(1) 2, 4:
The colon εἰς τὸ σῶμασθαι μετ’ ἐλέους (μετά δέους Η) καὶ συνειδήσεως (ὑ-ἀγαθίς LCC1) τὸν ἄριθμὸν τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν αὐτῶν1 has occupied the thoughts of many editors and scholars. To the majority who reject the reading δέους, the difficulty consists in the juxtaposition of ἐλέους, a quality of God,2 and συνειδήσες, a quality of the believers. Several attempts at solving the problem have been made, either by explaining ἐλέους as a human quality and συνειδήσες in different ways,3 or by emendation of συνειδήσες.4 J. B. Lightfoot’s last suggestion5 was to adopt the reading δέους because then ‘the whole clause is transferred from God to the believers and συνειδήσες becomes intelligible’.

The word δέους, however, besides being attested only by the reputedly inferior ms. H (Hierosolymitanus or Constantinopolitanus), appears nowhere else in the epistle; Clement always uses φόβος, φοβεσθαι. δέους is altogether rare6 in ecclesiastical literature. I therefore think we may regard it as a less likely reading.

In order to understand the colon with ἐλέους correctly, we should learn from 58,2 that ‘he who with lowliness of mind . . . has . . . performed the

2. cp. 9,1; 18,1.2; 22,8; 28,1; 50,2; 56,5.16; 59,4. Human mercy is only recommended as a means to earn God’s mercy, cp. 13,2: έλεάζετε ἵνα ἐλεηθῆ. 3. E. Hennecke, Neutestamentliche Apokryphen, 2. Aufl., Tübingen 1924: ‘mit barmherziger Gesinnung und Gewissenhaftigkeit.’
4. A. Aureli e G. Brunner, La Voce dei Santi Padri, vol. I, Milano 1912: ‘colla misericordia e con la consapevolezza (di tutti i fratelli)’—In their note the authors explain συνειδήσες as ‘consapevolezza delle debolezze altrui, e quindi soccorrendovi e incoraggiandovi l’un l’altro, si salvassero tutti.’
10. According to Goodspeed’s two indices, the word occurs only once, viz. in I Clem. 2,4.
decrees and commandments given by God shall be enrolled and chosen in the number of those who are saved (σωζόμενων) through Jesus Christ', and from 59,2 that ‘we ... will pray ... that the Creator of the Universe may guard unhurt the number of His elect’ from these two passages which are parallel to 2,4 it becomes clear that, after the salvation effected on man through the mediation of Jesus, the terms ἐκλεκτός and σώζειν become synonymous with ‘parishioner’ and ‘preserve’. R. Knopf also remarks that, although the words ἀριθμὸς τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν have a predestinarian sound, Clement is far from this conception.

The latter passage also shows that God, not the believers, is thought of as preserving every parishioner. The Lord being the preserver, the essentially human συνείδησις can hardly be accepted in the sentence 2,4 and a suitable emendation is desirable. In many passages (see above, n. 2) divine mercy is linked with ideas like χρηστότης, ἀγάπη, χάρις, ἀφεσις. Near the end of the epistle, in a passage which, as regards construction, may safely be accepted as a pendant of 2,4, we read in Clement’s prayer (60,1-2): ἐλεήμονα καὶ σωτηρίμονα, ἀφεσὶς ἡμῶν τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν καὶ τὰς ἁμαρτίας καὶ τὰ παραπτώματα καὶ πλημμέλειας. μὴ λογίσῃ πάσαν ἀμαρτίαν δούλων σου καὶ παιδισκών, ἀλλὰ καθαρίσου ἡμᾶς τὸν καθαρισμὸν τῆς σής ἀμαρτίας. Here ἐλεήμονα (ἔλεος) is combined with ἀφεσίς (ἀφέσις); moreover he prays for forgiveness of all transgressions (note the emphatic repetition) of the Lord’s precepts, in order that God may keep intact the number of His elect. This passage shows that 2,4 is a continuation of 2,3. In 2,3–5 the thought is gradually extended: in 2,3 they pray for forgiveness of their own sins, in 2,4 for the brethren, and 2,5 expresses mutual forgiveness.

I suggest the replacement of συνείδησις by συνιόδεστως, a neologism presumably created by the rhetorically trained9 Clement because the idea ‘comprehensive forgiveness’ was, in Koine, preferably expressed by means of a compound with σύν-, whereas the classical συνάφεσις means ‘a letting loose together’ or ‘a running out together’ (Liddell & Scott, 1953, p. 1700), and συγγνώμη appears to have been weakened to ‘concession’ (e.g. I Cor. 7,6). As Attic law was widely known in Hellenistic countries, the Hellenistically schooled Clement is almost sure to have known the term αἰδόσις (forgiveness which could be granted to the culprit by the relatives of the victim in cases of φόνος ἀκόσιος),10 and as he finishes 2,3 with εἰ τι ἀκόσιον ἡμάρτετε, the word could easily force itself on him; all the more so

7. Quoted from Kirsopp Lake’s translation.
8. o.c., p. 46, n. 4.
9. See fullness of expression, use of synonyms and period construction (1,1); colon and hyperbole (3,2); antithetical parallelism (2,1; 3,3); litotes (ἀμετωμέληται 2,7); climax and hyperbole (3,2); avoidance of repetition (πορεύομαι ... βαδίζειν 3,4; ἐρείπει ... ὁ προσεύχεσθεν 4,2); polysyndeton (1,3); asyndeton (end of 59,3).
because, to the orthodox mind, sin is no less a crime against God’s majesty than homicide against a human being.

The words ἰδιῶν ἢν ἦμὲν are a striking representation of the anxious daily prayer which the community of Corinth used to address to the Lord before their internal dissensions, and it is on their behalf that Clement in 59 ff. prays with identical intention.

A copyist untrained in rhetoric who knew the Christian principles could easily be tempted to make a conscious correction, thinking that the word which he found in his prototype had been inadvertently miswritten. So the reading μετ’ ἐλέους καὶ συνειδήσεως (A) came into being, which in its turn was unacceptable to the mind of the scribe who made the further conscious correction μετὰ δέους καὶ συνειδήσεως (H). The addition of ἀγαθής in LCC is also understandable from the same wish to make συνειδήσεως acceptable.

(2) 59,3: μόνον εὐθεργέτην (H)/"εὐθεργέτην" (LS)/"κτίστην" (C) πνευμάτων καὶ θεὸν πάσης σαρκός.11

The reading εὐθεργέτην is given in the Hierosolymitanus (or Constantinopolitanus) manuscript; the meaning ‘finder’ appears in the Latin and Syriac versions, and the meaning ‘creator’ in the Coptic translations.

Clement’s prayer is not only a request for divine mercy, but also a final attempt to bring the parishioners who were responsible for the dissension to repentance. With this aim several aspects of God’s unique omnipotence are mentioned. In the corrupt colon Clement wants to point out that both the human mind and the body are in God’s hand.12 The colon is, like several preceding ones, constructed antithetically. The contrast is based on the words πνευμάτων (σαρκός. From this we may infer that the corrupt colon must represent a parallel term for θεὸν. Both the reading εὐθεργέτην (H) and the translation ‘finder’ (LS) form phrases which are not very satisfactory parallels for θεὸν πάσης σαρκός. Taking μόνον with either εὐθεργέτην or ‘finder’ would be unnecessary and pointless, whereas this word is fully justified when taken together with a synonym of θεὸν, so as to express, in a different form, the idea contained in πάσης. In two later passages the Lord is called τὸν παντὸς πνεύματος κτίστην καὶ ἐπισκοπον (59,3) and δεσπότης τῶν πνευμάτων (64,1), each time with an antithetical addition of God’s omnipotence over the body. This entitles us to seek a solution in the direction mentioned above. In the later passage in 59,3 ἐπισκοπον may be regarded as a new extension of the thought, even as ἐκλεξάμενον κτλ. is a new extension on the corporal level.13 As in this later

11. Funk-Bihlmeyer, o.c.
12. R. Knopf’s translation ‘angels’ for πνεύματος may be rejected because in this part of the prayer only the relation of God to man is visualised, not the relation of God to other objects of creation.
13. τὸν παντὸς πνεύματος κτίστην καὶ ἐπισκοπον· τὸν πληθύνοντα ἐθνη ἐπὶ γῆς καὶ ἐκ πάντων ἐκλεξάμενον τοὺς ἀγαπῶντας σε . . .
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colon τὸν πληθύνοντα is used as a variation for θεόν of the former one, it is improbable that κτίστην would be used in both cola without variation, although the meaning 'creator' of the Coptic translations appears to be acceptable because of the aforementioned reasons. While κτίστης is found in so many other passages, it seems difficult to believe that any copyist would have misread this word. Other synonyms of θεόν also differ too much in form from εὐεργέτην.

I propose the replacement of εὐεργέτην by εὐεργέτην, another neologism, which, in my opinion, may have been coined under the influence of passages like Zech. 12,1 κύριος ... πλάσσειν πνεύμα ἄνθρωπον ἐν αὐτῷ and I Cor. 12,6 θεός ὁ εὐεργέω τὰ πάντα ἐν πάσιν. πνευμάτων then plainly is an objective genitive and the addition of words like (ἐν) ἄνθρωπος would make the passage parallel to the aforementioned Zech. 12,1. In this context εὐεργέτης acquires a meaning hardly to be rendered otherwise than by the meaning 'creator' of the Coptic manuscripts.

In copying from a cursive ms. the likeness of v and u alone would account for a reading εὐεργέτην caused by inadvertence and by the strangeness of the word. To my mind, however, it seems slightly more probable that, here too, we are confronted with conscious corrections on the part of different copyists. Scribes not conversant with the stylistic precept permitting a moderate use of neologisms would deem a correction necessary. This presumably accounts for the reading εὐεργέτην (H) under the influence of the later colons τὸν τῶν κινδυνευόντων βοηθόν, τὸν τῶν ἀπηλπισθέντων σωτῆρα, as well as for the meaning 'finder' (LS)—representing a Greek εὐρέτην in the prototype(s)—under the influence of the later colons τὸν ἐπιλέποντα ἐν τοῖς ἁρύσσοις, τὸν ἑπότην ἄνθρωπιν ἐργὸν. The notion of God as a benefactor of spirits (or souls) is extremely rare in ecclesiastical literature; in the only parallel given by commentators, viz. Ps. CXIV, there is a chance that ψυχή is used in the meaning 'life.'
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14. The verb εὐεργεῖν usually is accompanied by a complement introduced by ἐν or by a dative.

15. According to Kühner-Gerth, the objective genitive was used very loosely in Greek, but the presence of μόνον corroborates my opinion that πνευμάτων is to be understood as substitute for a direct object, because the devil is also a supernatural being capable of influencing the human spirit.


17. Rahlf, Septuaginta.

18. The author wishes to acknowledge advice received from Prof. G. v. N. Viljoen on the drafting of this note.
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