and the Acts come nearer to the literary standard of the time than does any other of the evangelists or the Apostle Paul. On the other side, the Semitic influence in the language and style has been studied, and Hebraisms have been found to be rather more abundant than in the other Gospels. In view of the marks of a superior Greek style, which the books show, this is surprising, and the cause has been variously explained. In the narratives and canticles of the first three chapters, the phenomenon is especially manifest; and here, some have held with doubtful right, that it points to a Semitic

---

8 Loc. cit.
original from which these chapters were translated. Others have been unable to separate these chapters, in this respect, from the rest of the work, and have felt bound to ascribe the Hebraisms to St. Luke himself in spite of his evidence of Greek literary training and his admitted Gentile birth.

A holy style appropriate to holy subjects has sometimes been assumed to account for the glaring contrast between the secular style of the preface, St. Luke 1:1-4, and the narrative immediately following, included in the rest of these chapters. This could be made plausible by the fact that the author's mind was filled with the language of the Greek Old Testament, and one of the most competent studies of the subject, Gustaf Dalman, holds that the Semitic influence has come in, wholly or almost wholly, second hand through the Septuagint, so that the Hebraisms should rather be termed Greek Biblicisms or Septuagint Grecisms.

The uniformity of St. Luke's style is one of his striking characteristics. It is not stereotyped and mechanical, but it is accompanied by great variety within the similar phrases, by a manifest fondness for change of expression, and by a notable copiousness of vocabulary in the terms used for things and actions often mentioned. This could be illustrated from

every chapter. Similar expressions in distant contexts so often show variation that the habit must be deemed a trait of the writer's style. We have here a mental trait of the writer, a mark of his taste. He likes to vary, and his variation shows a literary feeling and gives his writing a certain elegance.

Another writer, though not contemporary with Clement, but worthy of our notice in clarifying rhetoric, is St. John Chrysostom. In his περὶ Ἰερωσύνης especially, do we find elements of classical rhetoric. The theme here is logically developed and the great variety of subjects introduced have a direct bearing on the theme of the discourse. Sometimes, it is true, interruptions are of considerable length but even these are skilfully linked to the general development. The number and the variety of vivid images and scriptural quotations generously interspersed throughout the work, serve as an excellent means to relieve any tendency towards monotony, and thus stimulate the interest of the reader. He avoids most of the Sophistic excesses of artificial display, and he always subordinates his artistry to his subject matter. He uses the pagan devices of rhetoric including a number of highly artificial figures skilfully and with the exalted purpose of conveying the sublime truth of Christianity. The harmonious union of Christian and pagan elements thus achieved made him the highly successful preacher and writer he was.
Among the figures of vivacity, asyndeton, polysyndeton, and the rhetorical question are special favorites of St. Chrysostom. Their consistently frequent use as well as their judicious distribution produce an unmistakable and energetic liveliness throughout the discourse. Generally, Chrysostom uses the less elaborate types of these devices, and the occasional exceptions serve only to emphasize their restrained quality. Lack of irony is not surprising in an author who is evidently too sincere to indulge in the use of such subtleties. Chrysostom uses the figures of argumentation rather sparingly considering the fact that the treatise is in dialogue form and is argumentative in character from beginning to end. Personification and dialectic, however, seem to have a great appeal for him and by means of this conversational style of writing he injects a great deal of life into the discourse. The moderate use of these figures greatly enhances the easy flowing style of the treatise as a whole.

St. Chrysostom is lavish in his use of the various figures of parallelism. His skill in handling these figures clearly reflect his early Sophistic training. It is evident that St. Chrysostom was a serious man with a serious message. In order to convey this message most successfully he had to make use of the means at his disposal, these means happened to be the Sophistic rhetoric that he had acquired under Libanius; he
mastered it and used it to attain his high purpose.

These, then, are some of the considerations which make desirable a more thorough investigation of rhetorical style in the authors of the New Testament period. Surely no one would question that the sacred writers were more concerned with the sense than the manner of expression, but they knew as well as any author must know that the two are not quite so easily divorced. Therefore, if we are to attempt to gain better appreciation of the New Testament authors, surely it is of supreme importance to lay some stress upon points of artistic form, most especially in a literature where form and substance are so indissolubly allied as that of the Greek language.
CHAPTER III

CLASSICAL RHETORIC IN "CLEMENT OF ROME" UNDER FOUR ASPECTS

The purpose of this thesis is to investigate some of the stylistic features of Clement of Rome, limiting it to the single genuine treatise known as the First Epistle to the Corinthians. The Greek text used, as well as the English translation, will be that of J. B. Lightfoot in his book The Apostolic Fathers.¹ The plan and method of handling the subject are substantially taken from Thomas, Manchester and Scott,² using the four laws given: unity, coherence, emphasis, and interest. These various chapters give an analysis of the rhetorical features of the First Epistle to the Corinthians, together with conclusions based on the information obtained through the detailed study. The final chapter includes an evaluation of these conclusions and adds a few generalizations based on the study as a whole.

UNITY

The law of unity, or oneness, requires that the composition shall be about one thing. To write about two things in the same composition is obviously, at best, however skillfully

¹Lightfoot. The Apostolic Fathers.
they may be handled, to divide the attention of the reader between them, and at worst not only to divide the attention of the reader but to bring about a confusion of ideas. The effect, in either case, is to write about both things badly. The problem of unity, as a practical problem, is largely a matter of asking oneself in advance one plain question and then resolutely insisting on a plain answer. The question is simply this: what do I want to say?

Other questions also one must put to oneself, but this, the first in order, is easily the first in importance. It is undoubtedly from failure to ask and to answer it, in any real sense, far more than from any other cause, that so many of the articles written lack significant unity and in consequence are weak and ineffective. The writer who begins while he has the point or points which he wishes to make only dimly and confusedly in mind is easily induced to wander from his path, and is likely as not to end as if by accident, with no goal arrived at and with nothing whatever achieved. On the other hand, whatever his imperfections in other respects, the writer who has carefully determined what he wishes to say, and who therefore strives toward a definite end, is nearly sure to attain a substantial success. When we really know what we want to say, we are not tempted to say something else, but we usually manage, somehow or other, to say it clearly.
The practical relation of the question, "what do I want to say?", to the principle of unity is now perhaps sufficiently clear. With his point or points vividly in mind, definitely formulated to himself, the writer is but little likely to stray from his objective, or in any way to admit matter not clearly conducive to its fuller presentation. We should, of course, bear in mind that nothing which does definitely contribute to the fuller presentation of one's objective is irrelevant to it.

In the Epistle to the Corinthians it can not be doubted that what Clement wanted to say, his objective, he had determined with some care before beginning to write. This is evident from the air of suspense which hangs over the greater part of the letter. It is plain by the time one has reached the end of each of the first two paragraphs that Clement had something else in his mind beyond what he is saying, that he is holding something back. It is, of course, what he set out to say that he is holding back, the idea for which the little epistle exists, and toward which in successive stages each of the first two paragraphs point. Obviously one can not hold back an idea, and at the same time prepare carefully for it, without first knowing very definitely what it is. This is very evident in Clement for he uses every possible means to illustrate and enforce his one point.
The comprehensiveness is tested by the range of the Apostolic writings, with which the author is conversant and of which he makes use. He co-ordinates the two Apostles St. Peter and St. Paul in distinction to the Ebionism of a later age, which placed them in direct antagonism, and to the factiousness of certain persons even in the Apostolic times, which perverted their names into party watchwords notwithstanding their own protests. This mention is the fit prelude to the use made of their writings in the body of the letter. The influence of St. Peter's First Epistle may be traced in more than one passage, while expressions scattered up and down Clement's letter recall the language of several of St. Paul's epistles belonging to different epochs and representing different types in his literary career; nor is the comprehensiveness of Clement's letter restricted to a recognition of these two leading Apostles. It is so largely interspersed with thoughts and expressions from the Epistle to the Hebrews that many ancient writers attributed this Canonical epistle to Clement. Again, the writer shows himself familiar with the type of doctrine and modes of expression characteristic of the Epistle of St. James. Just as he co-ordinates the authority of St. Peter and St. Paul, as leaders of the Church, so in like manner he combines the teaching of St. Paul and St. James on the great doctrines of salvation. The same examples of Abraham and of Rahab which suggested to the one
Apostle the necessity of faith as the principle, suggested to the other the presence of works as the indispensable condition of acceptance. The teaching of the two Apostles which is thus verbally, though not essentially, antagonistic is "coincidentally affirmed" by Clement. It was "by reason of faith and hospitality" (διὰ πίστεως καὶ φιλοξενίαν) that both the one and the other found favor with God. "Wherefore," he asks elsewhere, "was our Father Abraham blessed? was it not because he wrought righteousness (δικαιοσύνη) and truth by faith (διὰ πίστεως)?" (Section 31) With the same comprehensiveness of view he directly states in one paragraph the doctrine of St. Paul, "being called by His will (διὰ θελήματος αυτοῦ) in Christ Jesus, we are not justified by ourselves (οὐ δι᾽ ἑαυτῶν δικαιούμεθα) nor by...works which we wrought in holiness of heart but by our faith (διὰ τῆς πίστεως);" (Section 32) while in the next he affirms the main contention of St. James, "we have seen that all the righteous (πάντες οἱ δίκαιοι) have been adorned with good works," following up this statement with the injunction "let us work the work of righteousness (justification) with all our strength" (ἐξ ὅλης ἴσχύος ἡμῶν ἐργασώμεθα ἐργον δικαιοσύνης). (Section 33).

May one never, then, abandon one's subject and introduce unrelated matter that has suggested itself to the mind? May one never digress, that is go away from, one's proper path?

The answer is that one may. To do so, however, may
destroy the complete unity of the passage, to lessen in some degree its effectiveness; and in yielding to such a temptation one must be ready to accept the consequences. Still there may be cases where the gain is worth the sacrifice, and then the writer asserts the privilege of overruling the general principles of art in order to obtain some special advantage.

Obviously the digression should never amount to a large fraction of the article into which it is obtruded; there might be danger of confusing the digression with the article proper. Again, reasonable warning should be given that the digression is a digression recognized by the writer as such, so that the reader's understanding of the true subject may be disturbed as little as possible. Such warning would normally appear at the beginning and end of the interpolated part, "if I may digress for a moment"..."to return to my subject;" and would vary in length and elaborateness as the occasion required. Clement is very careful in observing this. Wherever he digresses he tells his reader and uses the material in the digression as illustrations and exhortations. This is very clear in paragraph Four Γέγραπται γάρ οὕτως (For so it is written)...

For, to pass from the examples of ancient days, let us come to those champions who lived very near to our time). Then in paragraph seven he returns, ταῦτα ἀγαπητοί, ou
μόνον ὑμᾶς νοουθετοῦντες ἐπιστέλλομεν; ἀλλὰ καὶ ἑαυτοῦ ὑπο-
μνημοσύνες (these things, dearly beloved, we write, not only
as admonishing you, but also as putting ourselves in remembrance)
other examples may be found in paragraph Thirteen, καὶ ποιήσωμεν
τὸ γεγραμμένον (let us do that which is written): after enumer-
ating a great number of deeds done by Old Testament prophets and
characters he exhorts the Corinthians to do likewise; paragraph
Forty-six further exemplifies this, τοιούτων οὖν ὑποδείγμασιν
κολληθήμενα καὶ ὑμᾶς δεί, ἀδελφοί (to such examples as these
therefore, brethren, we also ought to cleave). Whenever he
quotes from the Scriptures, he is likewise very alert to inform
the reader. He uses such phrases as, γέγραπται γὰρ οὕτως, λέγει:
γὰρ αὐτῷ, λέγει γὰρ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἁγιόν, λέγει γὰρ ἡ γραφὴ, οὕτως
γὰρ θέσιν ὁ ἁγιος λόγος

Finally, the digression, if it be relatively of consi-
derable length, should certainly not end the composition, for
the end is the position of greatest emphasis and belong of right
to the author's primary message. An interesting example of this
observation may be seen in the author before us. The last two
paragraphs before his liturgical ending shows his final plea and
exhortation to return to holy living, for which the letter was
written.

Let us therefore be obedient unto His most holy and
glorious Name, thereby escaping the threatenings which were
spoken of old by the mouth of Wisdom against them which
disobey, that we may dwell safely, trusting in the most
holy Name of His majesty. Receive our counsel, and ye shall have no occasion of regret. For as God liveth, and the Lord Jesus Christ liveth, and the Holy Spirit, who are the faith and the hope of the elect, so surely shall he, who with lowliness of mind and instant in gentleness hath without regretfulness performed the ordinances and commandments that are given by God, be enrolled and have a name among the number of them that are saved through Jesus Christ, through whom is the glory unto Him for ever and ever. Amen.

But if certain persons should be disobedient unto the words spoken by Him through us, let them understand that they will entangle themselves in no slight transgression and danger; but we shall be guiltless of this sin. And we will ask, with instancy of prayer and supplication, that the Creator of the universe may guard intact unto the end the number that hath been numbered of His elect throughout the whole world, through His beloved Son Jesus Christ, through whom he called us from darkness to light, from ignorance to the full knowledge of the glory of His Name.

One striking feature throughout the whole epistle especially arrests our attention, the attitude maintained towards the Roman government. The close connection, not only with the Christianity, of the bearers and the writer of the letter with the imperial household seems to explain the singular reserve maintained throughout the epistle. The persecuted and the persecutor met face to face, as it were; they even lived under the same roof and mixed together in the common affairs of life. Thus the utmost caution was needed that collisions might not be provoked. We can well understand, therefore, with what feelings one who thus carried his life in his hand would pen the opening

---

words of the letter, where he excuses the tardiness of the Roman Church in writing to their Corinthian brethren by a reference to "the sudden and repeated calamities and reverses" under which they had suffered. Not a word is said about the nature of these calamities, not a word here or elsewhere about their authors. There is no indication that the fears of the Roman Christians had ceased. On the contrary, after referring to the victims of the Neronian persecution mentioned in Chapter Seven, it is said significantly, "we are in the same lists, and the same struggle awaits us." In the prayer for princes and governors, which appears in the liturgical ending, this sentiment finds its noblest expression:

"Guide our steps to walk in holiness and righteousness and singleness of heart, and to do such things as are good and well-pleasing in Thy sight, and in the sight of our rulers. Give concord and peace to us and to all that dwell on the earth...that we may be saved, while we render obedience to Thine almighty and most excellent and un-speakable might, that we, knowing the glory and honour which Thou hast given them, may submit ourselves unto them, in nothing resisting Thy will. Grant unto them therefore, O Lord, health, peace, concord, stability, that they may administer the government which Thou hast given them without failure. For Thou, O heavenly Father, King of the ages, givest to the sons of men glory and honour and power over all things that are upon the earth. Do Thou, Lord, direct their counsel according to that which is good and well-pleasing in Thy sight, that, administering in peace and gentleness, with godliness, the power which Thou hast given them, they may obtain Thy favour." 4

It is important to notice too, that though the letter
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lays the blame on a few individuals, it does not hesitate to re-
buke the whole Church. It describes in glowing language its 
extraordinary prosperity and goodness, and then goes on to state 
that it grew proud of itself; and from this sprung jealousy, 
strife, and disorder, the dishonored rising up against the 
honored, the foolish against the thoughtful, and the young 
against the elders.

We may thus conclude that the principle of unity has 
been adhered to by Clement and recognize the large part it plays 
in the effectiveness of His letter.

COHERENCE

Coherence, as the word suggests, requires that the 
parts of the treatise shall hang together. They must be made to 
follow one another naturally and logically, and their relation 
to each other and to the whole of which they are the parts, 
must be made clear. In order to solve the two problems thus 
suggested the writer must find the answer to two questions: in 
what order shall I arrange my material, and how shall I make 
this order apparent?5

There is no hard and fast law, however, requiring that

a given sort of material shall always be arranged in the same manner, but that does not mean that one can afford to neglect it, and above all it does not mean that one can get along, as some writers apparently attempt to do, with no arrangement at all. The surest general policy is to work out thoughtfully, painstakingly, the best plan one can, with the expectation of adhering to it closely in the actual writing of the treatise.

In investigating the coherence of the Epistle of Clement we shall do so under the standard patterns and general principles of arrangement which have been outlined for us in Thomas, Manchester and Scott; first, whether it be deductive or inductive in its arrangement or a combination of two orders in various ways and proportions. Deductive answers the question: shall I tell my reader straight off, at the beginning, everything I have in mind to say, sum it up for him in a few words, and remove all suspense as to what I am driving at? The inductive order is, of course, the reverse of the deductive. If a writer does not choose to give away at once the sum and substance of his treatise but give a detail at a time or perhaps all at once at the end, he will choose this arrangement.

The latter arrangement is manifest in the Epistle to the Corinthians. Here, if we are right in assuming that the
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author has one grand idea to present to which everything else in the letter is subordinate, the idea that our salvation from threatened evils is through spiritual redemption, we have a letter in which a single point is made, and in which the statement of this point is reserved to the end. It is a more interesting example of the structure than the other, because the development toward the culminating point is more intricate, and a more perfect example, because, for one thing, the culminating point is more sharply conceived and presented. Here does it not seem clear that Clement has chosen it because it enables him to present his views in the most persuasive manner? Possibly he felt that some of his readers would be prejudiced against the counsel he had at heart, that if he were to persuade them of their need he must be careful not to bring it forward abruptly at the outset; but rather to prepare for it subtly, to show grounds for belief in its truth and to lead the reader if possible to anticipate it in his own mind before it was told him. To accomplish such a result would evidently be a triumph of the writer's art. We can not know with certainty, of course, how the letter came to be organized as it is, but there is no doubt that it is highly persuasive in manner, and that a large factor in its persuasiveness is its inductive development.

There are other arrangements of material, some of which may supplement one another in the same plan. There is the
easy to the hard; that is, one may decide to arrange them in the order of difficulty. Another, the least to the greatest; a writer may decide to begin with the least important, and proceed upward to the most important. To these we may add one more, the agreeable to the disagreeable. This is extremely convenient, for how many speeches in familiar conversation, for example, there are that end with things not pleasant to hear which began with honeyed words! In the Epistle to the Corinthians, we see traces of this arrangement. Clement begins by praising the Corinthians in recalling their past life, when their exemplary concord and charity were known far and wide, but gradually he changes all, "like Jeshurun of old," he says, "you have waxed fat and wicked. Envy is your ruling passion. Let us therefore repent, as men repented at the preaching of Noah." (Section 9) Then he closes his Epistle with, "let us therefore render obedience that we may escape His threatened punishment. They that fulfil His commandments shall most assuredly be saved among the elect. We have warned the guilty and thus we have absolved ourselves from blame. We will pray to God therefore that He will keep His elect intact." (Section 59)

The opposite principles of similarity and contrast have each their uses in determining the order of details. The principle of similarity, requiring that details of like nature should be grouped together, is employed quite coherently in the
Epistle before us. Clement, in speaking of envy as their ruling passion, groups together examples of the prophets and apostles before them. 'Ορατε, ἀδελφοί, ζῆλος καὶ φθόνος ἀδελφοκτονίαν κατειργάσατο. διὰ ζῆλος ὁ πατὴρ ἡμῶν Ἰακὼβ ἀπέδρα ἀπὸ προσώπου Ἰσαὰκ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ. ζῆλος ἐποίησεν Ἰωσὴφ μέχρι θανάτου διωκόμεναι. ζῆλος φυγεῖν ἡνάγκασεν Μωσῆν. διὰ ζῆλος Ἀαρὼν καὶ Μαρίαμ ἔξω τῆς παρεμβολῆς ἡνίκασαν. ζῆλος δαθᾶν καὶ Ἀβειρῶν ζῴωντας κατηγαγεν εἰς θέου. διὰ ζῆλος δανείδοι φθόνον ἔσχεν οὐ μόνον ὑπὸ τῶν ἄλλων ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐδιώκην.

He says it is the same envy which led Cain to slay his brother, which sent Jacob into exile, which persecuted Joseph, which compelled Moses to flee, which drove Aaron and Miriam out of the camp, which threw Dathan and Abiram alive into the pit, which incited Saul against David (section 4). He continues to say this envy, which in these latest days, after inflicting countless sufferings on the Apostles Peter and Paul, brought them to a martyr's death (διὰ ζῆλος καὶ φθόνον οἱ κάλλιστοι καὶ δικαιοται στόλοι ἐδίωκθησαν καὶ ἔως θανάτου ἠλέησαν. 'Ὁ Πέτρος διὰ ζῆλος ἄδικον οὐχ ἔνα οὐδὲ δύο ἀλλὰ πλείονας ὑπήνεγκεν πόνους. διὰ ζῆλον καὶ ἔριν Παῦλος ὑπομονῆς βραβεῖον ὑπέδειξεν Section 5). Then section 6 is a continuance of this same thought διὰ ζῆλος παθόντες...διὰ ζῆλος διωκόμεναι γυναῖκες......παιδίσκαι...ζῆλος καὶ ἔρις πόλεις μεγάλας κατέστρεφεν καὶ ἔθνη μεγάλα ἐξερήσσεν, which has caused numberless woes to women and girls,
separated wives from their husbands and has destroyed whole cities and nations. Then again in section 9, 10, 11 and 12 he sets before them a group of examples upon which they are to fix their eyes (λαβώμεν) let us follow the example of Enoch who was translated, of Noah who was saved from the flood, of Abraham whose faith was rewarded by repeated blessings and by the gift of a son. Call to mind the example of Lot whose hospitality saved him from the fate of Sodom, when even his wife perished, and of Rahab whose faith and protection of the spies rescued her from the general destruction. In sections 24 through 27, he has grouped together details in regard to the resurrection of Christ. After this, in sections 42 through 44, he has grouped together details in regard to the bishops and the deacons.

So too, God Himself declares in the Scriptures. He has sworn, and He can and will bring it to pass. Clement groups in section 42 through 44 the examples and the details in regard to the bishops and the deacons. Ex γὰρ δὴ πολλῶν χρόνων ἐγέγραπτο περὶ ἑπισκόπων καὶ διακόνων, for indeed it had been written
concerning bishops and deacons from very ancient times. The Apostles, he says, were sent by Jesus Christ, as Jesus Christ was sent by the Father. They appointed presbyters in all churches, as the prophet had foretold. Herein they followed the precedent of Moses. Clement instructs them to remember how the murmuring against Aaron was quelled by the budding of Aaron's rod. In like manner the Apostles, to avoid dissension, made provision for the regular succession of the ministry. Then he tells them that they did wrongly to thrust out presbyters who had been duly appointed according to this Apostolic order, and had discharged their office faithfully.

These are the examples we give and from these we may well gather that sense of order is a real characteristic of this Epistle. Its motive and purpose was the maintenance of harmony. A great breach of discipline had been committed in the Corinthian church, and the letter was written to restore this disorganized and factious community to peace. It was not unnatural that under these circumstances the writer should refer to the Mosaic dispensation as enforcing this principle of order by its careful regulations respecting persons, places and seasons. It creates no surprise when we see him going beyond this and seeking illustrations, likewise, in the civil government and military organization of his age and country. But we should hardly expect to find him insisting with such emphasis on his principle
as dominating the course of nature. Nowhere is the reign of law more strenuously asserted. The succession of day and night, the sequence of the seasons, the growth of plants and the ebb and flow of the tides all tell the same tale. The kingdom of nature preaches harmony as well as the kingdom of grace. "Hitherto shalt thou come, and no further," is only a physical type of a moral obligation. We may smile as we read the unquestioning simplicity which accepts the story of the Phoenix and uses it as an illustration, but we are apt to forget that among his most cultivated heathen contemporaries many accepted it as true and others left it an open question. With this aspect of the matter, however, we are not at present concerned. The point to be observed here is that it is adduced as an illustration of natural law. It was not a miracle, in our sense of the term, as an interruption of the course of nature. It was a regularly recurrent phenomenon. The time, the place and the manner all were prescribed. The winds, with full freedom, perform their service in the appointed place and time. The smallest animals exist in peace and harmony side by side. All these the Creator and Lord of all has ordained, that they may be preserved in concord and unity for the good of all.

In the same way as to nature's eternal laws, Clement directs his hearers to history. He places before them the example of Enoch, Noah, Abraham, Lot, Moses, Job, David, and
others; also of the Christian martyrs, especially of Peter and Paul. Above all he points them to Christ, whom he presents to them as the sublimest example of humility and obedience. "See", he says, "dear people, what an example is given us here. If the Lord so humbles Himself, what shall we do, who through Him have come beneath the gentle yoke of His grace?" (Section 16)

We must remember that coherence involves two questions. We have considered the first, in what order shall one arrange his material?, and we now turn to the second, how shall one make this order apparent?

Thomas, Manchester and Scott have given us great assistance in determining how we may make the order clear. Following are the more important ways in which the necessary assistance is given to the reader. We shall, however, give only those ways which we find apparent in the Epistle to the Corinthians. At or near the beginnings of paragraphs, where new topics of any size usually make their appearance, words, phrases, or whole sentences are often used to indicate the place of that which follows in the composition as a whole, or to mark its relation to that which has gone just before. In Clement (Sections 5, 7) we find such phrases as: 'Ἀλλ' ἴνα τῶν ἀρχαίων ὑποδεικνύσεως ἔμεθα (But, to pass from the examples of ancient
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days), ταῦτα, ἀγαπητοί, σοὶ μόνον ὑμᾶς νοεθετοῦντες ἐπιστέλλομεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ εαυτοὺς ὑπομνήσκοντες (These things, dearly beloved, we write, not only as admonishing you, but also as putting ourselves in remembrance. In section 9, we have the word ἄλλα (wherefore) which helps to connect what has gone before. We may find these connecting words or phrases in the beginnings of sections 13, 14, 15, 29, 31, 34, 37, 48, 56, and 57. ταπεινοφρον- ἰκομένος σοὶ (let us therefore be lowly-minded), δίκαιον σοὶ καὶ ὅσιον (Therefore it is right and proper), τοίνυν κολληθῶμεν τοῖς μέτα (Therefore let us cleave unto them), προσέλθωμεν σοὶ αὐτῷ (Let us therefore approach Him), κολληθῶμεν σοὶ τῇ εὐλογίᾳ αὐτοῦ (Let us therefore cleave unto his blessings), δέον σοὶ ἔστιν (It is therefore needful), στρατευόμεθα σοὶ (Let us therefore enlist ourselves), ἐξάραμεν σοὶ τὸ ἐν τάχει (Let us therefore root this out quickly), καὶ ἡμεῖς σοὶ ἐντόχωμεν περὶ τῶν ἐν τινὶ παραπτώματι ὑπαρχόντων, ἡμεῖς σοὶ (you therefore). Other connecting phrases which help to make the order plain are in section 30, ἅγιον σοὶ μερίς (seeing then that we are the special portion of the Holy One), section 46, τοιοῦτοις σοὶ υποδείγματι (to such examples as these therefore), and ὀρᾶτε (you see) in section 50. The number of relations and shades of relationship that may thus be indicated between the new matter and what has preceded it is, of course, indefinitely large. These found in this Epistle will greatly help for clearness and ease of
One other device which we may list, which greatly assists in making the order clear, is that of employing a whole paragraph which has for its sole or its main purpose notification to the reader of his exact whereabouts in the general design. Of these, we find only one in the Epistle of Clement. Paragraph 46 not only tells us our whereabouts in the discourse but also brings us to the very point and purpose of the Epistle.

To such examples as these therefore, brethren, we also ought to cleave. For it is written... Let us therefore cleave to the guiltless and righteous: and these are the elect of God. Wherefore are there strifes and wraths and factions and divisions and war among you? Have we not one God and one Christ and one Spirit of grace that was shed upon us? And is there not one calling Christ? Wherefore do we tear and rend asunder the members of Christ?, and stir up factions against our own body, and reach such a pitch of folly, as to forget that we are members one of another? Remember the words of Jesus our Lord.
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To observe the law of coherence, then, is to work out a rational order for one's discourse, and then to see that the order is manifest. The great error of many writers is that of making too little use of the devices we have listed, at least of connecting links in the interior of the discourse. They do not define the relations of their ideas clearly enough to themselves to be able to define them for the reader, or they have not yet learned the supreme importance of making the reader's task easy for him, or they do not use their imaginations sufficiently to realize when the reader needs aid. Judging from appearances and from hasty examination of totals, we might be led to conclude that there is a tendency towards excessive use of such devices or connecting links in the Epistle to the Corinthians. They may be used when there is no need for them, or they may be painfully elaborated when only a word or two is required, but it is better to run the risk of such faults as these than to run the risk of obscurity.

**EMPHASIS**

The law of emphasis, reminding us that some parts of our subject are more important than others, insists that these shall be made especially memorable to our readers. Here the fundamental question is: How shall I make important things stand out?
There are, again, various ways of answering this question. The hints which follow may be considered the most practically useful.

Emphasis, dignity and the clarification of an idea as well as its forcefulness and persuasiveness are attained by the synonymous repetition characteristic of pleonasm. This repetition is achieved by placing together words, phrases or clauses of the same or at least similar meaning. The most frequent occurrence is the following two word pleonasms.

- ἀλλοτρίας καὶ ξένη (alien and stranger, section 1);
- προπετή καὶ αὐθάδη (headstrong and self-willed, section 1);
- ζήλος καὶ φθόνος καὶ ἐρις καὶ στάσις, διωγμὸς καὶ ἀκαταστασία, πόλεμος καὶ αἰχμαλωσία (jealousy and envy, strife and sedition, persecution and tumult, war and captivity, section 3);
- κενάς καὶ ματαιάς (idle and vain, section 7);
- μεγαλοπρεπεῖ καὶ ἐνοδῶ (excellent and glorious, section 9);
- ἀλαξονείαν καὶ τύφως (arrogance and conceit, section 13);
- δίκαιον οὖν καὶ δικίον (right and proper, section 14);
- αἰγείσις καὶ μηλωταῖς (goatskins and sheepskins, section 17);
- ἄφροσι καὶ ἄνοφτοις (foolish and senseless, section 21);
- ἄφρονες καὶ ἄθεντοι καὶ μωροί καὶ ἀπαίδευτοι χαλεπάξουσιν Ἦμᾶς καὶ μυκτηρίζουσιν (senseless and stupid and foolish and ignorant men jeer and mock at us, section 39);
- ἄθροος καὶ δίκαιος (guiltless and righteous, section 46);
- ἐρεῖς καὶ θυμοί καὶ διχοστασίαι καὶ σχίσματα πόλεμος τε ἐν ὑμῖν (strifes and wraths and factions and
divisions and war among you, section 46); διέλκωμεν καὶ διασπώμεν (tear and rend asunder, section 46); δεσμεῦμεν ὅλον καὶ σιτάμεθα (let us therefore entreat and ask of his mercy, section 50). In general it can be stated that the figure is not used to an exag-gerated degree, and its relative frequency is quite in keeping with the author's florid style.

Emphasis can also be attained by the repetition of an individual word. The repetition of the same word within the same clause is known as anadiplosis. The word may be repeated immediately or after a short interval. This figure lends not only emphasis to the passage but also intense and passionate feeling. ὑποτασσόμενοι μᾶλλον ἢ ὑποτάσσοντες (yielding rather than claiming submission, section 2); δ ἀνθρώπων τοῖς λαίκοις προστάγμασιν δέδεται (the layman is bound by the layman's ordinances, section 40); ἐπίστασθε γὰρ καλῶς ἐπίστασθε (for we know and know well, section 53).

The figure of epanaphora consists of the repetition of one or several words at the beginning of successive or alternate phrases, clauses or sentences. It is another means of attaining emphasis by repetition, but it is more than this. It makes for clearness and adds a certain amount of artistic beauty to the discourse. Even the simplest forms of this figure are not without some rhetorical value. They add to the artistic and pleasing method of presentation, and the more complex they
become the more their value increases. Clause *epanaphora* of one word is very frequent in the Epistle before us. Repetition of *καί* in threefold arsis has some rhetorical effect, which we find in paragraph 25, καί ταῦτα βαστάζων διανύει ἀπὸ τῆς Ἀραβικῆς χώρας ἕως τῆς Αἴγυπτου εἰς τὴν λεγομένην Ἡλιοσφολίαν καὶ ἡμέρας βλεπόντων πάντων; ἐπιπτᾶς ἐπὶ τὸν τόπον ἡλιόν βραδύν τίθησιν αὐτά, καὶ οὕτως εἰς τούπιον. Similarly, we find the word *εἰς* used in section 32, εἰς αὐτοῦ γὰρ ἑρείτις τε καὶ λευίται πάντες οἱ λειτουργοῦντες τῷ θυσιαστηρίῳ τοῦ θεοῦ εἰς αὐτοῦ ὁ Κύριος Ἰησοῦς τὸ κατὰ σάρκα· εἰς αὐτοῦ βασιλεῖς καὶ ἄρχοντες καὶ ἱγούμενοι and the word *εἰς* in section 35, εἰς ἐστηριγμένη ἢ ἡ διάνοια ἡμῶν διὰ πίστεως πρὸς τὸν θεόν· εἰς ἑκτερίματε τὰ εὐάρεστα καὶ εὐπρόσδεκατε αὐτῷ. εἰς ἐπιτελέσωμεν τὰ ἀνήμοντα τῇ ἀμώμῳ βουλῆσαι αὐτοῦ. In section 36 we have the word *διὰ* used five times producing this effect, διὰ τοῦτον ἐνοπτηριζόμεθα τὴν ἄμωμον καὶ ὑπερτάτην ὅσιν αὐτοῦ διὰ τοῦτον ἢνεώχθησαν ἡμῶν οἱ ὀφθαλμοί τῆς καρδίας, διὰ τοῦτον ἡ ἄσυνετος καὶ ἐσχωτωμένη διάνοια ἡμῶν ἀναθάλλει εἰς τὸ θαυμαστὸν αὐτῶν φῶς, διὰ τοῦτον ἤθελησεν ὁ δεσπότης τῆς ἀθανάτου γνώσεως ἡμῶς γεύσασθαι, διὰ τοῦτον ἀπενίστησιν εἰς τὰ ψῆν while *πῶς* is used three times in section 37, πῶς εὐεικτικῶς, πῶς ὑποτεταγμένως ἐπιτελεσθήσιν τὰ διατασσόμενα πῶς εὐτάκτως Again Clement uses the word *πῶς* five times in section 48, ἢτω τις πιστός, ἢτω δυνάτος γνῶσιν ἐξειπεῖν, ἢτω σοφῶς ἐν διαφύλαξι λόγων ἢτω γοργὸς ἐν ἔργοις, ἢτω ἄγνως In section
49 we find the word ἀγάπη used six times, ἀγάπη πάντα ἀνέχεται, ἀγάπη κολλᾷ ὑμᾶς τῷ θεῷ. ἀγάπη καλύπτει πλῆθος ἁμαρτιῶν, ἀγάπη σχίσμα οὐκ ἔχει, ἀγάπη οὐ στασιάζει, ἀγάπη πάντα ποιεῖ ἐν ὑμνοῖς and then in section 55 the word πολλοὶ, πολλοὶ βασιλεῖς καὶ ἴγορμενοι...πολλοὶ ἔξεχόρησαν ἰδίων πόλεων...πολλοὶ ἐαυτοὺς παρέδωκαν εἰς δουλείαν...πολλαὶ γυναῖκες ἐνδυναμώθησαί.

In conclusion, it can be said that Clement's use of the figures of repetition is extensive.

A third means of emphasis is heightening of the style. Probably every reader of discourses will recall particular passages that have remained vividly in his mind when all the context has been lost from memory, and this not because of their length, nor primarily at least because of their position in the discourse, though doubtless the most striking passages occur most frequently in emphatic positions, but because of some exceptional force or imaginativeness or beauty of style. Such a passage is section 45 in the Epistle before us.

Be ye contentious, brethren, and jealous about the things that pertain unto salvation. Ye have searched the Scriptures, which are true, which were given through the Holy Ghost; and ye know that nothing unrighteous or counterfeit is written in them. Ye will not find that righteous persons have been thrust out by holy men. Righteous men were persecuted, but it was by the lawless, they were imprisoned, but it was by the unholy. They were stoned by transgressors; they were slain by those who had conceived a detestable and unrighteous jealousy. Suffering these things, they endured nobly. For what must we say, brethren? Was Daniel cast into the lions' den by them that fear God? Or were Ananias and Azarias and Misael shut up in the furnace of fire by them that professed the excellent and
glorious worship of the Most High? Far be this from our thoughts. Who then were they that did these things? Abominable men and full of all wickedness were stirred up to such a pitch of wrath, as to bring cruel suffering upon them that served God in a holy and blameless purpose, not knowing that the Most High is the champion and protector of them that in a pure conscience serve His excellent Name: unto whom be the glory for ever and ever. Amen. 9

Position of details has a great part to play in producing true emphasis. In the first place, we are likely to remember especially well what comes at the beginning of a discourse and even better what comes at the end. What is said, for instance, at the beginning finds our mind alert and our attention easily engaged. What is said at the end lies freshest in the memory; and moreover, since by reason and experience we rather expect the writer to focus at that point on what is most important in his message, we are likely to pull ourselves together as we see signs of its approach and stir our minds to increased activity. Anything of genuine importance to the success of the discourse should be carefully placed at the beginning. Oftest probably it will be simply a clear indication of his subject, to which when the subject is difficult or many-sided he may add a formal explanation of his plan of treatment. Sometimes it will be a complete statement of his objective; that is, the things he has to say about his subject, as in the case of Clement.
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The end of the discourse, the position most emphatic of all, deserves even more careful consideration than the beginning. What shall occupy the position most emphatic of all? Clearly, it is what is most important; and what is most important is clearly the thing one really set out to say, one's objective that is: if it is a single point one is making, then surely this single point should be stated at the end of the discourse. If it is a number of points one is making, then these, or the most important of them, should there be summarized.

As to just how much final emphasis the objective requires in a given discourse, the writer must judge for himself. His imagination must tell him, as well as his vivid sense of his reader's state of mind. He know what effect he wishes to produce, and he knows the sort of reader he is addressing. "I have
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already in a quiet way," the writer may say to himself, "made apparent the point of my essay; do I need to formulate it at the end? If I do, will I not seem to my reader ungraceful, over-insistent or perhaps a bit uncomplimentary? I will close without another word." Again, the writer may be so deeply in earnest about truths he is expressing, so eager to lose no means of convincing his readers of their importance that no emphasis can seem to him too excessive. He will instinctively gather them together at the end in a supreme effort to stamp them indelibly on the minds of his readers, as is the case in the Epistle before us.

A very useful and artistic effect is produced in Clement's Epistle when the beginning and the end of his discourse is brought into intimate relation with each other. Nothing else can mark so well the unity, the oneness and wholeness, of the discourse. When the end reverts to the beginning, the figure is complete. An effect of this kind is obtained when the objective is stated at the beginning and then at the end is re-stated in such a way as to take the mind back to the beginning, or when at the beginning the reader is given a plan of the discourse, is promised that certain topics will be treated and then at the end is reminded that the plan has been carried out, the promise kept.

The following is an example of this: sections 1 and
By reason of the sudden and repeated calamities and reverses which are befalling us, brethren, we consider that we have been somewhat tardy in giving heed to the matters of dispute that have arisen among you, dearly beloved, and to the detestable and unholy sedition, so alien and strange to the elect of God, which a few headstrong and self-willed persons have kindled to such a pitch of madness that your name, once revered and renowned and lovely in the sight of all men, hath been greatly reviled.

Therefore it is right for us to give heed to so great and so many examples, and to submit the neck, and occupying the place of obedience to take our side with them that are the leaders of our souls, that ceasing from this foolish dissension we may attain unto the goal which lieth before us in truthfulness, keeping aloof from every fault. For ye will give us great joy and gladness, if ye render obedience unto the things written by us through the Holy Spirit, and root out the unrighteous anger of your jealousy, according to the entreaty which we have made for peace and concord in this letter.

Another means of emphasis is by proportion. It is obvious, other things being equal, that we are likely to be most impressed by what one talks about the most. What is placed before our attention the most will naturally cause a deeper impression than that which is placed there but a brief time. There are various ways in which an idea may be kept before the attention. It may be done by repeating it in various forms as we find in Clement's Epistle. The main point, the purpose of the Epistle, is stated in various ways throughout it, thus keeping it before his reader. He begins in section 1 by stating, ἐπὶ ζητομένων παρ' ὑμῖν πραγμάτων and then μιαρὰς καὶ ἀνοσίαν. In section 3
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he speaks of it again and elaborates a little more. ἐκ τοῦτον ζῆλος καὶ φθόνος καὶ ἔρις καὶ στάσις, διωγμὸς καὶ ἀκαταστασία, κόλεμος καὶ αἰχμαλωσία; οἱ ἄτιμοι ἐπὶ τοῦ ἐντίμου, οἱ ἄδοξοι ἐπὶ τοὺς ἐνδόξους, οἱ ἄφρονες ἐπὶ τοὺς φρονίμους, οἱ νέοι ἐπὶ τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους; ἀλλὰ ἐκαστὸν βαδίζειν κατὰ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας αὐτοῦ τὰς πονηρὰς; ἀδικον καὶ ἁσεβὴ ἀνειληφότας. In sections 7, 9 and 13 he returns and emphasizes it again. ἄδιδ ἀπολείπομεν τὰς κενὰς καὶ ματαιὰς φροντίδας; ἀπολιπόντες τὴν ματαιοπονίαν τὴν τε ἔριν καὶ τὸ εἰς τάς τιμῶς ἄγον ζῆλος; ταπεινοφρονήσομεν οὖν ἄδελφοί, ἀποθέμενοι πᾶσαν ἀλαζονείαν καὶ τύφος καὶ ἀφροσύνην καὶ ποιήσωμεν τὸ γεγραμμένον. The main purpose is brought to light again in section 23, διδὸ μὴ διψυχῶμεν, μὴ δὲ ἱνδαλλέσθω ἡ ψυχή ἡμῶν ἐπὶ ταῖς ὑπερβαλλούσαις καὶ ἐνδόξοις ὑφερεῖς αὐτοῦ, then again in sections 28, 30, 35, 41, 46 and 51, "forsake the abominable lusts of evil works;" "forsaking evil-speakings, abominable and impure embraces, drunkennesses and tumults and hateful lusts, abominable adultery, hateful pride;" "casting off from ourselves all unrighteousness and iniquity, covetousness, strifes, malignities and deceits, whisperings and backbitings, hatred of God, pride and arrogance, vainglory and inhospitality;" "not transgressing the appointed rule of his service;" "wherefore are there strifes and wraths and factions and divisions and war among you?" "For all our transgressions therefore which we have committed through any of the wiles of
the adversary."\(^{12}\) Then in the closing sections 54, 57, and 63, he lays stress to it. "Let him say; If by reason of me there be faction and strife and divisions, I retire, I depart, whither ye will;" "Ye therefore that laid the foundation of the sedition, submit yourselves;" "that ceasing from this foolish dissension we may attain unto the goal which lieth before us."\(^{13}\)

An idea may also be kept before a reader's attention by explaining it, by going more and more into detail with it, by illustrating it, by proving its truth and by comparing it with similar or contrasting ideas. All of these may be found in some form or other in the Epistle before us. In sections 2 and 3 Clement explains the origin of the evil which has overtaken the Corinthians, which makes this letter a necessity. The need of repenting and of forsaking these evil practices is given in sections 8, 9, 13, 14 and 15. The results of this evil is illustrated in sections 4, 5, 6 and 7. In sections 9 through 12 he gives examples to illustrate the need of this repentance and obedience. Again by means of Christ, Old Testament Prophets and Creation he illustrates the humility and the submissiveness which they ought to possess in sections 16 through 20. By going more and more into detail he explains his main point. In sections 21 through 29 he speaks of the judgment of God, \(\deltaρ\tauε, \ \alphaγαπητοι, \ \mu\)
He not only paints the dark picture of the judgment which befalls such as do these evil practices, but he illustrates their relationship to God as obedient and faithful servants, and this also by the aid of examples of Old Testament prophets. He further explains and emphasizes his main thought by proving its truth and its authority in sections 40 through 53, "Forasmuch then as these things are manifest beforehand and we have searched the depths of the Divine knowledge, we ought to do all things in order, as the Master hath commanded us." Then in the last sections he returns and summarizes all his details, giving a final plea.

"concerning faith and repentance and genuine love and temperance and sobriety and patience we have handled every argument, putting you in remembrance, that ye ought to please Almighty God in righteousness and truth and long-suffering with holiness, laying aside malice and pursuing concord in love and peace, being instant in gentleness; even as our fathers, of whom we spake before, pleased Him, being lowly-minded towards their Father and God and Creator and towards all me."15

The nature of this means of emphasis is not too obtrusive or artificial and the examples or various forms are quite evenly distributed. With these considerations in mind, Clement's use of proportion can be termed consistent and generous but not exaggerated. The figure adds a great deal of emphasis to the

14Ibid., pp. 292-298. 15Ibid., 304.
discussion and forcefully clarifies the main point.

Asyndeton consists of the omission of one or more connectives. It tends to relieve the monotony of a discourse, and its skillful use produces rapidity of expression. When prolonged, it emphasizes and adds clarity to the disconnected elements and gives additional force to other figures. The following in the Epistle of Clement is a typical example: ο Παῦλος ὁκομονῆς βραβεῖον ὑπέδειξεν, ἐπτάχις δεσμα φορέσας, φυγαδευθεὶς λίθους, κήρυξ γενόμενος ἐν τῇ ἀνατολῇ καὶ ἐν δόσει. Section 21 contains three such examples of asyndeton:

"Let us reverence our rulers; let us honour our elders; let us instruct our young men in the lesson of the fear of God; let us guide our women toward that which is good;" then "let them show forth their lovely disposition of purity; let them prove their sincere affection of gentleness; let them manifest the moderation of their tongue through their silence;" and "let them learn how lowliness of mind prevaleth with God, what power chaste love hath with God, how the fear of Him is good and great and savetb all them that walk therein in a pure mind with holiness."16

In paragraph 30 we have another example, "Let us clothe ourselves in concord, being lowly-minded and temperate, holding ourselves aloof from all backbiting and evil speaking, being justified by works...." Other examples may be found in sections 32, 34, 35 and in the great liturgical ending, section 59.

The opposite of this figure of asyndeton is polysyndeton, which is characterized by the number of connecting particles employed. This figure gives a sense of deliberateness and
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dignity to the discourse, and makes the connected elements stand out more clearly and distinctly. Two or more successive conjunctions are required to form the figure. The following, found in Clement, are typical of some of the more elaborate examples:

"Let us mark the soldiers that are enlisted under our rulers, how exactly, how readily, how submissively, they execute the orders given them," (section 37); "Senseless and stupid and foolish and ignorant men jeer and mock at us" (section 39); "Wherefore are there strifes and wraths and factions and divisions and war among you?" (section 46); "forgive us our iniquities and our unrighteousnesses and our transgressions and shortcomings" (section 60); "concerning faith and repentance and genuine love and temperance and sobriety and patience" (section 62).17

Other examples of this elaborate use of the figure may be found in paragraphs 3, 9, 7, 21, 30, 32, 35, 36, 37, 42, 41, 43, 46, 48 and 58. The frequency of the two-fold type of polysyndeton falls short of the elaborate types. We find it used in paragraph 2, "Ye were sincere and simple and free from malice towards another" in paragraph 33 "He praised them and blessed them and said," in paragraph 42 "Having therefore received a charge, and having been fully assured through the resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ and confirmed in the word of God with full assurance..." and in paragraph 46 "Have we not one God and one Christ and one Spirit of grace that was shed upon us?" 18
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Other weaker types of this figure may be found in paragraphs 17, 34, 35, 38 and 45. Thus we see there are many more examples of polysyndeton than there are of asyndeton. In each, however, we find a preference for the more elaborate uses of these figures. Such a decided preference shows a tendency toward deliberation in style.

A question that is asked for effect rather than to obtain information is known as a rhetorical question. The effect attained by these questions is the arousing of such feelings as sorrow, admiration, indignation and contempt. In its cumulative form the rhetorical question adds emphasis and liveliness to the discourse. Short and rapid questions have a stimulating effect, recall the attention of the reader and at times gloss over the weak points in an argument. Questions may also serve as a device to introduce new material in the form of quotations or illustrations, and they may summarize or recall briefly what has just been said. Clement does not frequently resort to these questions, as we note in the few following examples. Only one series of four questions is used to arouse admiration and this in the beginning of his Epistle:

"for who that had sojourned among you did not approve your most virtuous and steadfast faith? Who did not admire your sober and forbearing piety in Christ? Who did not publish abroad your magnificent disposition of hospitality? Who did not congratulate you on your perfect and sound knowledge?"
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As we have seen in the above questions, we may also see in two more series of questions a lively enumeration of details, as follows:

"Was Daniel cast into the lions' den by them that fear God? Or were Ananias and Azarias and Misael shut up in the furnace of fire by them that professed the excellent and glorious worship of the Most High?" (section 45) "Wherefore are there strifes and wraths and factions and divisions and war among you? Have we not one God and one Christ and one Spirit of grace that was shed upon us? And is there not one calling in Christ? Wherefore do we tear and rend asunder the members of Christ, and stir up factions against our own body, and reach such a pitch of folly, as to forget that we are members one of another?" (section 46)

Rhetorical questions introducing an explanation, illustration or Scriptural quotation used for emphasis may be found in:

"What must we say of David that obtained a good report?" (section 18); "For where can any of us escape from His strong hand? And what world will receive any of them that desert from His service?" (section 28); "What then must we do, brethren? Must we idly abstain from doing good, and forsake love?" (section 33); "Who therefore is noble among you? Who is compassionate? Who is fulfilled with love?" (section 54)

One other rhetorical question is used: that of briefly recalling what has gone before, as in section 26:

"Do we then think it to be a great and marvelous thing, if the Creator of the universe shall bring about the resurrection of them that have served Him with holiness in the assurance of a good faith,...by a bird...?" 21
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Variety, emphasis and liveliness are attained by such a use of this figure.

The figures of argumentation are devices that grew out of the formal usages of the early court-room practices. These devices lived on when there was no longer any practical need for them, but their skillful use adds variety, emphasis and a dramatic touch to the style of the author. This group includes diaparesis, epidioorthosis, prokataleipsis, prosopopoeia, dialektikon and hypophora. Most of these we shall find have been employed by Clement.

*Diaparesis* is a pretended doubt. It usually takes the form of a simple question, such as: where shall I begin, where shall I leave off and what shall I say? Its purpose is to win the good-will of the reader by a show of modesty or to arouse his attention by pointing out the difficulty of what is to follow. The weak example we have in Clement is in section 48, "For where can any of us escape from His strong hand? And what world will receive any of them that desert from His service?" Such an extremely sparing use of this figure is another evidence of Clement's directness. He prefers other devices to attract the attention of the reader.

*Epidioorthosis* is a figure that corrects or restricts a previous statement. The unexpected interruption which it entails

---
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gives it rhetorical force, and it also gives the impression that
the writer is very conscientious in any statement that he makes.
The following is an example of Clement: τι οὖν ποιήσωμεν, ἀδελφοί
ὅρησωμεν ὁπί τῆς ἁγαθοποιίας καὶ ἐγκαταλείπωμεν τὴν ἁγάπην.
(section 33).

The figure prokataleipsis is a device that anticipates
and answers objections before the opponents have a chance to
raise them. It is used to emphasize and clarify the point under
discussion, as well as to introduce new material and to vary the
method of presentation. The following are examples in Clement's
Epistle: "For Christ is with them that are lowly of mind, not
with them that exalt themselves" (section 16); "Let us therefore
cleave unto His blessing, and let us see the ways of blessing"
(section 31); "Forasmuch then as these things are manifest be-
forehand, and we have searched into the depths of the Divine
knowledge, we ought to do all things in order, as...the Master...
commanded" (section 40); "What marvel, if they which were en-
trusted...with such a work by God appointed the aforesaid per-
sons?" (section 43); and in section 54, "Who therefore is noble
among you? Who is compassionate? Who is filled with love?23
For similar examples compare sections 4, 9, 14 and 42. Since
there are nine instances of this figure, it may be said that
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Clement makes sufficient use of it. This device is especially useful in the art of persuasion, and it is noteworthy that its use is limited to those sections of the treatise where the argumentation is the strongest.

The figure **prosopopoia** represents a real or an imaginary person as speaking directly. The dramatic nature of this figure always imparts a great deal of vivacity to the discourse. When joined with personification, it becomes even more powerful. No example of such a combination, however, was found in this treatise. Scriptural quotations too because of their number and nature have been excluded from this study, though they have much the same effect. Vividness and clarity are always attained by the introduction of this figure. The imaginary debate reproduced by **prosopopoia** tends to elucidate the complicated questions under discussion.

**Dialektikon** is a figure in which a question is followed immediately by its answer. This question-answer combination is somewhat similar to the dialogue form of **prosopopoia** mentioned above. It also produces much the same effect, it gives liveliness, vivacity and clarity to the passage. When this device is used to introduce a new subject, it also arrests the attention of the reader. The following are representative examples of **dialektikon** as found in the Epistle to the Corinthians.

"For who that had sojourned among you did not approve your most virtuous and steadfast faith? Who did not admire your
sober and forbearing piety in Christ? Who did not publish abroad your magnificent disposition of hospitality? Who did not congratulate you on your perfect and sound knowledge? For ye did all things without respect of persons, and ye walked after the ordinances of God, submitting yourselves to your rulers and rendering to the older men among you the honour which is their due." (section 1);

"But how shall this be, dearly beloved? If our mind be fixed through faith towards God; if we seek out those things which are well pleasing and acceptable unto Him; if we accomplish such things as be seem His faultless will, and follow the way of truth, casting off from ourselves all unrighteousness and iniquity, covetousness, strifes, malignities and deceits, whisperings and backbitings, hatred of God, pride and arrogance, vainglory and inhospitality." (section 35);

"Take up the epistle of the blessed Paul the Apostle. What wrote he first unto you in the beginnings of the Gospel? Of a truth he charged you in the Spirit concerning himself and Cephas and Apollos, because that even then ye had made parties." (section 47); and in section 49,

"Who can declare the bond of the love of God? Who is sufficient to tell the majesty of its beauty? The height, whereunto love exalteth, is unspeakable." 25

For similar examples, though in weaker form, compare sections 18 and 31.

Hypophora proposes an objection in the form of a question for the purpose of immediate refutation. This figure adds liveliness to the passage in which it is used, and gives it a conversational tone. It also tends to inspire confidence in the author inasmuch as he represents himself as willing to answer objections. Only one example of this figure was found in this treatise, section 39.

The fact that the figures of argumentation occur only slightly more than seventeen times establishes the fact that these figures are not particularly favored by Clement. Those, however, which have the greatest enlivening effect are used the most frequently. It is noteworthy that these old court-room devices have continued to live on, and especially that they are used as frequently as they are in a written treatise. The total use of these figures is not such that they can be considered to constitute a marked element in the style of the author.

These are the more important means of securing emphasis. They are very simple and very easily applied, but to their application there is one obvious prerequisite. Before one can make clear to a reader what is important in a discourse and what is unimportant, one must first be clear upon the question oneself. This we may conclude is very apparent in the Epistle to the Corinthians. Clement knew what he wanted to say before he began to write, and by means of these figures of emphasis he intensifies the importance and the urgency of his message.

**INTEREST**

There is yet one more law: the law of interest. A
discourse may be unified, coherent, emphatic and yet unnecessarily dull, unattractive, hard to understand and hard to read. It is never to be forgotten that one writes to be read and that what is hard to read, judged by those for whom it is intended, will ordinarily find few readers. There are, of course, various kinds of subjects: those which are by nature more difficult and more unattractive than others and those which are very detailed and technical. However there is no subject which the writer can not, by taking thought and by keeping his reader sympathetically in mind, make more easily grasped and more entertaining than it would otherwise be likely to be.

Thomas, Manchester and Scott have again reduced the law of interest, as they did the other laws mentioned above, to the form of a simple question, how shall I interest my reader? With this before us we shall examine the Epistle to the Corinthians to determine whether or not Clement attempted to answer it, whether he had the interest of his readers in mind as he wrote. We shall follow the above named authors in regard to this question in only its broadest aspect. Even thus interpreted, it is a large and complex one. We shall here confine the discussion to the idea which may be summed up in the following precept: use concrete matter freely.
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What do we mean by concrete matter? Simply this. It means such details, particulars, instances, illustrations, examples, descriptions, comparisons and contrasts as will bring the discussion down to the reader's level and into contact with actual experiences, with objects such as one has seen and touched and with actions such as one has witnessed or better still has had a part in.

In each phase of the problem in the First Epistle to the Corinthians, Clement is very careful to group the examples, the illustrations and Scriptural quotations so as to produce no restraint, making it possible for the reader to immediately grasp the thought or problem presented. When speaking of the jealousy which had arisen in the Church at Corinth, Clement relates several concrete examples of Old Testament prophets, who were either partakers of such evil or victims of those who practised such. These were examples, no doubt, which the people of Corinth had all read about and had heard referred to often; such as Cain and Abel, Jacob and Esau, Moses, Aaron and Miriam, Dathan and Abiram and David.

"Ye see, brethren, jealousy and envy wrought a brother's murder. By reason of jealousy our father Jacob ran away from the face of Esau his brother."

From these he directs the reader's attention to the examples in their own generation, not only for the sake of unity but also that the interest may not wane or leave one hanging in
"By reason of jealousy and strife Paul by his example pointed out the prize of patient endurance. After that he had been seven times in bonds, had been driven into exile, had been stoned, had preached in the East and in the West, he won the noble renown which was the reward of his faith, having taught righteousness unto the whole world and having reached the farthest bounds of the West; and when he had borne his testimony before the rulers, so he departed from the world and went unto the holy place, having been found a notable pattern of patient endurance."27 (section 5).

In exhorting the Corinthians to repent of this evil practice, he does so by means of Scriptural quotations and illustrations which deal explicitly with the need and the result of such obedience. The following are Scriptural quotations used in section 8:

"Yea and the Master of the universe Himself spake concerning repentance with an oath; For, as I live, saith the Lord, I desire not the death of the sinner, so much as his repentance ... And if ye be willing and will hearken unto Me, ye shall eat the good things of the earth; but if ye be not willing, neither hearken unto Me, a sword shall devour you; for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken these things."

Then of the examples of the result of repentance we have the lives of Abraham, Lot and Rahab referred to in sections 10 through 12:

"Abraham, who was called the "friend," was found faithful in that he rendered obedience unto the words of God"; "For his faith and hospitality a son was given unto him in old age"; "For his hospitality and godliness Lot was saved from Sodom"; "For her faith and hospitality Rahab the harlot was saved."28

Confusion for the reader inevitably results when the
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writer makes use of examples that are only partially relevant, or in extending an analogy shifts the ground of comparison or changes without warning from irony to direct statement. Clement, however, employs only such examples and Scriptural quotations as are necessary to substantiate his point. When he speaks of the lowliness of Christ, he uses the following Scriptural quotation from section 16:

"We announced Him in His presence. As a child was He, as a root in a thirsty ground. There is no form in Him, neither glory. And we beheld Him, and He had no form nor comeliness, but His form was mean, lacking more than the form of men. He was a man of stripes and of toil, and knowing how to bear infirmity: for His face is turned away. He was dishonoured and held of no account. He beareth our sins and suffereth pain for our sakes: and we accounted Him to be in toil and in stripes and in affliction. And He was wounded for our sins and hath been afflicted for our iniquities. The chastisement of our peace is upon Him...But I am a worm and no man, a reproach of men and an outcast of the people. All they that beheld me mocked at me; they spake with their lips; they wagged their heads, saying, He hoped on the Lord; let Him deliver him, or let Him save him, for He desireth him."

In section 23 Clement exhorts the Corinthians not to be double-minded, neither to let their souls indulge in idle humor respecting God's exceeding and glorious gifts. Then he adds:

"Let this scripture be far from us where He saith: Wretched are the double-minded, which doubt in their soul, and say, These things we did hear in the days of our fathers also, and behold we have grown old, and none of these things hath befallen us. Ye fools, compare yourselves unto a tree; take a vine. First it sheddeth its leaves, then a shoot cometh, then a leaf, then a flower, and then a sour berry, then a
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full ripe grape."\textsuperscript{30}

After a series of questions in section 46 of the strife and wraths and factions and divisions, he says:

"Remember the words of Jesus our Lord: for He said, Woe unto that man. It were good for him if he had not been born rather than that he should offend one of mine elect. It were better for him that a mill-stone were hanged about him, and he cast into the sea, than that he should pervert one of mine elect.\textsuperscript{31}

Clement not only uses Scriptural quotations and examples of Old Testament Prophets to make the discourse alive and interesting, but also he brings them in contact with objects such as one has seen and touched. Certainly in sections 1 and 2, he rouses their interest when he speaks of their former character and reputation. In section 6 he speaks of their actual experience in seeing the result of jealousy:

"Unto these men of holy lives was gathered a vast multitude of the elect, who through many indignities and tortures, being the victims of jealousy, set a brave example among ourselves. By reason of jealousy women being persecuted. . . jealousy hath estranged wives from their husbands. . . jealousy and strife have overthrown great cities and uprooted nations."\textsuperscript{32}

He further stimulates interest in speaking of the reaction of creation which is very familiar to all, in obedience to God.

"The heavens are moved by His direction and obey Him in peace. Day and night accomplish the course assigned to them
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by Him, without hindrance one to another. The sun and the moon and the dancing stars according to His appointment circle in harmony within the bounds assigned to them, without any swerving aside... the smallest of living things come together in concord and peace. All these things the great Creator and Master of the universe ordered to be in peace and concord, doing good unto all things, but far beyond the rest unto us who have taken refuge in His compassionate mercies through our Lord Jesus Christ."

In speaking of the resurrection of Christ, he again takes the common objects which his readers have seen and touched which certainly helps to kindle interest, in section 24:

"Day and night show unto us the resurrection. The night falleth asleep, and day ariseth; the day departeth, and night cometh on. Let us mark the fruits, how and in what manner the sowing taketh place. The sower goeth forth and casteth into the earth each of the seeds; and these falling into the earth dry and bare decay: then out of their decay the mightiness of the Master's providence raiseth them up, and from being one they increase manifold and bear fruit."

Other examples of personal objects and concerns, which naturally arouse interest in any reader, may be found in section 37:

"Let us mark the soldiers that are enlisted under our rulers how exactly, how readily, how submissively, they execute the orders given them. All are not prefects, nor rulers of thousands, nor rulers of hundreds, nor rulers of fifties, and so forth; but each man in his own rank executeth the orders given by the king and the governors."

and then:

"Let us take our body as an example. The head without the feet is nothing; so likewise the feet without the head are nothing; even the smallest limbs of our body are necessary
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and useful for the whole body: but all the members conspire and unite in subjection, that the whole body may be saved.\textsuperscript{35}

Though Clement's Epistle abounds in illustrations, examples and Scriptural quotations, yet these are never too long or detailed to cause the letter to be dry and monotonous nor to cause the reader to be so absorbed in the illustration as to forget the main message. It is, rather, by means of these that the discourse becomes far more effective and forceful. His illustrations on jealousy are very short, the longest being thirteen lines. When he comes to illustrate repentance, his examples are considerably longer but only sufficiently so as to give the main facts and the necessary information regarding each illustration. The Scriptural quotations and examples which he employs in describing the humility and the submissiveness which each ought to possess are rather long, especially those of Christ and David. These perhaps may be classed as too lengthy for there is considerable detail connected with them; yet the many descriptions of their humility, their lowliness of mind and their submissiveness tends to arouse interest and forcefulness. The Scriptural quotations which Clement uses in speaking of the judgment of God are very short, but to the point. Their pointedness impresses the reader's mind and adds interest:

\textsuperscript{35}\textit{Ibid.}, pp. 290-291.
"He shall come quickly and shall not tarry; and the Lord shall come suddenly into His temple, even the Holy One, whom ye expect" (section 23); "Where shall I go, and where shall I be hidden from Thy face? If I ascend into the heaven, Thou art there; if I depart into the farthest parts of the earth, there is Thy right hand; if I make my bed in the depths, there is Thy Spirit." (section 28)

and in section 34, "Behold, the Lord, and His reward is before His face, to recompense each man according to his work." The good judgment in the length of his descriptions, examples and Scriptural quotations impresses us with the fact that Clement evidently had the interest of the reader in mind as he wrote.

It is profuseness of this kind of material that makes reading easy and pleasant; a discourse without it is like a house without windows, dark and cold, unattractive and comfortless. We may therefore conclude that Clement was aware of the fact that upon the principle of concreteness, more than upon any other, hinges the solution of a practical problem of great importance. The vital message which he had, without examples, illustrations and Scriptural quotations, would be very dull, unattractive and lacking in explanation.

36Ibid., 286.
CHAPTER IV

THE DICTION OF CLEMENT OF ROME

There is no type of writing in which style in the narrower sense of the term, that is, felicity in the use of words, is not essential to success and effectiveness. The writer must know not only the meaning of a word but also its suggestion; he must have more than a dictionary knowledge of the words he uses. He must know words as he knows people, by having lived with them. It is not enough that words should be concrete and specific; they must stimulate the imagination so that the reader will share the experience of the writer. Thus, no study of the style of an author is complete without mention of his diction.

The style of First Corinthians is very plain and simple, imitating an ecclesiastical and unaffected way of writing and breathing the true genius and spirit of the Apostolic age. It was written because of great schism and sedition in the church of Corinth, begun by two or three factious persons against the governors of the church, who, envying either the gifts or the authority and esteem of their guides and teachers, had attempted to depose them, and had drawn the greatest part of the church into the conspiracy; whom, therefore, he endeavored by soft words and hard arguments to reduce back to peace and unity. His modesty and humility in it are peculiarly discernible; not only
that he wholly writes it in the name of the church of Rome, without so much as ever mentioning his own, but in that he treats them with such gentle and mild persuasiveness. Nothing of sourness, or an imperious lording it over God's heritage, is to be seen in the whole Epistle.

The letter bears a striking resemblance, in turn of thought and even in style, to the writings of the New Testament. It is, as it has often been called, a truly Apostolical writing. The writer never speculates. He forms to himself no complete system of theology. He believes in the truths as facts, and these truths come out as they have relation to the practice of daily life. Then throughout the whole, there runs a continual reference to all matters to God. The writer continually has before him the idea of an ever-present, loving and providing Father, in whose hands he and all his brethren are. His references to Christ are of the same nature. He always thinks of Him as his Lord. He does not indulge in dry theories regarding Him. He gives no explanation of any puzzles. He feels Him to be a power working within him for holiness. Then his phraseology is strikingly similar to that of the New Testament. He speaks of the "elect," of the "called," of "justification," of those "who fall asleep," exactly as in the writings of St. Paul. There are two points, however, in which there are striking differences. The first is that Clement far more frequently quotes long
passages of the Old Testament, and the second is a more enlarged reference to the operations of God in nature. It is a curious circumstance that the writers of the New Testament never indulge in any lengthened descriptions of the beauties of the world around them, or of the sun, moon and stars. St. Paul mentions the argument for God derived from his works, and he has one grand burst where he summons before him the whole creation travailing and groaning since the introduction of sin. Still he does not linger on this theme. Clement, on the other hand, has a whole chapter devoted to the order and harmony of the world; and as it is really a beautiful piece of writing, and throws light on that tendency towards expansion of style which gradually makes the works of Christian writers more voluminous as we travel from the apostles, we transcribe it:

"The heavens, moved by his management, are obedient to Him in peace. Day and night run the course appointed by Him, nowise hindering each other. Sun and moon and the choruses of the stars roll on in harmony according to his command, within their prescribed limits without any deviation. The pregnant earth, according to His will, sends up at the proper seasons nourishment abundant for men and beasts, and all the living things that are on it, neither hesitating, nor altering any of the decrees issued by Him. The in-explorable parts of abysses, and the inexplicable arrangements of the lower world, are bound together by the same ordinances. The vast immeasurable sea, gathered together into various basins according to His fashioning, never goes beyond the barriers placed round it, but does as He has commanded. For He said: "Thus far shalt thou come, and thy waves shall be broken within thee." The ocean, impassable to men, and the worlds beyond it, are directed by the same commands of the Lord. The seasons of spring and summer and autumn and winter give place to each other in peace. The stations of the winds, at the proper season,
perform their service without hindrance. The everflowing fountains, fashioned for enjoyment and health, never fail to afford their breasts to nourish the life of men; and the smallest of living things meet together in peace and concord. All these the Great Fashioner and Lord of all has appointed to be in peace and concord; doing good to the whole, but exceedingly abundantly to us who have fled to his mercies for refuge through our Lord Jesus Christ, to whom be glory and majesty for ever and ever. Amen.  

Another characteristic of the writer is moderation: the sobriety of temper and reasonableness of conduct, which is expressed by the word ἐπιείκεια. One who takes a comprehensive view of all the elements in the problem before him, and is moreover pervaded by a sense of the principle of harmony and order, cannot well be extravagant or impulsive or fanatical. He may be zealous, but his zeal will burn with a steady glow. This is not a quality which we should predicate of Ignatius or even of Polycarp, but it is eminently characteristic of Clement. The words ἐπιείκεια, ἐπιείκεια occur many times in his Epistle. In two different passages the substantive is qualified by a striking epithet, which seems to be its contradiction, ἐκ τένης ἐπιείκεια (intense moderation). The verbal paradox describes his own character. This gentleness and equability, this sweet reasonableness, was a passion with him.

The liturgical character of Clement's language asserts itself not only in the concluding prayer, but throughout the

---
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whole Epistle. The litany at the close is only the climax of the Epistle, which may be regarded as one long psalm of praise and thanksgiving on the glories of nature and of grace. Before the discovery of the lost ending, discerning critics had pointed out the resemblance of language and of thought to the early liturgies even in the then extant portions of the Epistle. At an early stage before he enters upon the main subject of the letter, the feuds of the Corinthian Church, Clement places himself and his readers in an attitude of prayer as the fittest appeal to their hearts and consciences. He invites his readers to προσέλθωμεν οὖν αὐτῷ ἐν δυσιότητι ψυχῆς ἀγνάς καὶ ἀμιαντοὺς χειρας αἴροντες πρὸς αὐτόν (to approach God in Holiness of soul, raising pure and undefiled hands to him -- section 29). He reminds them that they are an elect and Holy people, as the special inheritance of an Holy one, special portion of a Holy God, and that they are bound to do the things pertaining to Holiness, ποιήσωμεν τὰ τοῦ ἁγίου πάντα (section 30). This mode of expression is essentially liturgical. Again they are bidden to attach themselves to the blessings of God, κολληθῶμεν οὖν τῇ εὐλογίᾳ αὐτοῦ (section 31), and to recognize the magnificence of the gifts given by Him, τὰ μεγαλεῖα τῶν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ δεδομένων δώρων (section 32). The greatness of God's gifts reminds Clement of their proper counterpart, our ministration due to Him by the law of reciprocity. We must be prompt to render with fervency (ἐκτένειας) and
zeal every good service. We are made in God's own likeness, and are consequently the heirs of his blessing (section 33). Our ministrations on earth are the copy and counterpart of the angelic ministration in heaven. Only the eye and ear of faith are needed, κατεναθμευτὸν τὸ πᾶν πλῆθος τῶν ἁγίων αὐτῷ, to recall the sight and sound of these celestial choirs. In this way, Clement prepares the minds of his hearers for the lesson and rebukes which follow.

This analysis will show that the liturgical close of the Epistle is the proper sequel to what precedes. The whole letter is a great eucharistic psalm which gathers about its main practical aim, the restoration of all the church at Corinth.

Though Clement echoes the language of New Testament writers, as well as the Old Testament, yet we may find several words and phrases which are peculiar to Clement and may even have their origin in his writings. The words listed below are based on the authority of J. B. Lightfoot.2

In sections 1, 45 and 57 we find the word πανάρετος which is not found in the New Testament, but is a favorite word with Clement. Whether the epithet was first used by Clement and derived from him by later writers, or not, is difficult to say. He delights in using such compounds, of which the following are

---

examples, παμμεγεθής, πανάγιος, παμπληθής, παντεπότης.

The word ὑπότης is very rarely applied to the Father in the New Testament, but occurs in this one Epistle nearly twenty times. The idea of subjection to God is thus very prominent in Clement, while the idea of Sonship, on which the Apostolic writers dwell so emphatically, is kept in the background. This fact is perhaps due in part to the subject of the Epistle, which required Clement to emphasize the duty of submission; but it must be ascribed in some degree to the spirit of the writer himself.

The word μεγαλοπρεπής is frequently used in Clement, sections 1, 10, 19, 45 and 58. It is only found once in the New Testament. Ταπεινοφρονῶν is also a favorite word with Clement. We find it used twice in section 13, three times in section 16, then in sections 2, 17, 30 and 48, once. This verb occurs only once in the Old Testament and not once in the New Testament.

In regard to ἔργοπαρέκτης (his employer), Mr. Lightfoot states that he has not found any other instance of this word, which is equivalent to ἔργοδότης. Again, of the word πανάγιος he makes this comment, "this is apparently the first occurrence of the word, which afterwards takes a prominent place in the language of Greek Christendom." 3

The large and comprehensive spirit of Clement, as exhibited in the use of the Apostolic writers, has already been
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pointed out. While he draws his arguments from the law of Moses and his illustrations from the Old Testament, thus showing his sympathy with the Judaic side of Christianity, he at the same time uses freely those forms of expression which afterwards became the watchwords of the Gnostic sects and were doubtless frequently heard on the lips of their forerunners, his contemporaries. To this class belong τὰ βαθικά τῆς γνώσεως of which γνώσις is a favorite word with Clement as can be seen in his quoting of it in sections 1, 36 and 41 and especially in section 48, ἐπω δύνατάς γνώσιν ἐξειπεῖν.

The passage, τοῦ μακάριου Παύλου τοῦ ἀποστόλου, of Clement is perhaps the earliest instance of the specially Christian sense of μακάριος. In section 43 he applies the epithet to Moses; in section 55 to Judith. The word continues to be used occasionally of the living and even in later writers. Then in section 59 he uses another form, (θαττόν and τάχιον in the same sentence) which is doubly strange, as it does not occur in the New Testament.

These are some of the words which Clement employed, which were favorites of his, in giving color and detail to the lines of his Epistle.

The term Classical is used to speak of Greek as it was spoken by the Greeks themselves, in their own country, prior to 332 B.C. However when Alexander the Great conquered the Medo-
Persian Empire, his armies spread the knowledge of the Greek language over the then-known world. Remaining as armies of occupation and settling among the conquered peoples, they popularized the language, simplifying its grammatical and syntactical structure. The language, as spoken by them, became what is called Koine Greek. The word Koine means common and refers to the fact that the mingling of the various Greek tribes and dialects in the great armies of Greece produced a common language, a language held in common by all Greeks; whereas before, the country of Greece was divided into various Greek states, each having its own Greek dialect. This Greek is called Koine. This is the Greek that became the international language.

Classical Greek compared to Koine Greek is comparable to English used by the great writers of the past to the English which the average person uses in ordinary conversation. The Greek translation of the Old Testament, the Septuagint, is in the Koine Greek. The New Testament is also written in the same style. Clement likewise writes in the Koine Greek. These therefore were written in the language of the ordinary person, not in the language of the scholar. The following is a list of words showing the Koine elements in Clement's vocabulary. The Classical usage is presented first, then the Koine usage in Clement.

\(\gamma\iota\alpha\xi\omega\). The Classical Greek word meaning to sanctify is \(\gamma\iota\xi\omega\), which means to consecrate, for instance, altars, sacrificial
fices, to set apart for the gods, to present, to offer. The word used in the New Testament answering to ἀγίζω is ἀγίαζω which means, to place in a relation to God answering to His Holiness. Neither word means merely to set apart, but in the case of the pagan word, to set apart for gods, and in the case of the Christian word to set apart for God. The latter is used in the introduction, and sections 35 and 46 of Clement's Epistle.

The word humility is the translation of ταπεινοφροσύνη. The word commonly used by Classical writers which is related to ταπεινοφροσύνη was ταπεινός. Speaking of the use of ταπεινός by Greek writers, Trench says: "the instances are few and exceptional in which ταπεινός signifies anything for them which is not grovelling, slavish, and mean-spirited."¹ He states that this word is associated in the Greek Classics with such words as the following: ἄνελεσθερος (not free, illiberal, slavish, servile, niggardly, stingy), ἄγεννής (without illustrious birth, low-born, cowardly, mean), καταθέως (downcast). But he also shows that at times the word was used with a better meaning. It is linked by Plato² with a word that speaks of certain ones who were honored. Demosthenes³ uses it to describe words that are also moderate, modest, and temperate. Xenophon⁴ sets it over against
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³Loc. cit.
⁴Loc. cit.
those who are described as holding themselves to be above others. Plutarch says that the purpose of divine punishment is that the soul may become wise, prudent (ταπεινός), and fearful before the face of God. The word ταπεινοφροσύνη occurs in the Epistle to the Corinthians in sections 3, 13, 16, 17, 19, 30, 31, 38 and 48 and is translated in these places by the words humility, lowliness of mind and humbleness of mind.

The word ὑπόγραμμα (a copy, an example) is a Koine word which occurs in sections 6, 16 and 33. The Classical word which corresponds is ὑπογραφή. In the word γραφεῖον (the writing), Clement seems to adopt the threefold division of the Old Testament books. In the Classical language γραφεῖον is not a writing but a pen.

Though Clement uses some Classical idioms and words he shows a marked usage of the Koine elements in his vocabulary.
CHAPTER V

EVALUATION OF THE STYLE AS A WHOLE

Clement's reputation as one of the great masters of rhetoric is amply sustained in this study of the mechanics of his art. He uses the devices of rhetoric moderately enough to derive the full benefit from them, though he, at the same time, does not fall into any of their excesses. This moderation, and this choice of a happy mean, give him his pleasing and vivid style.

The theme is logically developed, and the great variety of subjects introduced have a direct bearing on the main theme of the discourse. Sometimes, it is true, interruptions are of considerable length; but even these are skillfully linked to the general development. The number and variety of vivid images and Scriptural quotations, generously interspersed throughout the work, serve as an excellent means to relieve any tendency toward monotony, and thus stimulate the interest of the reader.

The Sophistic influence of Clement's work has often been minimized because any such influence is apparently contrary to his own personal convictions. Actually however, and in spite of his repeated denunciations of profane rhetoric and all that it stood for, he was unconsciously perhaps profoundly influenced; for his early training could not so easily have been ruled out
of his life. Neither should we find fault with him for catering to the tastes of the intellectuals of his time, for in this manner his influence proved to be all the greater.

The rhetorical features of Clement's style, which have been discussed in the various chapters of this treatise, can be briefly recapitulated as follows:

The principle of unity is, we may believe, kept before our author throughout the writing of his Epistle. He uses every possible means to illustrate and enforce his one point. Though he digresses somewhat, yet he is very careful to tell his readers so and to maintain the unity of the discourse.

The two questions asked in regard to coherence, in what order shall one arrange one's material and how shall one make this order apparent?, are quite clearly observed in Clement's Epistle.

Clement's observance of the law of emphasis may be considered extensive. His abundant use of the figures of repetition lend variety to the discourse. There can be little doubt that he used the figure of epanaphora deliberately as a vehicle of forcefulness. The position and proportion which he gave to his details are very clearly marked. A great effect is produced by his stating the objective at the beginning, and then at the end restating it. Nothing else marks so well the unity and the oneness of the discourse. His use of proportion can be termed
consistent and forceful. The figure adds a great deal of emphasis to the discourse, and clarifies the main point.

Among the figures of vivacity, asyndeton, polysyndeton and the rhetorical question are special favorites of Clement. Their consistently frequent use, as well as their wise distribution, produce an unmistakable and energetic liveliness throughout the discourse. Generally Clement uses the elaborate types of these devices, giving the discourse a sense of dignity and deliberateness. Lack of irony is not surprising in an author who is evidently too sincere to indulge in the use of such subleties. Clement uses the figures of argumentation rather sparingly, considering the fact that the treatise is in dialogue form and is argumentative in character from beginning to end. The moderate use of these figures greatly enhances the easy flowing style of the treatise as a whole.

Even the more numerous figures, in the present case, seem to fit into the general construction so neatly that they in no way detract from the sublimity of the moral instruction intended. Although it would appear that some figures are used excessively, they nevertheless accomplish their purpose; and this purpose is never one of mere display, but rather the exposition of the eternal truth.

Clement, it may be stated, had the interest of his readers in mind as he wrote. The excellent illustrations and
Scriptural quotations he used helped greatly in not only explaining his main message but also in creating interest.

The choice and use of words, by which Clement expresses his message, are very appropriate and effective. He uses words which well describe the various phases of his message and which his reader can readily understand.

These, then, are some of the considerations which make desirable a more thorough investigation of rhetorical style in the New Testament. The estimate of the use of rhetoric in the New Testament has not been, in all essentials, true. With the view that the sacred writers were more concerned with the sense than the manner of expression, one has no quarrel. They knew, as well as any author must know, that the two are not so easily divorced. Therefore, if we are to attempt to gain better appreciation of the New Testament authors, surely it is of supreme importance to lay some stress upon points of artistic form; most especially in a literature where form and substance are so indissolubly allied as that of the Greek language, even though the grammar and syntax of the Koine does depart at times from strict Classical rules.
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