New Test. Stud. 59, pp. 415–432. © Cambridge University Press, 2013
doi:10.1017/S0028688513000040

Justification, Good Works, and Creation in Clement of Rome's Appropriation of Romans 5–6*

DAVID J. DOWNS
Fuller Theological Seminary, 135 North Oakland Avenue, Box 258, Pasadena, CA 91182, USA. email: ddowns@fuller.edu.

In *1 Clement* 32–33, Romans 5–6 is alluded to in a summary statement concerning justification by faith (32.4), followed by two rhetorical questions that stress the ethical implications of this confession (33.1). These allusions to Romans are punctuated by an appeal for readers to imitate the pattern of good works established by God during creation (33.2-8). This article contends that the difference between Romans 5–6 and one of the earliest Christian readings of these chapters is not accidental, for the ethical appeal in *1 Clement* 33 reflects the author's distinct cosmological perspective and rhetorical aims.

Keywords: *1 Clement*, creation, justification, reception history, Romans

Study of the reception of Paul's writings in early Christianity is a burgeoning field at the moment.[1] This essay aims to contribute to the reception history of the Pauline letters by exploring one of the earliest appropriations of Paul's letter to

* An earlier version of this essay was presented at 'Creation, Conflict, and Cosmos: A Conference on Romans 5–8 in Celebration of Princeton Theological Seminary's Bicentennial' in Princeton, NJ, 2–5 May 2012. I am grateful to the participants in my short-paper session for the helpful feedback they offered and to Prof. Beverly Roberts Gaventa for organizing the conference and encouraging me to submit a paper proposal.

1 Still worth consulting on this topic is A. Lindemann, *Paulus im ältesten Christentum: Das Bild des Apostels und die Rezeption der paulinischen Theologie in der frühchristlichen Literatur bis Marcion* (BHT 58; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1979). More recent contributions include: W. S. Babcock, ed., *Paul and the Legacies of Paul* (Dallas: Southern Methodist University, 1990); C. J. Roetzel, 'Paul in the Second Century', *The Cambridge Companion to St. Paul* (ed. J. D. G. Dunn; Cambridge: Cambridge University, 2003) 227-41; J. Aageson, *Paul, the Pastoral Epistles, and the Early Church* (Library of Pauline Studies; Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2008); M. F. Bird and J. R. Dodson, eds., *Paul and the Second Century* (LNTS 412; New York and London: T&T Clark, 2011); and K. Liljeström, ed., *The Early Reception of Paul* (Publications of the Finnish Exegetical Society 99; Helsinki: Finnish Exegetical Society, 2011).

the church in Rome, namely, a reading of Romans 5–6 found in *1 Clement* 32–33. The thesis of this article is that, although the author of *1 Clement* 32–33 adopts from Romans the language of justification by faith and the conviction that those who are justified must perform good works, the ethical exhortation in *1 Clement* 33 is rooted in a cosmology that differs significantly from that found in Romans. Whereas Paul in Romans 5–8 depicts human and non-human creation as existing in bondage to decay and groaning under subjugation to hostile powers (Rom 8.18-23), the author of *1 Clement* images all creation living in harmony and peace in obedience to God (esp. *1 Clem.* 20), an idyllic representation that serves Clement's goal of promoting concord among his divisive Corinthian audience. Yet while the material presentation of the κόσμος in *1 Clement* may differ substantially from Paul's in Romans, the author of *1 Clement* follows Paul rhetorically in using cosmology as an instrument of community critique and reorientation.

1. The Context of *1 Clement*

1 Clement is a letter sent by the church in Rome to believers in Corinth, probably sometime toward the end of the first century of the Common Era.[2] Although the document is called '*1 Clement*' because of an early tradition that it was written by Clement, the third bishop of Rome,[3] the letter itself names no individual author and purports only to originate from 'the church of God that sojourns in Rome' (prescript; cf. 65.2), even if its stylistic and literary unity suggests that it is the creation of a single hand.[4] For the sake of convenience, I shall refer to the author of the text variously as 'the author' and 'Clement', although I do not believe that we can maintain with certainty that the text was actually written by a historical person called Clement, still less that its author was an early Roman bishop.

2 A date in the last two decades of the first century is likely because of (1) the allusion in *1 Clem.* 5–6 to the deaths of Peter and Paul, in the past, during the persecution under Nero and (2) the implication of *1 Clem.* 44 that some leaders appointed by 'our apostles' are still alive. Thus, the letter cannot have been before the late 60s or early 70s and is not likely to have been written after the end of the first century. For thorough discussions, see H. E. Lona, *Der erste Clemensbrief: Übersetzt und erklärt* (KAV 2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998) 75-8, and A. Lindemann, *Die Clemensbriefe* (HNT 17; Die Apostolischen Väter I; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1992) 11-20.

3 Early sources that attribute the letter to Clement, bishop of Rome, include Irenaeus (*Haer.* 3.3.3), Tertullian (*Praescr.* 32.2), and Eusebius (*Hist. eccl.* 3.16; 3.4.9; cf. Eusebius's citation of a letter from Dionysius of Corinth in *Hist. eccl.* 4.23.11).

4 Unless otherwise noted, the text and translation of *1 Clement* used in this essay are adapted from M. W. Holmes, *The Apostolic Fathers: Greek Texts and English Translations* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 3rd ed. 2007). All translations of the NT are adapted from the NRSV.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688513000040 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The general occasion for *1 Clement* can be reconstructed with some confidence from allusions throughout the epistle to the experience of conflict among the Corinthian believers to whom the epistle is addressed. The text opens with a reference to 'the matters in dispute among you, dear friends, especially the detestable and unholy schism' (1.1). In *1 Clem.* 3.1-4 the author cites Deut 32.15 to claim that 'jealousy and envy, strife and sedition, persecution and anarchy, war and captivity' have come to the Corinthians (3.2), and this scriptural citation is followed by a reference to various groups within the church being 'stirred up' against one another: 'those without honor against the honored, those of no repute against the highly reputed, the foolish against the wise, the young against the old' (3.3). More explicit is the indication in *1 Clement* 44 and 47 that the Corinthians had rebelled against and removed from ministry certain leaders—identified as those holding the office of ἐπισκοπή (44.1, 4) and also as οἱ πρεσβύτεροι (47.6)—an act of 'schism' (σχίσμα) that the author of the letter believes 'has brought many to despair, plunged many into doubt, and caused all of us to sorrow' (46.9), particularly because of Clement's conviction that the deposed leaders had fulfilled their ministry blamelessly. Information about this conflict in Corinth reached the church in Rome, and the Roman believers responded by dispatching this letter, framed in the discourse of deliberative rhetoric, along with a delegation from the church in Rome (63.3-4; 65.1).[5]

The aim of the epistle is pithily summarized near its conclusion in 63.2: 'For you will give us great joy and gladness if you obey what we have written through the Holy Spirit and root out the unlawful anger of your jealousy, in accordance with the appeal for *peace and harmony* that we have made in this letter'. Practically, this goal of 'peace and harmony' will be manifested in the restoration to office of the deposed leaders, accompanied by either the departure of the rebels (54.2) or the submission of repentant schismatics to the authority of the presbyters (57.1–58.2). We shall return in due course to the letter's goal of promoting peace and harmony, for it is directly related to the author's cosmology.

2. *1 Clement* and Paul's Letter to the Romans

The first task of this article is to show that the letter called *1 Clement* does, in fact, offer a reading of Romans 5–6. Before we consider specific linguistic evidence from the letter, however, it is worth pointing out that references to Paul's letters—and 1 Corinthians and Romans in particular—in *1 Clement* are *a priori* likely, given (1) the author's knowledge of the tradition concerning Paul's death

5 For an excellent study of *1 Clement* as an example of deliberative rhetoric, see O. M. Bakke, *'Concord and Peace': A Rhetorical Analysis of the First Letter of Clement with an Emphasis on the Language of Unity and Sedition* (WUNT 2/141; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688513000040 Published online by Cambridge University Press

in Rome in *1 Clem.* 5.5-7, (2) the historical existence of close connections between the Corinthian and Roman congregations, both recipients of Paul's letters, from the earliest apostolic times (e.g. Acts 18.1-3; Rom 16.1-16; 2 Tim 4.20), and (3) the likelihood of continuity between the community to which Paul first addressed his epistle to the Romans and the Christian believers in Rome at Clement's time.[6] Considering these factors, it would be unusual if the author of *1 Clement* did not betray any evidence of an awareness of Paul's letters to Corinth and Rome.

Not surprisingly, then, the author of *1 Clement* not only directly cites 1 Cor 1.10 in *1 Clem.* 47.1-3, but also attributes the statement to 'the epistle of the blessed Paul the apostle'.[7] Given the author's aim of extinguishing factionalism and encouraging peace among his contemporaries in Corinth, an explicit appeal to material from 1 Corinthians 1–4, a text in which the apostle Paul addresses a similar issue among the same Corinthian congregation some thirty years earlier, is entirely expected.[8]

Evidence for Clement's use of Romans is equally compelling. 'Practically certain' is the literary relationship between the vice lists of Rom 1.29-32 and *1 Clem.* 35.5-6.[9] Additional links between Romans and *1 Clement* can be found

6 Regardless of the meaning of the phrase ἐπὶ τὸ τέρμα τῆς δύσεως ἐλθών in *1 Clem.* 5.7, which I take be an allusion to Paul's travels to Spain (whether those journeys are historical or not), the phrase μαρτυρήσας ἐπὶ τῶν ἡγουμένων ('having borne witness before the rulers') probably suggests Paul's witness before Roman imperial officials in Rome, even if the geographical location of this testimony is not expressly articulated. On the origins of the tradition of Paul's death in Rome, see M. Bockmuehl, 'Peter's Death in Rome? Back to Front and Upside Down', *SJT* 60 (2007) 1-23; D. L. Eastman, *Paul the Martyr: The Cult of the Apostle in the Latin West* (Writings from the Greco-Roman World Supplements; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011) 16-24 (cf. Phil 1.20-23; 2 Tim 4.6; Acts 20.17-38; B. Dehandschutter, 'Some Notes on 1 Clement 5,4-7', *IP* 19 [1989] 83-9; H. Löhr, 'Zur Paulus-Notiz in *1 Clem* 5,5-7', *Das Ende des Paulus: Historische, theologische und literaturgeschichtliche Aspekte* [ed. F. W. Horn; BZNW 106; Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 2001] 197-213).

7 D. A. Hagner identifies in *1 Clement* knowledge of all the Pauline epistles except for 1–2 Thessalonians and Philemon (*The Use of the Old and New Testaments in Clement of Rome* [NovTSup 34; Leiden: Brill, 1973] 236-7). Even if some have questioned Hagner's maximalist approach, there is no debate about the fact that the author of *1 Clement* cites or alludes to material from both 1 Corinthians and Romans (so A. J. Carlyle in *The New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers* [Oxford: Clarendon, 1905] 38-42; Lindemann, *Paulus im ältesten Christentum*, 177-99; Lindemann, *Clemensbriefe*, 17-18; Lona, *Erste Clemensbrief*, 49).

8 See Hagner, *Use*, 195. For a more recent (and generally more cautious) discussion, see A. F. Gregory, '*1 Clement* and the Writings that Later Formed the New Testament', *The Reception of the New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers* (ed. A. F. Gregory and C. Tuckett; 2 vols.; Oxford: Oxford University, 2005) 1.129-57.

9 Carlyle, *New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers*, 38. That Paul and the author of *1 Clement* independently drew upon an earlier tradition cannot be ruled out (a possibility considered by Lindemann, *Paulus im ältesten Christentum*, 188), but such an explanation seems unlikely, especially considering other external and internal factors in favor of Clement's knowledge of Romans.

throughout the latter epistle, but the next strongest parallel—and the key text for our purposes—is located in *1 Clement* 32–33.[10]

Rom 5.21–6.2[11]	*1 Clem.* 32.4–33.1
5.21 ἵνα ὥσπερ ἐβασίλευσεν ἡ ἁμαρτία ἐν τῷ θανάτῳ, οὕτως καὶ ἡ χάρις βασιλεύσῃ διὰ **δικαιοσύνης** εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν.	32.4 καὶ ἡμεῖς οὖν, διὰ θελήματος αὐτοῦ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ κληθέντες, οὐ δι᾽ ἑαυτῶν **δικαιούμεθα** οὐδὲ διὰ τῆς ἡμετέρας σοφίας ἢ συνέσεως ἢ εὐσεβείας ἢ ἔργων ὧν κατειργασάμεθα ἐν ὁσιότητι καρδίας, ἀλλὰ διὰ τῆς πίστεως, δι᾽ ἧς πάντας τοὺς ἀπ᾽ αἰῶνος ὁ παντοκράτωρ θεὸς **ἐδικαίωσεν,** ᾧ ἔστω ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. ἀμήν.
6.1 **Τί οὖν** ἐροῦμεν; ἐπιμένωμεν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ, ἵνα ἡ χάρις πλεονάσῃ;	33.1 **Τί οὖν** ποιήσωμεν, ἀδελφοί; ἀργήσωμεν ἀπὸ τῆς ἀγαθοποιΐας καὶ ἐγκαταλίπωμεν τὴν ἀγάπην;
6.2 μὴ γένοιτο. οἵτινες ἀπεθάνομεν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ, πῶς ἔτι ζήσομεν ἐν αὐτῇ;	μηθαμῶς τοῦτο ἐάσαι ὁ δεσπότης ἐφ᾽ ἡμῖν γε γενηθῆναι, ἀλλὰ σπεύσωμεν μετὰ ἐκτενείας καὶ προθυμίας πᾶν ἔργον ἀγαθὸν ἐπιτελεῖν.

3. Romans 5–6 in *1 Clement* 32–33

There are notable linguistic and stylistic connections between these two passages, including Clement's use of the literary device of diatribe. The links are even more formidable at the conceptual level, however: both feature the language and logic of justification by faith (Rom 5.21; cf. 5.1: 'Therefore, since we are justified by faith…'); both raise rhetorical questions related to the possibility that justification by God's grace might provide a license for ethical laxity, either sin (Rom 6.1) or failing to do good and to demonstrate love (*1 Clem.* 33.1); and both emphatically reject the logic of antinomianism by pointing out the ethical implications of justification and calling readers to moral transformation,

10 The next most compelling of the additional connections is probably *1 Clem.* 32.2//Rom 9.5. Other possible allusions, none of which are decisive, would include: *1 Clem.* 30.6//Rom 2.29b; *1 Clem.* 31.1//Rom 6.1; *1 Clem.* 34.2//Rom 11.36; *1 Clem.* 36.2; 51.5//Rom 1.21; *1 Clem.* 37.5//Rom 12.4; *1 Clem.* 38.1; 46.7//Rom 12.4; *1 Clem.* 47.7//Rom 2.24; and *1 Clem.* 50.6-7//Rom 4.7-9.

11 Text in bold indicates a verbal or cognate parallel; underlined text indicates a conceptual overlap.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688513000040 Published online by Cambridge University Press

either through walking in the new life that comes from freedom from sin (Rom 6.3-7) or through the performance of good works (*1 Clem.* 33.1-2, 8).[12]

The aspect of Clement's reading of Romans here that has generated the most scholarly discussion is found in the assertion that 'we are not justified through ourselves…but through faith' (οὐ δι᾽ ἑαυτῶν δικαιούμεθα…ἀλλὰ διὰ τῆς πίστεως), with this statement often viewed as one of the earliest post-apostolic expressions of the Pauline doctrine of justification by faith. This articulation notwithstanding, previous generations of interpreters—especially in the German tradition—tended to dismiss the soteriology of *1 Clement* as a lamentable departure from the radical grace of Paul's gospel, an exodus into the self-justifying, moralistic legalism represented by the bogeyman of either 'Hellenistic Judaism' or 'early Catholicism'. Thus, Rudolf Knopf, in his influential 1920 commentary on *1 Clement*, declared the language of faith and works in Clement to represent *Synergismus*:

> Faith (grace) and good works—this is the new formula that characterizes the early church, and with this formula the development of the Old Catholic Church emerges. Pre-Christian sins are wiped out by baptism. For those sins that follow, a person must have faith in divine mercy *and*, at the same time, that person must exhibit his or her own good deeds, apart from which the person cannot be saved.[13]

Knopf was followed in his interpretation of *1 Clement* by Rudolf Bultmann, who identified *1 Clement* as the clearest example of a movement in the early church away from the Pauline doctrine of *sola gratia* toward the view that humans must perform good works in order to obtain future salvation.[14] According to

12 In addition to these connections, it should be noted that the encouragement to consider the ways of God's blessing in *1 Clem.* 31 begins by reminding readers that Abraham was blessed 'because he attained righteousness and truth through faith' (δικαιοσύνην καὶ ἀλήθειαν διὰ πίστεως ποιήσας, 31.2). This correlation of (1) Abraham, (2) δικαιοσύνη, and (3) πίστις parallels the discussion of similar themes in Rom 4.1-25. Unlike Paul, however, the author of *1 Clement* follows the reference to Abraham by pointing also to the examples of Isaac and Jacob (*1 Clem.* 31.3-4). Earlier in the letter, the author of *1 Clement* also cites Gen 15.5-6 with reference to Abraham's justification by faith (10.6). On the reference to Isaac's willing sacrifice in *1 Clem.* 31.3 as one of the earliest examples of the Aqedah tradition in Christian literature, see L. A. Huizenga, 'The Aqedah at the End of the First Century of the Common Era: *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum, 4 Maccabees,* Josephus' *Antiquities, 1 Clement*', *JSP* 20 (2010) 105-33, esp. 131-3.

13 R. Knopf, *Die Apostolischen Väter: Die Lehre der zwölf Apostel. Die zwei Clemensbriefe* (HNTSup 1; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1920) 98; my translation.

14 See R. Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament* (2 vols.; trans. K. Grobel; New York: Scribner's, 1951–55) 2.200-1. Following Bultmann, S. Schulz's study of 'early Catholicism' declares *1 Clement*; to represent 'die Selbstrechtfertigung der Frommen aufgrund geleisteter und verdienstlicher Tugenden' (*Die Mitte der Schrift: Der Frühkatholizismus im Neuen Testament als Herausforderung an den Protestantismus* [Stuttgart: Kreuz, 1976] 322). In English-speaking scholarship, T. F. Torrance (*The Doctrine of Grace in the Apostolic Fathers*

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688513000040 Published online by Cambridge University Press

this view, either the Pauline-sounding statement about justification in *1 Clem.* 32.4 employs the terminology of πίστις and δικαιόω in markedly different ways from how that same vocabulary is used in the undisputed Pauline letters or this one avowal of justification by faith stands in tension with the rest of Clement's letter, a document that is alleged elsewhere consistently to affirm justification by works.[15]

More recent scholarship has suggested that this unsympathetic reading of *1 Clement* is deeply flawed, however.[16] First, any interpretation of *1 Clement* must account for the rhetorical nature of the composition. The author of *1 Clement* is not offering a soteriological treatise but is instead providing practical paraenesis for members of the Corinthian congregation as they negotiate the aftermath of a serious internal conflict. Second, while the author of *1 Clement* does consistently stress the fact that human behavior can incur God's blessing or wrath, Clement's stress on judgment according to works must be located in the larger context of the document's emphasis on divine compassion and divine agency in salvation. Those to whom the letter is addressed, for example, are 'called and sanctified by the will of God through our Lord Jesus Christ' (prescript; cf. 1.1); God is the giver of peace, of the desire to do good, and of the Holy Spirit (2.2); God has poured out the blood of Christ for the salvation of the whole world (7.4; cf. 21.6); and those from Adam to the present day who are perfected in love receive this perfection—and with it a place among the godly—by God's grace (50.3). According to the soteriological economy of *1 Clement*, 'everything rests on the goodness, mercy, and election of the Creator, which have befitted the "chosen portion" through Jesus Christ. Since God has acted in this way, it is people's duty to do his will in obedience.'[17] This emphasis on divine initiative

[London and Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1948]) is consistently negative in his appraisal of the soteriology of *1 Clement*; of the role of Christ in salvation: 'In the last resort therefore Clement is unable to ascribe saving significance to Christ himself' (47); of *1 Clem.* 32: 'There can be no doubt that this is Pauline language, but it cannot be understood in a Pauline fashion' (50); 'Like the whole mass of Judaistic writers, Clement thinks of God's mercy as directed only toward the pious; and if he uses the word χάρις, as in Philo, it carries with it the same principle' (55).

15 So T. Aono, *Die Entwicklung des paulinischen Gerichtsgedanken bei den Apostolischen Vätern* (EHS 23/137; Bern: Lang, 1979) 80-2.

16 H. Räisänen, '"Werkgerechtigkeit"—Eine Frühkatholische Lehre? Überlegungen zum 1. Klemensbrief', *Studia Theologica* 37 (1983) 79-99; an English translation is available as '"Righteousness by Works": An Early Catholic Doctrine? Thoughts on 1 Clement', *Jesus, Paul and Torah: Collected Essays* (trans. D. E. Orton; Sheffield: JSOT, 1992) 203-24; see also the careful discussions in Lindemann, *Clemensbriefe*, 98-100, and Lona, *Erste Clemensbrief*, 363-5.

17 Räisänen, 'Righteousness by Works', 211. I would disagree, however, with Räisänen's contention that *1 Clement* is so completely theocentric that 'Christ could be completely removed

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688513000040 Published online by Cambridge University Press

in salvation, coupled with a stress on the fact that God's mercy should lead to good deeds while the failure to perform good works will lead to divine judgment, is fully compatible with the soteriology of the Pauline epistles.[18] Far from offering a departure from the Pauline doctrine of justification by faith, *1 Clement* represents an early and emphatic adoption and recontextualization of it.

There is much more that could be said regarding the language of justification by faith in *1 Clem.* 32.4. My primary interest in this article, however, lies less in the specific nature of Clement's appropriation of the Pauline doctrine of justification by faith than with the relationship of this confession to the ethics and cosmology of *1 Clement*. For just as Paul concludes his discussion of justification by faith in Romans 5 by posing a question about the significance of this teaching for the behavior of those who are justified by faith in Christ in Rom 6.1—'What then are we to say? Should we continue in sin in order that grace may abound?'—so also Clement emulates the Apostle by following his own statement of justification with a rhetorical question focused on the obedience of those whom God has justified: 'What then shall we do, brothers and sisters? Shall we idly abstain from doing good, and forsake love?' (33.1). For both Paul and the author of *1 Clement*, the answer to these questions is clearly, 'No'. For each of these authors, justification by faith has profound implications for the moral transformation of believers in the present. Yet in articulating the *warrant* for such ethical behavior, Clement of Rome demonstrates a perspective that differs significantly from his apostolic forebear.

According to Paul in Romans 6, those who are called to belong to Jesus cannot continue to live in sin because the enslaving power of sin has been destroyed by the believer's participation in Christ's death and resurrection through faith and the ritual of baptism. Romans 6, in fact, presents one of the most focused and powerful declarations of participationist soteriology in the Pauline letters

---

from Clement's theology without any change to its basic structure' (215). Torrance expresses a similar sentiment: 'Much use is made of Pauline expressions, and once Clement actually speaks of faith in Christ, but nevertheless there is no doubt that faith pertains "not so much to the person of Christ as to Christ's precepts" and the real object of faith is God alone' (*Doctrine*, 46; quotation from R. A. Lipsius, *De Clementis Romani epistola ad Corinthios priore disquisitio* [Leipzig: Brockhaus, 1855] 74). For more positive assessments of the importance of Clement's christology for his pastoral paraenesis, see Lona, *Erste Clemensbrief*, 398-407; Bakke, *Concord and Peace*, 327-41.

18 Cf. Rom 2.6-10; 8.13; 14.10-12; 1 Cor 3.10-15; 2 Cor 5.10; Gal 6.7-8; Col 3.25; Eph 2.10; 6.8; 1 Tim 5.24-25; 2 Tim 4.8, 14. On the motif of judgment according to deeds in Paul's letters, see K. L. Yinger, *Paul, Judaism, and Judgment according to Deeds* (SNTSMS 105; Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1999); M. F. Bird, *The Saving Righteousness of God: Studies on Paul, Justification, and the New Perspective* (Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2007) 155-78; K. Kim, *God Will Judge Each One according to Works: Judgment according to Works and Psalm 62 in Early Judaism and the New Testament* (BZNW 178; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2010).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688513000040 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(cf. Gal 2.19-20; 1 Cor 15.20-28; 2 Cor 4.5-12; 5.17; Phil 3.8-11).[19] Death to sin and sin's enslaving power is signified by the believer's burial with Christ in the act of baptism, and those who join in Christ's death through baptism are assured of their participation in Christ's resurrection (6.5, 8). For this reason, Paul can issue an imperative of new existence, free from the power and passions of sin, for those 'who have been brought from death to life' (Rom 6.13). Paul's negative answer to the question, 'Should we continue to sin in order that grace may abound?', then, is formed by his conviction regarding the believer's participatory union in Christ's crucifixion and resurrection, a shared narrative made possible by God's grace and resulting in the believer's death to sin and release from sin's enslaving power.[20]

Clement, on the other hand, roots his ethical exhortation in an appeal for readers to imitate the pattern of good works established by God during creation (*1 Clem.* 33.2-8). The Corinthian believers are urged first to 'hasten with earnestness and zeal to accomplish every good work' (πᾶν ἔργον ἀγαθὸν ἐπιτελεῖν, 33.1), for with this commitment to the performance of good deeds they emulate God, 'the Creator and Master of the universe', who rejoices in his own works.[21] There follows in *1 Clem.* 33.3-6 a litany of the works of the Creator, an account roughly modeled on the creation narrative in Genesis 1. As in Genesis 1, and supported by a direct citation of Gen 1.26-27, the fabrication of humankind in God's own image represents the high point of Clement's brief narrative of beginnings (*1 Clem.* 33.4-6). The Lord's adorning of himself with good works in the act of creating the heavens, the earth and water, all living creatures, and humankind, the crown jewel of the created world, thus serves as an example (ὑπογραμμός) for readers of the letter to follow in order to conform themselves to the divine will, a conformity demonstrated by their doing 'the work of righteousness' (33.7-8). It is not that participationist soteriology is entirely absent in *1 Clement*, but such a conviction is muted throughout the letter,[22] and it is not found in

19 On the notion of participation in Christ in the Pauline writings, see, e.g., M. Hooker, 'Interchange in Christ', *JTS* 22 (1971) 349-61; R. C. Tannehill, 'Participation in Christ: A Central Theme in Pauline Soteriology', *The Shape of the Gospel: New Testament Essays* (Eugene: Cascade, 2007) 223-37; J. D. G. Dunn, *The Theology of Paul the Apostle* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998) 390-441; and now C. R. Campbell, *Paul and Union with Christ: An Exegetical and Theological Study* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2012).

20 See especially B. Byrne, 'Living Out the Righteousness of God: The Contribution of Rom 6.1–8.13 to an Understanding of Paul's Ethical Presuppositions', *CBQ* 43 (1981) 557-81.

21 Including this statement, the phrase 'good work' (ἔργον ἀγαθόν: 2.7; 34.4) and its plural form 'good works' (33.7 [2×]; 38.2) occur six times in the letter.

22 If by the term 'participationist soteriology' we mean that believers experience the saving benefits of Christ through their union with him in his death and resurrection, there are a few places where the author of *1 Clement* hints at this soteriological model. For example, the author's claim in 24.1 that the Lord Jesus Christ is the 'firstfruit' (ἀπαρχή) of the coming resurrection of believers (τὴν μέλλουσαν ἀνάστασιν) both alludes to the Pauline

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688513000040 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Clement's explicit appropriation of Romans 5–6 in *1 Clement* 32–33.[23] Instead, the author of *1 Clement* turns to creation for evidence of the character of God when encouraging readers to imitate God's own work and to conform to the divine will.

4. Cosmology and Ethics in *1 Clement*

I would like to suggest that these two different *warrants* for ethical behavior also reflect substantive differences in the cosmological perspectives of Paul and Clement, at least insofar as the cosmologies of Romans and *1 Clement* are related to the rhetorical and theological concerns of their respective authors. When I use the term 'cosmology', I am referring to one's view of the origin, nature, and purpose of the *cosmos*, the physical universe. Since both Paul and

concept in 1 Cor 15.20-28 of Jesus' resurrection as the 'firstfruits' of a future resurrection and implies that believers will share in Jesus' narrative trajectory. Additionally, if the verb ἐνοπτρίζομαι in *1 Clem.* 36.2 connotes the idea that believers themselves *reflect* the 'faultless and transcendent face' of Christ (perhaps with an allusion to the similarly participatory language of 2 Cor 3.18, where the cognate verb κατοπτρίζω is found), then perhaps this text also speaks of believers' mystical union with Christ. To these two texts we might add statements in *1 Clement* about the believing community as the body of Christ (37.5–38.1; 46.7) and possibly some instances of the locution ἐν Χριστῷ (1.2; 21.8; 22.1; 32.4; 38.1; 43.1; 46.6; 47.6; 49.1; 54.3).

23 If *1 Clem.* 7.4 ('Let us fix our eyes on the blood of Christ and understand how precious it is to his Father, because, being poured out for our salvation, it won for the whole world the grace of repentance') does, in fact, reveal that 'the idea of salvation through the blood-of-Christ in 1 Clement is rooted in the eucharistic and corporate life of the early Christian community', as E. W. Fisher has argued, then perhaps it would be possible to argue for the presence of a sacramental and participationist soteriology in the congregation's sharing in the death of Jesus through the observation of the Eucharist ('"Let Us Look upon the Blood-of-Christ" (1 Clement 7:4)', *VC* 34 [1980] 218-36, esp. 218). According to Fisher, *1 Clem.* 7.4 indicates that, as the believer gazes upon the blood of Christ during the ritual celebration of the Eucharist, one 'beholds his saviour, or his salvation. He appropriates to himself the salvation by means of seeing, that is through *a visual participation in the divine*' (234, emphasis added). Unfortunately, Fisher's form-critical argument that *1 Clem.* 7.4 refers to Eucharistic practice is unpersuasive, not least because Fisher isolates the so-called 'exhortation form' in *1 Clem.* 7.4 (i.e. a hortatory subjunctive) from the larger context of pastoral paraenesis found throughout the document. Excluding the occurrence in scriptural citations, first-person plural hortatory subjunctives are directed to readers in *1 Clem.* 5.1 (2×), 3; 7.2 (2×), 3, 4 (2×), 5; 9.1 (3×), 2, 3; 13.1 (2×), 3; 14.3; 15.1; 17.1; 19.2 (2×), 3 (3×); 21.3, 5, 6 (5×); 24.1, 2, 4; 25.1; 27.3; 28.1 (2×); 29.1; 30.1, 3 (2×); 31.1 (3×); 33.1, 7, 8 (2×); 34.5 (2×), 7; 35.4; 37.1, 2, 5; 38.3; 46.4; 48.1 (3×); 50.2 (2×); 51.1; 56.1, 2; 58.1. Thus, Fisher's claim that the use of the subjunctive form of the verb ἀτενίζω in *1 Clem.* 7.4 represents an example of 'the dominant form-critical category' of 'epiphany' fails to account for the frequency of subjunctive appeals throughout *1 Clement*.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688513000040 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the author of *1 Clement* hold to the conviction that the physical world is the product of God's purposeful action, it is appropriate also to speak of each author's view of 'creation'.[24]

The cosmology of Romans is complex, and can only be summarized in the briefest terms in the present study.[25] In a recent article on this topic, Beverly Gaventa has shown that Paul generally uses the term κόσμος in Romans in a neutral way, sometimes to refer to humanity as a whole (1.8; 3.6) and once to refer to God's creation of the universe as a display that ought to have evoked praise and worship of God as Creator among human beings (1.20; cf. 3.19).[26] Gaventa also demonstrates, however, that 'one important, perhaps the most important, aspect of Paul's cosmology in Romans is that humanity (i.e. the human cosmos) is at present the object of a conflict between God and anti-God powers. That is, the universe is inhabited by powers other than the power of God and the frail power of human beings.'[27] Not only is humanity apart from Christ captive to the powers of Sin and Death, but, as Rom 8.19-23 indicates, even non-human creation is bound up, along with humanity, in its subjection to futility; humans in Christ and non-human creation together groan in expectation of their freedom from bondage to decay.[28] Thus, the κόσμος in Romans, which includes both human beings and non-human creation, is presently, as Gaventa puts it, 'the location of a

24 See, e.g., the essays in J. Pennington and S. M. McDonough, eds., *Cosmology and New Testament Theology* (LNTS 355; London: T&T Clark, 2008), especially the introduction to J. White, 'Paul's Cosmology: The Witness of Romans, 1 and 2 Corinthians, and Galatians', 90-106.

25 See E. Adams, *Constructing the World: A Study in Paul's Cosmological Language* (Studies of the New Testament and Its World; London: T&T Clark, 1999) 151-220; B. Byrne, 'An Ecological Reading of Rom. 8.19-22', *Ecological Hermeneutics: Biblical, Historical and Theological Perspectives* (ed. D. G. Horrell et al.; London: T&T Clark, 2010) 83-93; O. Wischmeyer, 'Kosmos und Kosmologie bei Paulus', *Weltkonstruktionen: Religiöse Weltdeutung zwischen Chaos und Kosmos vom Alten Orient bis zum Islam* (ed. P. Gemeinhardt and A. Zgoll; ORA 5; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010) 87-102. White, 'Paul's Cosmology', constructs a nine-point 'cosmological narrative' based on material from a variety of Paul's letters.

26 Rom 4.13 should probably be included as a use of κόσμος to refer to the physical creation; see M. Forman, *The Politics of Inheritance in Romans* (SNTSMS 148; Cambridge: Cambridge University, 2011) 58-101.

27 B. R. Gaventa, 'Neither Height nor Depth: Discerning the Cosmology of Romans', *SJT* 64 (2011) 265-78 (270).

28 In spite of the majority view that κτίσις in Rom 8.19-23 represents non-human creation, Gaventa advances a persuasive argument that κτίσις is 'as an all-encompassing term, one which refers to everything God has created, including humanity' ('Neither Height', 276). For a reading of the text that highlights the close connections between human and nonhuman creation in Rom 8.19-23, see D. G. Horrell, C. Hunt, and C. Southgate, *Greening Paul: Reading the Apostle in a Time of Ecological Crisis* (Waco: Baylor University, 2010); cf. J. Bolt, 'The Relationship between Creation and Redemption in Romans 8.18-27', *CJT* 30 (1995) 34-51; J. Moo, 'Romans 8.19-22 and Isaiah's Cosmic Covenant', *NTS* 54 (2008) 74-89.

conflict between God and anti-God powers, most prominently the powers of Sin and Death'.[29]

When we turn to the portrayal of the origin, nature, and purpose of the *cosmos* in *1 Clement*, a very different picture emerges. In considering this topic, pride of place must be given to the praise of peace and harmony in creation found in *1 Clement* 20, a passage that has perhaps received more attention than any other in the letter. Having introduced the theme of humility in ch. 16, the author provides a series of scriptural models of this virtue in 16.1–18.17, a section that begins with an extended reflection on the pattern (ὁ ὑπογραμμός) of humility provided by Christ (16.1-17) and concludes with examples from the biblical tradition, including the prophets Elijah, Elisha, and Ezekiel (17.1); Abraham (17.2); Job (17.3-4); Moses (17.5-6); and, with an extended citation of Psalm 51, David (18.1-17). It seems that this motif of mimesis continues at the beginning of ch. 19, although the focus shifts from the imitation of humble predecessors (ταπεινόφρων) in 19.1 to the imitation of the peace and harmony of God's creation in 19.2-3. The 'hymn of the universe' that follows paints an idyllic picture of the peace and harmony of the entire created order:[30]

> 20 [1]The heavens move at his direction and obey him in peace (ἐν εἰρήνῃ). [2]Day and night complete the course assigned by him, neither hindering the other. [3]The sun and moon and the choirs of stars circle in harmony (ἐν ὁμονοίᾳ) within the courses assigned to them, according to his direction, without any deviation at all. [4]The earth, bearing fruit in the proper seasons in fulfillment of his will, brings forth food in full abundance for both humans and beasts and all living things that dwell upon it without dissension and without altering anything he has decreed. [5]Moreover, the incomprehensible depths of the abysses and the indescribable judgments of the underworld are constrained by the same ordinances. [6]The basin of the boundless sea, gathered together by his creative action into its reservoirs, does not flow beyond the barriers surrounding it; instead it behaves just as he ordered it. [7]For he said: 'Thus far shall you come, and your waves shall break within you'. [8]The ocean—impassible a by humans—and the worlds beyond it are directed by the same ordinances of the Master. [9]The seasons, spring and summer and autumn and winter, give way in succession, one to the other, in peace (ἐν εἰρήνῃ). [10]The winds from the different quarters fulfill their ministry in the proper season without disturbance; the ever-flowing springs, created for enjoyment and health, give without fail their life-sustaining breasts to humankind. Even the smallest living things come together in harmony and peace (ἐν ὁμονοίᾳ καὶ εἰρήνῃ). [11]All these things the great Creator and Master of the universe ordered to exist in peace and harmony (εἰρήνῃ καὶ ὁμονοίᾳ), thus doing good to all things, but especially abundantly to us who have taken refuge in his compassionate mercies through our Lord Jesus Christ, [12]to whom be the glory and majesty for ever and ever. Amen.

29 Gaventa, 'Neither Height', 265.

30 The phrase 'hymn of the universe' comes from Bakke, *Concord and Peace*, 164; cf. Lindemann, *Clemensbriefe*, 67-75.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688513000040 Published online by Cambridge University Press

This passage has received considerable scholarly attention because of a long-standing debate about the possible influence of Stoic and/or Jewish sources upon the author's thought. An impressive array of Stoic parallels can be considered in comparison with *1 Clem.* 20.1-12, not least because a number of Stoic sources also emphasize the harmonious nature of the universe, often with notable linguistic overlap with this text.[31] While recognizing the presence of Stoic themes and terminology, Willem van Unnik, in an influential article, highlighted the motif of harmony (ὁμόνοια) in creation in a number of Palestinian Jewish writings, arguing that 'the point of view of the Stoics is anthropocentric, that of 1 Clement theocentric, his "theos" being the God of the Old Testament'.[32] More recently, Cilliers Breytenbach has shown that numerous Stoic texts map notions of cosmic harmony onto portrayals of (or arguments for) civic harmony. Breytenbach suggests that Clement's depiction of cosmic concord as an example for the Corinthian community to follow participates in this same tradition of political rhetoric, even as Clement's 'Jewish Christian monotheistic tradition' shapes the author's conviction that true cosmic harmony is accomplished by the one Creator.[33]

For the purposes of the present article, more important than the alleged background of *1 Clement* 20 is the function of its passage in this present literary context.[34] As it stands, the chapter serves two purposes. First, as we have seen in *1 Clement* 34, to the extent that readers of the letter are encouraged to emulate the good works of God, which are manifestly demonstrated in God's creation of the world, God's praiseworthy activity as Creator provides a pattern for imitation (cf. *1 Clem.* 33.7-8). Note that the 'hymn of the universe' is introduced in 19.2-3 with a series of six first-person subjunctive exhortations, four of which are verbs of sight or perception (ἀτενίζω, ὁράω, ἐμβλέπω, νοέω) whose object is 'the Father and Maker of the whole world'.

> Seeing, then, that we have a share in many great and glorious deeds,[35]
> let us hasten on to the goal of peace,

31 Pseudo-Aristotle *[Mund.]* 397a; Cicero *Nat. d.* 2.38.98–47.120; Dio Chrysostom *Conc. Apam.* 40.35-37; *In cont.* 14. The parallels are listed and discussed in the classic works on *1 Clement*, including Knopf, *Die Apostolischen Väter*, 75-6; and L. Sanders, *L'Hellénisme de Saint Clément de Rome et le Paulinisme* (Studia Hellenistica 2; Louvain: Peeters, 1943) 121-30.

32 W. C. Van Unnik, 'Is 1 Clement 20 Purely Stoic?', *VC* 4 (1950) 181-9 (184). Jewish parallels would include *1 En.* 2–5; *T. Naph.* 3; *As. Mos.* 12.9-10; *Pss. Sol.* 18.12-14, 54-56; cf. Pss 18; 104; Jer 8.7.

33 C. Breytenbach, 'Civic Concord and Cosmic Harmony: Sources of Metaphoric Mapping in *1 Clement* 20:3', *Encounters with Hellenism: Studies on the First Letter of Clement* (ed. C. Breytenbach and L. L. Welborn; AGJU 53; Leiden: Brill, 2004) 182-96.

34 See also Bakke, *Concord and Peace,* 160-7.

35 Namely, the deeds of humility described from 16.1–19.1.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688513000040 Published online by Cambridge University Press

> which has been handed down to us from the beginning;
> *let us fix our eyes* upon the Father and Maker of the whole world
> and hold fast to his magnificent and excellent gifts and benefits of peace.
> *Let us observe him* with our mind,
> and *let us look* with the eyes of the soul on his patient will.
> *Let us note* how free from anger he is toward all his creation.

In this sense, gazing upon and contemplating the activity of God the Creator provides a model for Christian 'theoformity', or conformity to the character of the Creator, the God whose actions here are characterized by peace, patience, and an absence of anger.[36]

The second function served by this passage is that it offers a picture of an obedient, ordered, and peaceful *creation* as an example for the Corinthians to imitate in their own (presently disobedient, disordered, and contentious) social relations. The author of *1 Clement* is not interested in cosmology as a matter of metaphysical reflection or aesthetics (even if the imagery in *1 Clement* 20 is evocatively poetic). Instead, the construction of the world in *1 Clement* 20 is intimately related to the letter's goal of encouraging 'peace and harmony' in Corinth (63.2). That the harmonious universe is a paradigm for Corinthian mimesis is made clear in the following section.[37] Having highlighted the extent to which the peace and harmony of the universe results in 'benefactions with respect to all things, but especially to us who have taken refuge in God's compassionate mercies through our Lord Jesus Christ' (20.12, my translation), the author warns his readers not to neglect this harmony: 'Take care, dear friends, lest his many benefits turn into a judgment upon us all, as will happen if we fail to live worthily of him and to do harmoniously those things that are good and pleasing in his sight' (21.1). Just as the earth bears abundant fruit in time in accordance with God's will (κατὰ τὸ θέλημα, 20.4), with the result that all creatures enjoy plentiful food from the earth without dissension, so also the readers of the letter are summoned to follow God's will and avoid dissension (cf. 21.4). Thus, the harmonious cosmology of *1 Clement* 20 reflects the rhetorical aims of its author insofar as the idyllic picture of the peace and harmony of the created world serve as a model for the Corinthian church to imitate.

What is stated or implied about the origin and purpose of the physical world elsewhere in the letter of *1 Clement* largely corresponds to the sanguine portrait of ch. 20 and occasionally echoes the two important themes developed there: (1)

36 The term 'theoformity' is taken from M. Gorman, *Inhabiting the Cruciform God: Kenosis, Justification, and Theosis in Paul's Narrative Soteriology* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009). It is important to emphasize, however, that with respect to *1 Clement* the term 'theoformity' describes 'God-shaped' behavior and does not necessarily point in the direction of theosis.

37 See, e.g., Dio Chyrsostom's *Conc. Apam*. 40.35-37 for a very similar rhetorical strategy; Bakke, *Concord and Peace*, 164-7; cf. C. Eggenberger, *Die Quellen der politischen Ethik des 1. Klemensbriefes* (Zürich: Zwingli, 1951) 74-86.

God's good work as Creator provides an example for God's people to follow, and (2) the peaceful and harmonious nature of the cosmos itself serves as a model for Corinthian mimesis. God is frequently and positively identified as 'Creator' throughout the letter:

1. When LXX Gen 1.26-27 is cited in 33.5, the verb ποιέω is used three times to designate God's creative activity, and in 7.3 and 14.3 a participial form of the same verb describes God as 'the one who made us'.[38]
2. The term κτίστης denotes God as 'Father and Creator' in 19.2, 'Guardian and Creator' in 59.3, and 'Father and God and Creator' in 62.2, and in 34.6 the entire creation is said to be full of God's glory (πλήρης πᾶσα ἡ κτίσις τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ; cf. 19.3; 59.3).
3. Similarly, the synonym δημιουργός ('craftsworker, builder, creator') is a title for God in 20.11; 26.1; 33.2; 35.3 (δημιουργὸς καὶ πατὴρ τῶν αἰώνων); and 59.2. Another favorite divine title in *1 Clement*, δεσπότης, is three times qualified with the adjective ἅπας, indicating that God is the 'Master of all things' (my translation; 8.2; 20.11; 33.2; cf. 55.6: τὸν παντεπόπτην δεσπότην τῶν αἰώνων; 64.1: δεσπότης τῶν πνευμάτων καὶ κύριος πάσης σαρκός).
4. In *1 Clem.* 38.3, readers are encouraged to acknowledge God's role and beneficence in their own personal creation: 'Let us acknowledge, brothers and sisters, from what matter we were made; who and what we were, when we came into the world; from what grave and what darkness the one who made and created us brought us into his world, having prepared his benefits for us before we were even born'. This text suggests that, while the Corinthians are called to imitate God's character and God's good deeds, works seen in God's activity of creation, the readers of the letter are not themselves 'creators', nor are they responsible for their own lives. They must acknowledge their ultimate dependence upon God, and the fitting result of such recognition is thanks and praise to God (38.4).[39]
5. *1 Clem.* 59.2 introduces a prayer to the 'Creator of the universe', the content of which runs from 59.3–61.3. In this doxological section, God's creative power and sustaining protection of his creation are both praised and invoked: believers hope on God's name, 'which is the primal source of all creation'

38 7.3: 'Indeed, let us note what is good and what is pleasing and what is acceptable in the sight of the one who made us' (καὶ ἴδωμεν τί καλὸν καὶ τί τερπνὸν καὶ τί προσδεκτὸν ἐνώπιον τοῦ ποιήσαντος ἡμᾶς); 14.3: 'Let us be kind to them, in accordance with the compassion and tenderness of the one who made us' (χρηστευσώμεθα ἀυτοῖς κατὰ τὴν εὐσπλαγχνίαν καὶ γλυκύτητα τοῦ ποιήσαντος ἡμᾶς); cf. 36.3 (with reference to God's action upon angels) and 61.3.

39 This sentiment continues in *1 Clem.* 39.1-9 with a long citation of material from Job (i.e. 4.16-18; 15.15; 4.19–5.5), material that is introduced by the rhetorical questions, 'For what can a mortal do? Or what strength does an earthborn creature have?' (39.2).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688513000040 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(59.3); God is called 'the God of all flesh' and 'the Creator and guardian of every spirit' (59.3); God's 'works have revealed the everlasting structure of the world' (60.1); the Lord who 'created the earth' is praised as 'faithful throughout all generations, righteous in your judgments, marvelous in strength and majesty, wise in creating and prudent in establishing what exists' (60.1); God is asked to give 'harmony and peace to us and to all who dwell on the earth' (60.4); and, in the portion of the prayer concerned with earthly rulers and governors, their ability to rule is ascribed to God's granting to 'human beings glory and honor and authority over the creatures upon the earth' (61.2).

The harmonious characterization of the physical world in *1 Clement* 20 is also paralleled briefly in 9.4, where it is noted that during the time of Noah living creatures entered into the ark in harmony. Moreover, in *1 Clement* 24–25, three positive examples from nature are used to testify to the validity of Jesus' resurrection. First, believers observe 'the resurrection that regularly occurs' (τὴν κατὰ καιρὸν γινομένην ἀνάστασιν) when night gives way to day and day to night (24.3) and when seeds are sown into the ground but 'the Master's providence raises them up' (24.4-5). Moreover, the example of the phoenix (25.1-5)—which the author of Clement ostensibly assumes to be a real bird that lives for 500 years before it dies, and a worm nourished by the phoenix's decaying flesh grows wings and carries the bones of its parent to the city of Heliopolis—also supports the hope that 'the Creator of the universe shall bring about the resurrection of those who have served him in holiness' (26.1). Thus, these examples from the order of the cosmos attest to the surety of resurrection.

If there are hints in *1 Clement* of a darker portrayal of the created world, they are substantially muted. Certainly conflict (1.1; 3.2-4; 44.4-6; 46.5–48.6; 54.3; 57.1-2), struggle (1.1; 2.4; 55.2; 59.4), persecution (5.2; 6.1; 39.1; 45.3-8; 59.4), and even martyrdom (5.1-7) are part of the past and (potentially) present experience of the faithful in Christ. Yet there is little in *1 Clement* that corresponds to Paul's claim in Romans 8 that the physical world itself suffers bondage and awaits liberty. There is an assertion in *1 Clem.* 3.4 that 'through ungodly jealousy… death entered into the world (θάνατος εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον)'. Although this sentiment is loosely paralleled in Rom 5.12, the phrase θάνατος εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον is actually a direct citation of Wis 2.24 (φθόνῳ δὲ διαβόλου θάνατος εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον). Given the reference here to death's entry into the world through 'unrighteous and ungodly ζῆλος', it is likely that the author of *1 Clement* has borrowed the phrase from Wisdom and associated ζῆλος with the divisive activity of the opponents in Corinth.[40] It does not appear that θάνατος is personified as an anti-God power in *1 Clement*, as is the case in

40 See Hagner, *Use*, 68-9; Lindemann, *Clemensbriefe*, 33-4.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688513000040 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Romans 5–8. The author also suggests, at least as a theoretical possibility, that God, who established all things by his majestic word, can destroy all things by a word (27.4), but this insinuation is not related to any corruption within the created universe so much as it is an assertion of God's absolute freedom (cf. *1 Clem.* 27.5-7).[41] Thus, there is nothing in *1 Clement* that appreciably undermines the pleasant portrayal of creation in chs. 20 and 33, the emphasis on God as Creator, or the positive role that the physical world plays in attesting to theological truth.

5. Conclusion: World-Construction in Romans and *1 Clement*

It is clear that the author of *1 Clement* draws upon the language and logic of Romans 5–6 in order to (re)state the doctrine of justification by faith and to emphasize the ethical implications of justification. Yet in encouraging those who have been justified by faith toward the pursuit of doing good and demonstrating love, Clement centers his appeal for moral transformation not on the narrative of the believer's participation in Christ through baptism, as Paul does in Rom 6.2-14, but on an exhortation for readers to imitate the pattern of good works established by God during creation (*1 Clem.* 33.2-8). I have attempted to demonstrate that these different rhetorical strategies reflect variations in the cosmological perspectives of Paul and Clement.

Beverly Gaventa has suggested that in Paul's letter to the church in Rome 'cosmology and soteriology are inextricably connected to one another'.[42] That is:

> Paul's cosmology is soteriology. What Paul sees in creation (both the human cosmos and the remainder of creation) is less its order or its wonder than its captivity to powers which continue to endeavour to separate it from its rightful Lord. Although the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ defeated Sin and Death and inaugurated a reign of God's Grace, all of creation continues to stand on tiptoe (to borrow from the translation of J. B. Phillips) waiting for the arrival of its redemption.[43]

In *1 Clement*, however, it is cosmology and *ecclesiology* that are deeply joined together. What Clement sees in creation is not its bondage to anti-God powers but its ordered, peaceful, and harmonious witness to the character of God and to the kind of peaceful social relations that the author hopes his letter will

41 To this list we might add (1) that the violent power of lions is recognized in a citation of LXX Ps 49.16-23 in 35.11; (2) that mortals and 'earth born creatures' (γηγενής) lack power (39.2); and (3) that Gentiles have experienced times of 'pestilence' (λοιμικός), although this word seems to function as a metaphor for political dissent rather than as a reference to food crisis (55.1; so BDAG, 4610; cf. the reference to famine in the citation of Prov 1.23-33 in *1 Clem.* 57.3-7).

42 Gaventa, 'Neither Height', 265.

43 Gaventa, 'Neither Height', 278.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688513000040 Published online by Cambridge University Press

produce among the Corinthian believers. Cosmic harmony reflects God's own good work and provides an example for the Corinthians to imitate.

That we should find the cosmology of *1 Clement* so deeply connected to the specific rhetorical aims of the letter comes as no surprise. Edward Adams has shown that diverse cosmological perspectives found in 1 Corinthians, 2 Corinthians, Galatians, and Romans all display in Paul's own letters this very same tendency to construct the κόσμος in different ways according to the discrete socio-rhetorical strategy of each epistle. In the conclusion to his aptly titled study *Constructing the World*, Adams writes, 'The ways in which Paul employs the terms [κόσμος and κτίσις] in his letters are inextricably bound up with the situations he addresses (the use of κόσμος in 2 Corinthians is the exception). His usages not only *reflect* the situations which elicit his writing; they are intended to *affect* these situations.'[44] No less than the apostle Paul, from whom he inherits the language of justification and the conviction that justification can never be divorced from the performance of good works, the author of *1 Clement* is engaged in the task of 'world-construction'. The cosmology of *1 Clement* plays an important role in the author's goal of promoting peace and harmony among the divisive Corinthians. In this, Clement's presentation of the κόσμος may differ substantially from that in Romans, but the author of *1 Clement* follows Paul in using cosmology as an instrument of community critique and reorientation.

44 Adams, *Constructing the World*, 240 (italics original).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688513000040 Published online by Cambridge University Press