1 Clement as an Argumentative Text

Supplements to Novum Testamentum

VOLUME 196

1 Clement as an Argumentative Text

Edited by

David S. du Toit
Jacob N. Cerone
Kathrin Hager

BRILL

LEIDEN | BOSTON

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Du Toit, David S. editor | Cerone, Jacob N. (Jacob Nathaniel), 1985- editor | Hager, Kathrin, editor
Title: 1 Clement as an argumentative text / edited by David S. du Toit, Jacob N. Cerone, Kathrin Hager.
Other titles: First Clement as an argumentative text Description: Leiden ; Boston : Brill, [2025] | Series: Supplements to Novum Testamentum, 0167-9732 ; volume 196 | Includes bibliographical references and index.
Identifiers: LCCN 2025035972 | ISBN 9789004742055 hardback | ISBN 9789004742062 ebook
Subjects: LCSH: Clement I, Pope. First epistle of Clement to the Corinthians | Reasoning–Early works to 1800
Classification: LCC BR65.C56 A15 2025
LC record available at https://lccn.loc.gov/2025035972

Typeface for the Latin, Greek, and Cyrillic scripts: "Brill". See and download: brill.com/brill-typeface.

ISSN 0167-9732
ISBN 978-90-04-74205-5 (hardback)
ISBN 978-90-04-74206-2 (e-book)
DOI 10.1163/9789004742062

Dedicated to Andreas Lindemann

Contents

Preface

In this volume are gathered papers presented in July 2023 at a conference on *The First Letter of Clement as an Argumentative Text*, organized and hosted by the Department of New Testament Studies at the University of Erlangen-Nuremberg. After our application for funding had been turned down by one of the major sponsors of such conferences in Germany, we decided not to resign but defiantly proposed holding the conference as an online symposium. We extend our sincere thanks to all the contributors who enthusiastically agreed to gather online and engage in well-informed and critical discussions of the papers presented. In so doing, all the participants made the conference a striking success.

The publication of the conference papers—originally intended for 2024—was unfortunately delayed by several unforeseen hazards. We are, therefore, happy that at last we can now present the results of the conference to all those interested in this most fascinating, but unfortunately rather neglected writing from Early Christianity. We sincerely thank Brill for publishing the volume and are especially indebted to the Series Editors of *Novum Testamentum Supplements*, Margaret Mitchell and David Moessner, for including the volume in this distinguished series. We direct a word of special thanks to Margaret Mitchell for reading the whole manuscript with admirable diligence and amazing precision and for her many corrections and helpful suggestions, all of which contributed to making the volume a better contribution to the academic discourse on 1 Clement. We also thank Laura Morris, Rasmi Shetty, Marjolein van Zuylen, Nitzan Shalev, as well as Marlou Meems for guiding us expertly through the process of preparing the manuscript for publication.

Finally, this volume is dedicated to *Andreas Lindemann* in gratitude for his monumental contribution to research on the Apostolic Fathers in general and 1 Clement in particular. His commentary on 1 Clement published more than thirty years ago remains a scholarly benchmark as the many references to it in this volume clearly attest to.

David du Toit, Jacob Cerone, and Kathrin Hager
August 2025

Notes on Contributors

Patrick Bahl
is a research assistant at the Seminar for Church History (Reformation, new and current Church History) of the Faculty of Protestant Theology at the University of Münster. He was awarded a doctoral degree (2018: *Macht der Argumentation—Macht der Sünde. Die argumentative Funktion des Sündenbegriffs im Römerbrief vor dem Hintergrund antiker Argumentationstheorie*, published 2019) and a Habilitation (2021: *Der Pfarrer bei Gottfried Arnold—Gottfried Arnold als Pfarrer*, published 2023) by the University of Münster. His research areas include the history of the Reformation and Pietism, hermeneutics and methodology of the history of reception, and the early modern history of biblical interpretation.

Jeremiah Bailey
completed his doctorate at Baylor University in 2021 with a dissertation on class conflict and the occasion of First Clement. He is series editor for Classic Studies on the Apostolic Fathers (Pickwick Press) and the Baylor Handbooks on the Apostolic Fathers (Baylor University Press). His main research areas are second-century Christianity, Paul's Letters, Second Temple Judaism, and reception history of early Christian literature.

Dan Batovici
is a research associate in the Research Unit of Biblical Studies of the Faculty of Theology and Religious Studies at KU Leuven, where he earned his PhD in 2015 with a thesis on early Christian Greek literary papyri. He works broadly on the reception of early Christian literature and is preparing a Cambridge Elements volume on *"Apostolic Fathers," Early Christian Studies, and the Apostolic Connection in Late Antiquity*.

Cilliers Breytenbach
is extraordinary Professor of New Testament and Ancient Studies at Stellenbosch University and retired Professor of New Testament at Humboldt University, Berlin. He was awarded a doctoral degree (1983: *Nachfolge und Zukunftserwartung nach Markus*, published in 1984) as well as a Habilitation (1986: *Versöhnung*, published in 1989) by the Ludwig-Maximillian University in Munich. His main research interests include Pauline soteriology (2010: *Grace, Reconciliation, Concord*), Mark (2021: *The Gospel according to Mark as Episodic Narrative*), the expansion of Early Christianity (coauthor 2017: *Early Christianity in Lycaonia*;

and 2022: *Early Christianity in Athens and Attica*), and early Christian epigraphy (*Inscriptiones Christianae Graecae* at icg.uni-kiel.de).

Jacob N. Cerone
is a doctoral candidate in New Testament at the University of Erlangen-Nuremberg. He is an in-house editor of the *Encyclopedia of the Bible and Its Reception* (De Gruyter), Series Editor of *Classic Studies on the Apostolic Fathers* (Pickwick), and Series Editor of Patristic Essentials (Fontes Press). He is also a coeditor of the *Apostolic Fathers Greek Reader* (GlossaHouse).

David Downs
is Clarendon-Laing Professor of New Testament Studies at the University of Oxford and Laing Fellow in Theology and Religion at Keble College. He has published three monographs, including *Alms: Charity, Reward, and Atonement in Early Christianity* and (with Benjamin Lappenga) *The Faithfulness of the Risen Christ: Pistis and the Exalted Lord in the Pauline Letters*.

David du Toit
is Professor of New Testament (History and Literature of Early Christianity) at the University of Erlangen-Nuremberg. He was awarded a doctoral degree (1996: *Theios Anthropos. Zur Verwendung von θεῖος ἄνθρωπος und sinnverwandten Ausdrücken in der Literatur der Kaiserzeit*, published 1997) as well as a Habilitation (2006: *Der abwesende Herr. Narrative und geschichtstheologische Strategien im Markusevangelium zur Bewältigung der Abwesenheit des Auferstandenen*) by the Humboldt University of Berlin. His main research interests include early Christology, the Gospel of Mark, Early Christianity and Greco-Roman culture, semantics and lexicography of early Christian Greek, methodology in Historical-Jesus-research.

Tanja Forderer
is a research assistant at the Eberhard Karls University of Tübingen. She received her doctorate from the University of Hamburg in 2020 (2022: *"Was Gott zusammengefügt hat …"? Eine argumentationsanalytische Untersuchung von Ehe-Scheidung im Neuen Testament am Beisoiel von Mk 10,1–12 und 1Kor 7,10–16*). She is currently working on a Habilitation on narratives of violence in the Revelation of John. Her research interests include argumentation analysis, narratology, the Gospel of Mark, and the Pauline letters.

Kathrin Hager
is a doctoral candidate at the chair for New Testament at the University of Erlangen-Nuremberg and is pastor in the Lutheran Church in Eckenhaid, Bavaria. From 2017–2023 she was an assistant to the chair of New Testament, first at the Ludwig Maximilian University in Munich and then at the University of Erlangen-Nuremberg. Her dissertation project focuses on the foundation of ethics in 1 Clement.

Paul A. Hartog
(PhD, Loyola University Chicago) is a Professor of Theology at Faith Baptist Theological Seminary. He is the author of *Polycarp and the New Testament* (Mohr Siebeck, 2002) and *Polycarp's Epistle to the Philippians and the Martyrdom of Polycarp* (Oxford, 2013), the editor of *The Contemporary Church and the Early Church* (Pickwick, 2010) and *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Early Christian Contexts* (James Clarke, 2015), and the coeditor of the Apostolic Fathers Commentary Series (Cascade).

James A. Kelhoffer
is Professor of New Testament Studies at Uppsala University. He completed the doctorate (1999: *Miracle and Mission*, published 2000) at the University of Chicago and was a Humboldt Fellow at Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München (2007–2009). Other publications include *The Diet of John the Baptist* (2004), *Persecution, Persuasion and Power* (2010), and *Conceptions of "Gospel" and Legitimacy in Early Christianity* (2014). He is currently writing a commentary on Second Clement for Hermeneia.

Hermut Löhr
is currently Professor for New Testament and Ancient Judaism at the Protestant Theological Faculty of Bonn University (since 2017). Before, he held positions as a professor in Jena and Münster. His publications include *Studien zum frühchristlichen un frühjüdischen Gebet*, which focus on 1 Clem 59–61 (2003), and the RAC articles on Paul the apostle and the deutero-Pauline literature. He serves as an editor for the series *FRLANT, ÖTK*, and *EbJC*. His present research focuses on Paul's letter to the Philippians, the Shepherd of Hermas, the development of early Christian morality in its Jewish context, and aspects of early Christian philosophy.

Harry O. Maier
is Professor of New Testament and Early Christian Studies at Vancouver School of Theology, Canada, and Fellow at the Max Weber Centre for Advanced Cul-

tural and Social Studies at the University of Erfurt, Germany. His doctoral disseration (Oxford University) was published in 1991 (republished, 2002), as *The Social Setting of the Ministry as Reflected in the Writing of Hermas, Clement, and Ignatius*. Other books explore the social worlds of early Christianity, the Book of Revelation, and uses of vivid speech in ancient Christian persuasion.

Jonathan Reichel
is a research assistant at the Chair of New Testament at the University of Erlangen-Nuremberg. He was awarded a doctorate by the University of Erlangen-Nuremberg in 2024 for his dissertation on Paul's metaphorical depiction of sin as a tyrant in Rom 6–7. His main research interests are argumentation with metaphors and the interpretation of metaphors, ancient conceptions of autocracy, and hamartiology in Paul.

L.L. Welborn
is Professor of New Testament and Early Christianity at Fordham University. Among his publications are *The Young against the Old: Generational Conflict in First Clement* (2018) and *That There May Be Equality: Paul's Appeal for Partnership in the Collection* (2023). He is the editor of three book series: *Synkrisis* (Yale University Press), *Paul in Critical Contexts* (Fortress Academic), and *The First Urban Churches* (with James R. Harrison). He is preparing a commentary on First Clement for the *Hermeneia* series.

CHAPTER 6

The Narrative on Cain's Fratricide (Genesis 4:3–8 LXX) in 1 Clement 3:4–4:7 and Its Aetiological Function in the Argument

Cilliers Breytenbach

At the end of the first century, 1 Clement[1] was written to the Christian community in Corinth,[2] where younger men took control by ousting the older presbyters. The letter strives to change this state of affairs.[3] Framed as a letter, the text uses the argumentative mode of communication,[4] as can be seen, for example, in its extensive use of examples (ὑποδείγματα) from the past and the present.[5] In this essay, I will focus on another mode of argumentation used within the letter: aetiology. After (1) clarifying the notion of "aetiology," (2) 1 Clem 3:4–4:7 is analyzed as an appeal to aetiology within the literary context of the letter. (3) Then I will compare the use of this aetiology with the examples in 1 Clem 4–6, before (4) I relate 1 Clement's use of an aetiological narrative to aetiologies in contemporaneous Greek literature. (5) Finally, the chapter ends with a short conclusion.

1 Aetiology

There is renewed interest in aetiology,[6] which has recently been defined as "the explanation of the origin of, for example, a city, a ritual, or a name," the first aetiological epic being Apollonius' *Argonautica*, the model for Vergil's aetiological epic narrative, including the foundation of Rome and the Roman *gens*.[7]

1 If not stated otherwise, references to 1 Clement refer to Codex Alexandrinus and references to the Septuaginta to Wevers, *Genesis*. Translations, unless noted, are my own.
2 On the dating, see Tuckett, *1 and 2 Clement*, 63.
3 See, e.g., Welborn, *Young against the Old*.
4 Modes of communication or text types like narration, argumentation, explanation, listing, description are trans-historical *invariant* procedures; see Hempfer, "Gattung," 653.
5 See Breytenbach, "Historical Example."
6 See, for instance, the essays in Wessels/Klooster, eds., *Inventing Origins*.
7 Walter, "Aetiology," 609.

 | DOI:10.1163/9789004742062_007

According to Walter, *aetia* can vary in form; they are defined by their function, in particular by the way they connect the past to the speaker's present. This connection is highlighted by particles or causal phrases, and the link between the past and the present is not primarily temporal but causal. "[W]hat is emphasised instead is the continuity between the result of a specific past event and the present."[8]

For now it suffices to define aetiology as a narrative about past events that is told with present events or states of affairs in mind so that the present is given a prehistory. Put into the context of the beginnings, the aetiology can either authenticate or disqualify the present state of affairs, events, or actions. In the case of 1 Clem 3:4–4:7 the aetiological narrative is taken from the book of Genesis, which within the "epistemic community"[9] of the author and his addressees tells about the beginnings of humankind. Even though we do not need to classify the story about Cain and Abel in Gen 4:3–8 LXX as aetiology, the recourse to this narrative in 1 Clement is aetiological. The story about the beginnings of humankind is re-purposed to disqualify the present action and state of affairs in Corinth resulting from it.

However, aetiology is a narrative mode of communication, whereas, as a macro text, 1 Clement is a letter written largely in the argumentative mode of communication. In this letter, the author cites the narrative from Genesis. Thus, first we must explore the recurrence of the narrative on the beginning within the larger argument of the letter.[10]

2 Text Analysis

2.1 *The Text*

We follow the reading of Codex Alexandrinus (= A), fol. 134$^{v–r}$, the manuscript on which modern editions of 1 Clement are based.[11] This uncial manuscript indicated divisions within the sentences by using the diacritical mark ⸗ as στι-

8 Walter, "Aetiology," 611.

9 On epistemic communities, see van Dijk, *Discourse*, 147–152, 321: "As is the case for linguistic communities and communities of practice, epistemic communities may also first be characterized by their functions, namely as the social structures that allow the organized acquisition and diffusion of knowledge necessary for the communication and interaction of their members."

10 For the concept of citation based on recurrence of the pretext in the focus text and its difference from allusion, see Plett, "Poetics."

11 See British Library Royal MSS 1 D. v–viii. https://www.bl.uk/manuscripts/Viewer.aspx?ref=royal_ms_1_d_viii_fs001r (accessed Sept. 27, 2023).

γμὴ μέση, middle stop. Apart from v. 5, these divisions make sense, and I followed them, adding the verse numbers and the question marks (;).

1 Clem 3:4–4:7:

4 Διὰ τοῦτο πόρρω ἄπεστιν ἡ δικαιοσύνη καὶ εἰρήνη
ἐν τῷ ἀπολιπεῖν ἕκαστον τὸν φόβον τοῦ θεοῦ -
καὶ ἐν τῇ πίστει αὐτοῦ ἀμβλυωπῆσαι -
μηδὲ ἐν τοῖς νομίμοις τῶν προσταγμάτων αὐτοῦ πορεύεσθαι -
μηδὲ πολιτεύεσθαι κατὰ τὸ καθῆκον τῷ Χριστῷ -
ἀλλὰ ἕκαστον βαδίζειν κατὰ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας τῆς καρδίας αὐτοῦ τῆς πονηρᾶς -
ζῆλον ἄδικον καὶ ἀσεβῆ -ἀνειληφότας
δι᾽ οὗ καὶ θάνατος εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον
4.1 Γέγραπται γὰρ οὕτως -
καὶ ἐγένετο μεθ᾽ ἡμέρας ἤνεγκεν Κάϊν ἀπὸ τῶν καρπῶν τῆς γῆς θυσίαν τῷ θεῷ -
καὶ Ἄβελ ἤνεγκεν καὶ αὐτὸς ἀπὸ τῶν πρωτοτόκων τῶν προβάτων καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν στεάτων αὐτῶν -
2 καὶ ἐπεῖδεν ὁ θεὸς - ἐπὶ Ἄβελ καὶ ἐπὶ τοῖς δώροις αὐτοῦ -
ἐπὶ δὲ Κάϊν - καὶ ἐπὶ ταῖς θυσίαις αὐτοῦ οὐ προσέσχεν -
3 καὶ ἐλυπήθη Κάϊν λίαν -
καὶ συνέπεσεν τῷ προσώπῳ αὐτοῦ
4 Καὶ εἶπεν ὁ θεὸς πρὸς Κάϊν -
ἱνατί περίλυπος ἐγένου -
καὶ ἱνατί συνέπεσεν τὸ πρόσωπόν σου; -
οὐκ ἐὰν ὀρθῶς προσενέγκῃς -
ὀρθῶς δὲ μὴ διέλῃς -
ἥμαρτες;
5 ἡσύχασον -
πρὸς σὲ ἡ ἀποστροφὴ αὐτοῦ -
καὶ σὺ ἄρξεις αὐτοῦ -
6 Καὶ εἶπεν Κάϊν πρὸς Ἄβελ τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ
διέλθωμεν εἰς τὸ πεδίον -
Καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ εἶναι αὐτοὺς ἐν τῷ πεδίῳ[12]
[καὶ] ἀνέστη Κάϊν ἐπὶ Ἄβελ - τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀπέκτεινεν αὐτόν -
7 Ὁρᾶτε ἀδελφοί ζῆλος καὶ φθόνος - ἀδελφοκτονίαν κατειργάσατο -

12 A writes ΠΑΙΔΙΩΙ.

Translation:

> (3) [4] For this reason, righteousness and peace are far removed, since each person has abandoned the reverential awe of God and become dim-sighted in faith in him, neither proceeding in the ordinances of his commandments, nor living according to what is appropriate in Christ. Instead, each one walks according to the desires of his evil heart, because they have taken up unrighteous and impious jealousy—through which also death entered the world. (4) [1] For so it is written, 'It came about that after some days, Cain brought an offering to God from the fruits of the earth; and for his part, Abel also brought from the first born of the sheep and their fat. [2] And God looked favorably upon Abel and his gifts but paid no regard to Cain and his offerings. [3] And Cain was extremely upset and became downcast. [4] And God said to Cain, "Why have you become so upset and downcast? If you brought the proper sacrifice but did not divide correctly, have you not sinned? [5] Be calm, peacable. It will return to you but you shall rule over it." [6] And Cain said to his brother Abel, "let us go into the field." And it came about that when they were in the field, Cain rose up against his brother Abel and murdered him.' [7] You see, brothers, jealousy and envy brought about the murder of a brother.[13]

2.2 *Grammatical, Intertextual, and Text-Critical Problems*

Before engaging in the exposition, we need to clarify some grammatical, intertextual, and text-critical matters. First Clement 3:4 is one long sentence, wherein the accusatives and infinitives explain why justice and peace are far off (πόρρω ἄπεστιν). The author mentions four reasons why justice and peace are missing among each (ἕκαστον) of the addressees: what they do (ἀπολιπεῖν and ἀμβλυωπῆσαι) and what they do not do (μηδὲ … πορεύεσθαι μηδὲ πολιτεύεσθαι). After a contrasting ἀλλά, the author repeats ἕκαστον and continues the [ἐν τῷ] + infinitive construction dependent on the main clause (πόρρω ἄπεστιν ἡ δικαιοσύνη καὶ εἰρήνη). He states how everybody is going about (ἕκαστον βαδίζειν). The phrase κατὰ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας … ἀνειληφότας explains how they go about, and ζῆλον ἄδικον καὶ ἀσεβῆ functions as the object of the perfect participle. The relative οὗ takes up ζῆλον.

In 1 Clem 4:1–6 the author of 1 Clement reproduces the text of Gen 4:3–8 LXX as transmitted in Codex Alexandrinus almost without alteration.[14] The follow-

13 Translation (adapted): Ehrman, *Apostolic Fathers*, 40–43.

14 For a critical edition of the text of Genesis, see Wevers, *Genesis*. For a translation, see the text above. For a full exposition, see Brayford, *Genesis*, 249–251.

ing deserves to be noted: The use of κύριος for יהוה in the fourth century Codex Alexandrinus on Gen 4:3 and 6 is secondary.[15] The Greek manuscript of Genesis used when 1 Clement was written by the end of the first century, probably had either the Tetragrammaton in ancient Hebrew letters (like 8ḤevXIIgr) or a lacuna. First Clement seems to be closer to the original. In 4:1a the author of 1 Clement wrote θεῷ (LXX^{A} has κυρίῳ) and in 4:4 ὁ θεός (LXX^{A} has κύριος ὁ θεός) and substitutes τῷ Κάϊν for πρὸς Κάϊν. In v. 1b he left out αὐτοῦ after προβάτων and in 4:3a he has the aorist passive ἐλυπήθη (he took offense) where Gen 4:5b has the active ἐλύπησεν (he grieved). Like Gen 4:5 LXX^{A}, v. 3b reads συνέπεσεν τῷ προσώπῳ. The author of 1 Clement added αὐτοῦ after τῷ προσώπῳ and the subject of the verb συνέπεσεν is still Cain. There is thus no need to read τὸ πρόσωπον with Bihlmeyer and most modern editions.[16]

First Clement 4:4b–5, citing Gen 4:7 LXX, has greater problems. We shall not go into the translation difficulties in Gen 4:7a, for the Hebrew original itself is unintelligible.[17] In Gen 4:7b, cited in 1 Clem 4:5, the LXX translated the Hebrew in its own way.[18] The LXX understood חטאת not as a noun חַטָּאת ("sin"), but as a verb חָטָאת ("you sinned") and translated it with ἥμαρτες at the end of the rhetorical question. רבץ (from רָבַץ, "to lie down, to lurk") was not taken as a participle רֹבֵץ (it should have been feminine רבצה after חטאת), but as an imperative רְבֹץ, starting a new phrase and translated with ἡσύχασον, "be calm, peaceable!" The LXX probably understood תשוקתו ("his desire," from שׁוק, "to desire") as תשובתו ("his return," from שׁוב, "to return"). The awkward pronoun αὐτοῦ after ἡ ἀποστροφή in the Greek translates the masculine Hebrew suffix ו, which takes up the masculine participle רֹבֵץ. However, the verb ἄρχω translates מָשַׁל ("to rule"). In 1 Clem 4:6 Alexandrinus reads πεδίον/ῳ and has a καί before ἀνέστη.

2.3 *Exposition*

After clarifying these linguistic points, a short exposition is due. From the very beginning, the author vilifies the actions of the group of younger men within the Corinthian assembly who have disempowered the elderly presbyters. A few persons (πρόσωπα), whom he describes (1 Clem 1:1) as impetuous (προπετῆ) and stubborn (αὐθάδη), started and inflamed sedition (στάσις) to insanity (ἀπόνοια)

15 See also Hagner, *Use*, 38–39.

16 See the discussion in Lona, *Clemensbrief*, 148. Also, in 1 Clem 4:4b Bihlmeyer and later editors read ἵνατί whereas Rahlfs accented ἵνα τί.

17 For the problems in the Hebrew text, see Gertz, *Buch Mose*, 163–166; for the differences between the original and the Greek translation, see Brayford, *Genesis*, 251–252; Prestel/Schorch, "Genesis," 174.

18 Gen 4:7b (BHS): לַפֶּ֖תַח חַטָּ֣את רֹבֵ֑ץ וְאֵלֶ֙יךָ֙ תְּשׁ֣וּקָתוֹ֔ וְאַתָּ֖ה תִּמְשָׁל־בּֽוֹ׃.

within the Corinthian assembly. This sedition is strange (ἀλλότρια) and foreign (ξένη) to God's chosen, morally repulsive (μιαρά), unholy (ἀνόσιος). After praising the assembly, stating that all recognition and expansion (δόξα καὶ πλατυσμός) were given to them (3:1a), the author immediately (3:1b) applies to them the metaphor of Israel as the obese Jacob, "the beloved one," by freely quoting from Deut 32:15: "he ate and drank and became broad and fat, and kicked out with his heels, the beloved one."[19] In this state, Jacob abandoned God who made him, and departed from God his savior (Deut 32:15c). In Corinth, from this state of corpulence, evil escalates as it progresses from bad to worse: ζῆλος καὶ φθόνος, ἔρις καὶ στάσις, διωγμὸς καὶ ἀκαταστασία, πόλεμος καὶ αἰχμαλωσία[20] ("jealousy and envy, strife and faction, persecution and disorderliness, war and captivity"). In the assembly the sedition led to the inversion of the normal order. "The dishonorable were stirred up (ἐπηγέρθησαν) against the honorable, the disreputable against the reputable, the foolish against the prudent, the young men against the older presbyters."[21] We shall not go into the nature of this conflict between young and old in Corinth,[22] but rather follow the next section in 3:4–4:7, where the author explores the nature and cause for the jealousy and envy (ζῆλος καὶ φθόνος).

The introductory passage in 3:4 first depicts how everyone abandoned the fear of God, became blind in terms of trust, did not follow his commandments, and did not govern themselves (πολιτεύομαι) according to what is fitting for Christ (κατὰ τὸ καθῆκον τῷ Χριστῷ). "Instead, each one walks according to the desires of his evil heart, because they have taken up unrighteous and impious jealousy—through which also death entered the world."[23] When everyone goes about following the desires of his evil heart, the results are devastating. When the core of the person, his/her heart, is evil, desires (ἐπιθυμίαι) come from this evil heart. This happened in Corinth, and everyone took up (ἀναλαμβάνω) envious zeal. This is explicitly qualified as unjust and ungodly. Introducing the causal clause with διά, the author severely criticizes such jealousy (οὗ) by adding that it is the origin, the cause of physical death in the world. Presuppos-

19 1Clem 3:1b: ἔφαγεν *καὶ ἔπιεν* καὶ ἐπλατύνθη καὶ ἐπαχύνθη καὶ ἀπελάκτισεν ὁ ἠγαπημένος. Deut 32:15 LXX: ἔφαγεν *Ιακωβ καὶ ἐνεπλήσθη*, καὶ ἀπελάκτισεν ὁ ἠγαπημένος, *ἐλιπάνθη*, ἐπαχύνθη, ἐπλατύνθη ("Jacob ate and was filled, and the beloved one kicked. He grew fat; and became heavy; he became broad!" NETS). Apart from adding καὶ ἔπιεν, the author changes the word order and deletes Ιακωβ καὶ ἐνεπλήσθη as well as ἐλιπάνθη. In 1Clem 3:1b, ὁ ἠγαπημένος is the subject of the whole phrase and refers to the addressees.

20 1Clem 3:2; Bakke, *Concord and Peace*, 46.

21 1Clem 3:3.

22 See Welborn, *Young against the Old*.

23 1Clem 3:4; adapted from Ehrman, *Apostolic Fathers*, 41.

ing the Jewish belief about the beginnings of the world, he retells the story from Gen 4:3–8 about the two sons of Adam and Eve, Cain and Abel, in 1Clem 4:1–6 as an aetiological explanation that death came into the world through "unjust and irreverent jealousy (ζῆλον ἄδικον καὶ ἀσεβῆ)."

The citation from Gen 4:3–8 in 1Clem 4:1–6 is thus introduced as the origin of death caused by ζῆλος.[24] In 3:4 the author of 1Clement draws on Wis 2:24.[25] Incited by the evil desires of the heart, everyone made "unjust and irreverent jealousy (ζῆλον ἄδικον καὶ ἀσεβῆ)" his own. The author thus qualifies the ζῆλος through which death came into the world as unrighteous (ἄδικος) and impious (ἀσεβής) by using the words of Wis 2:24. There is a frame around the citation, though. After rehearsing the narrative of Gen 4:3–8 LXX, 1Clem 4:7 addresses his audience directly in the words of Wis 10:3, drawing the conclusion from the story about the two brothers, Cain and Abel.[26] Within this frame taken from Wis 2:24 and 10:3, 1Clem 4:1–6:1 uses the narrative from Gen 4:3–8 LXX aetiologically to explain how death came into the world. Simultaneously, the narrative defines death as the result of a violent act, motivated by jealousy.

We turn to the citation. Following Codex Alexandrinus on 1Clem 4:1–6 (see n. 11), we divide 1Clem 4:1–6 into four sections: 1–3, 4–5, 6a, and 6b. One could imagine one scene for vv. 1–3 and 4–5 and another for 6a and 6b. The first scene: Citing the biblical narrative (Gen 4:3–8 LXX),[27] 1Clem 4:1 mentions the firstborn

---

24 With Lindemann, *Clemensbriefe*, 33.

25 Wis 2:24: φθόνῳ δὲ διαβόλου θάνατος εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον πειράζουσιν δὲ αὐτὸν οἱ τῆς ἐκείνου μερίδος ὄντες. See Jacob Cerone's contribution to this volume on the argumentative function of Wis 2:24 in 1Clem 3–6.

26 The indeclinable personal name ὁ Κάϊν (Heb 11:4; 1John 3:12; Jude 11) transliterates the Hebrew masculine name קַיִן *qayin*. The uncertain etymology ("possibly from the root קנה *qnh to acquire, to gain possession*, but also *to give birth/create* [both found in Ug.]" [Gradzikiewicz, "Onomastics," s.v.]) has led to speculation in Ps.-Clem. Hom. 3.25.1 and 3.42.7 that the name means "possession" (from קנה) or ζῆλος "envy" (from קנא). For Josephus the name means possession (*Ant.* 1.52); for Philo, the cursed brother-murderer Cain is a possession (κτῆσις) that is no possession (*Cher.* 52; see also 65; *Sacr.* 2). Ἄβελ is the transliteration of a "Heb. masc. non-compound name from noun הֶבֶל *heḇel = breath, vapor, vanity*. Josephus, *Ant.* 1.2 Ἄβελος σημαίνει δὲ οὐθέν *means nothing/meaninglessness*. Philo, *Migration* 74 Ἄβελ—ὄνομα δέ ἐστι τὰ θνητὰ πενθοῦντος *the name is of one who mourns over mortal things*" (Gradzikiewicz, "Onomastics," s.v.).

27 Gen 4:2b–12 (Hiebert in NETS): "And Habel became a herder of sheep, but Kain was tilling the earth. 3And it came about after some days that Kain brought to the Lord an offering of the fruits of the earth, 4and Habel, he also brought of the firstlings of his sheep and of their fat portions. And God looked upon Habel and upon his gifts, 5but on Kain and on his offerings he was not intent. And it distressed Kain exceedingly, and he collapsed in countenance. 6And the Lord God said to Kain, 'Why have you become deeply

Cain's unspecific sacrifices (θυσίαι) first. As one tilling the cursed earth he succeeded in harvesting in spite of the thorns and thistles (Gen 3:17–18). Only then does the narrator mentions that Abel brought (to the altar valuable) gifts (δώρα) from the firstlings of his sheep and from their fat. As in the biblical text, God becomes the actor in v. 2. The narrator first mentions that God observed, took notice (ἐφοράω) of Abel and his gifts first and only then that God did not turn to or pay attention to (προσέχω) Cain's sacrifices.[28] The biblical narrator continues with Cain's actions. In v. 3 the aorist passive ἐλυπήθη (he took offense) shifts the focus to Cain's reaction. Adding αὐτοῦ after τῷ προσώπῳ, the author of 1Clement underlines the emphasis in Gen 4:5b LXX on "Cain's inner pain" and makes clear that the subject of the verb συνέπεσεν is still Cain: "He collapsed in his countenance."[29]

In v. 4a the subject of the verb συνέπεσεν has changed to τὸ πρόσωπον, and God asks a rhetorical question referring to Cain's reaction: "Why did your countenance collapse?" In v. 4b the main clause is a second rhetorical question on which a positive answer is expected: "didn't you sin?" (οὐκ … ἥμαρτες;). The condition under which the answer would be positive is embedded in the question and refers to the manner in which Cain sacrificed: "[didn't you sin,] if you brought (the sacrifice) rightly (ἐὰν ὀρθῶς προσενέγκῃς), but did not divide correctly (ὀρθῶς δὲ μὴ διέλῃς)."[30] Philo too reckoned that there was something wrong with the way in which Cain divided the yield of his crops he sacrificed to God. For the Alexandrian, Cain's offering was not holy and perfect, because the self-loving Cain kept the first fruits of the crops to himself.[31]

---

grieved, and why has your countenance collapsed? [7]If you offer correctly but do not divide correctly, have you not sinned? Be still; his recourse is to you, and you will rule over him.' [8]And Kain said to his brother Habel, 'Let us go through into the plain.' And it came about when they were in the plain, that then Kain rose up against his brother Habel and killed him. [9]And God said to Kain, 'Where is your brother Habel?' And he said, 'I do not know; surely I am not my brother's keeper?' [10]And God said, 'What have you done? The voice of your brother's blood is crying out to me from the earth! [11]And now you are cursed from the earth, which has opened wide its mouth to receive your brother's blood from your hand. [12]For you will till the earth, and it will not continue to yield its strength to you; you will be groaning and trembling on the earth.'" For the Greek, see 1Clem 4 above.

28 For the meaning of the verbs, see Muraoka, *Lexicon*, s.v.

29 In the LXX, συνέπεσεν τῷ προσώπῳ ("he fell in the countenance") translates יפלו פניו ("his face fell"); Brayford, *Genesis*, 251.

30 In the Hebrew original of Gen 4:7a, the meaning is unclear.

31 Philo, *Agr*. 127; *Conf*. 124; *Sacr*. 52, 72; *QG* 1.60, 62.

The phrase in 1Clem 4:5 (ἡσύχασον· πρὸς σὲ ἡ ἀποστροφὴ αὐτοῦ, καὶ σὺ ἄρξεις αὐτοῦ) repeats Gen 4:7b LXX^{A}.[32] God is the speaker of the command ἡσύχασον, Cain the addressee. The aorist stem of the imperative implies that Cain should immediately relax and refrain from disturbing activity: "be calm, peaceable."[33] The reason is immediately given: πρὸς σὲ ἡ ἀποστροφὴ αὐτοῦ καὶ σὺ ἄρξεις αὐτοῦ. To understand both sentences, one has to infer either a masculine or neuter noun as the intratextual referent of αὐτοῦ (bis) from the preceding context.[34] By conferring with the Hebrew, one could infer ἁμάρτημα as the result of ἥμαρτες (ἁμαρτάνω). After asking "didn't you sin?" (οὐκ … ἥμαρτες;), God urges Cain "be calm, peaceable!" (ἡσύχασον). Then he warns him: πρὸς σὲ ἡ ἀποστροφὴ αὐτοῦ ("to you is the return of it"). In this citation of Genesis, the pronouns (αὐτοῦ bis) are neuter and refer back to the sinful act.[35] Then God instructs Cain: καὶ σὺ ἄρξεις αὐτοῦ ("but you shall rule over it"). The καί, like the original ו (*ναν*), is adversative. The future indicative ἄρξεις serves as an imperative and presents the action as virtually certain. God thus warns Cain that it (the ἁμάρτημα) will return to him and instructs him to rule over it.

The second scene (v. 6) needs less comment. Cain exhorts his brother to go to the field. However, he did not relax and refrain from disturbing activity. While they were there, it came to pass. Deleting the καί, the author of 1Clement continues: "Cain stood up against his brother Abel and killed him." In the light of these actions, it is evident that he summoned his younger brother to a deserted place to kill him. The "murder" was premeditated.

In v. 7, the author picks up the topic of ζῆλος from 1Clem 3:4. Drawing on Wis 2:24 he initially stated that it is through ζῆλον ἄδικον καὶ ἀσεβῆ that death came into the world (δι' οὗ καὶ θάνατος εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον). The verb κατεργάζομαι ("to bring about a result by doing something"[36]) in 1Clem 4:7 draws on Wis 10:3 and takes up δι' οὗ from 1Clem 3:4: "You see, brothers, jealousy and envy brought about the killing of a brother" (ὁρᾶτε ἀδελφοί ζῆλος καὶ φθόνος ἀδελφοκτονίαν κατειργάσατο). The rare word ἀδελφοκτονία ("fratricide"),[37] is a key term from Wis 10:3, which was associated with Cain in Jewish litera-

32 For the differences between the Greek translation in Codex Alexandrinus and the Hebrew text in Codex Leningradensis, see 2.2 above.

33 See BDAG, s.v.

34 The commentators refrain from explaining the phrase (Lindemann, *Clemensbriefe*, 35; Lona, *Clemensbrief*, 149).

35 The first αὐτοῦ is a possessive genitive for the implied ἁμάρτηματος, the second a genitive after ἄρχω. Brayford, *Genesis*, 252, also takes αὐτοῦ as neuter, the first referring to sin. See previous note.

36 BDAG, s.v.

37 From ἀδελφοκτονέω, "to be murderer of a brother or sister"; LSJ, s.v.

ture written in Greek.[38] In reference to the unrighteous Cain, who departed from Wisdom in anger, Wis 10:3 explains: "he perished through his fratricidal rage." It is clear that physical death came into the world through the violent actions of Cain. For the author of 1 Clement, death is not the result of ailment or natural catastrophe, nor of Adam's sin, but of Cain slaying his brother out of jealousy.[39]

For those familiar with ancient Jewish tradition, the choice of Cain as an example of utmost wickedness was at hand.[40] The narrative about Cain and Abel in 1 Clement was read and heard against the reception of these two figures among Jews of the Second Temple. Since 1 Clement was written in Greek to a Greek speaking audience, and because it draws on Cain's actions, we focus on the reception of Cain in Jewish Greek literature more or less contemporary to 1 Clement.[41] This will help us to outline the "common ground"[42] the author presupposed he and his envisaged audience shared when they listened to his citation of the Cain and Abel narrative. According to Philo, the mean and common (φαῦλος), self-loving (φίλαυτος), godless and impious (ἄθεος καὶ ἀσεβής) Cain, who did not accept repentance, committed fratricide (ἀδελφοκτονία).[43] He was the first to commit the greatest crime of all and first defiled the ground with human blood.[44] He was sly (πανοῦργος), "the symbol of wickedness" (τὸ κακίας σύμβολον).[45] Josephus depicts the "brother murderer" (φονεὺς τἀδελφοῦ)[46] and his offspring in the most negative terms: "Thus within Adam's

38 See Philo, *Fug.* 60; *Det.* 96; *Post.* 50; *Agr.* 21; Jos. *Ant.* 1.65; Greek Jub. frag. m (ἐντεῦθεν ἤρξατο ἡ κακομηχανία ἐν κόσμῳ γίνεσθαι, καὶ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς μὲν διὰ τῆς τοῦ Ἀδὰμ παρακοῆς, ἔπειτα δὲ διὰ τῆς τοῦ Κάϊν ἀδελφοκτονίας, νῦν δὲ ἐν χρόνοις τοῦ Ἰάρεδ καὶ ἐπέκεινα φαρμακεία καὶ μαγεία, ἀσέλγεια, μοιχεία τε καὶ ἀδικία.).

39 This explanation of the origin of death deviates from Paul's thesis that death came through Adam's sin (Rom 5:12), but is carried forth in early Christian literature, e.g., Theophilus, *Autol.* 2:29: καί οὕτως ἀρχὴ θανάτου ἐγένετο εἰς τόνδε τὸν κόσμον ὁδοιπορεῖν ἕως τοῦ δεῦρο ἐπὶ πᾶν γένος ἀνθρώπων ("and so the beginning of death came into this world, to reach the whole race of men to this very day"; text and trans. Grant, *Theophilus*, 72–73). See also Origen, *Sel. Ps.* (PG 12.1600.47–48). See also David Downs' contribution to this volume.

40 T. Ab. A calls him Κάϊν ὁ πονηρός.

41 Abel was seen as victim; cf. 4 Macc 18:2. According to the Greek version of Enoch (22:7), the spirit of Abel lived on. Abel appeals (to heaven) until Cain's offspring is removed from the face of the earth.

42 On the term, see van Dijk, *Discourse*, 318.

43 Cf. Philo, *Sacr.* 3, 51; *Det.* 32, 140, 78, 86, 103, 96, 119; *Post.* 21; *Fug.* 60. See Aleknienė, "Caïn et Abel."

44 Philo, *Virt.* 99. See also *Agr.* 21.

45 Philo, *Det.* 165; *Fug.* 63; *Conf.* 122.

46 Josephus, *Ant.* 1.57, 60–66.

lifetime, the descendants of Cain went to depths of depravity, and, inheriting and imitating one another's vices, each ended worse than the last."[47] The author of 1 Clement was familiar with the Bible in Greek, and the example of Cain from Gen 4:3–8 served him well to illustrate what ζῆλος brings about (κατεργάζομαι). It was the reason for the first case of death, "premeditated murder," Cain's fratricide (1 Clem 3:4; 4:7).

3 Aetiology and Example

From 1 Clem 4:8 on, the author lists examples (ὑποδείγματα—cf. 5:1) from the books of Moses as examples of jealous zeal or envy. In contrast to the narrative about Cain and Abel, these examples are not introduced with "so it is written" (γέγραπται … οὕτως). They are not cited. With the exception of 4:10b, which quotes Exod 2:14, the author merely alludes to various narratives from the books of Moses. It is notable that in the original context in the Greek Bible, these narratives are not said to be examples of jealousy (ζῆλος). Through the repetitive introduction of the word ζῆλος (jealousy) or the phrase διὰ ζῆλος (because of jealousy),[48] the author presents them as ὑποδείγματα, as illustrations for the devastating consequences of envy (ζῆλος). Well-known individuals from the past had to flee (ἀποδιδράσκω, διωχθῆναι, and φεύγω) because of the jealousy of another: Jacob because of Esau (Gen 27:41–46), Joseph because of his brothers (Gen 37), Moses because of those from the same tribe (ὁμόφυλοι) in Egypt (Exod 2:11–15). Others had to leave: Aaron and Miriam went outside the encampment (Num 12), Dathan and Abiram went down into Hades alive (Num 16:23–35), and finally David fled because of Saul (1 Kgdms 18–24). The author continues that in more recent times the apostles Peter and Paul were prosecuted because of jealousy (ζῆλος) and envy (φθόνος). These apostles and more men and women—even from the assembly of God in Corinth—can serve as examples (ὑποδείγματα in 1 Clem 5:1 and 6:1).

However, the narrative about Cain and Abel is not merely alluded to, but quoted in full in 1 Clem 4:1–6. It seems as if this difference does not have to do with the formal characteristics of the original narratives in the Greek translations of the Pentateuch and beyond, but with the function the narratives have

47 Josephus, *Ant.* 1.66 (text and trans. Thackeray, *Josephus*, 30–31 [LCL]): ἔτι δὲ ζῶντος Ἀδάμου Κάιος τοὺς ἐγγόνους πονηροτάτους συνέβη γενέσθαι κατὰ διαδοχὴν καὶ μίμησιν ἄλλον ἄλλου χείρονα τελευτῶντα.

48 The word ζῆλος only occurs three times in the Pentateuch, in each case referring to God's zeal (Num 25:11 *bis*; Deut 29:20).

in the argument of 1 Clement. In the case of the ὑποδείγματα in 1 Clem 5–6, the focus is on the figures, who—according to the author's argument—suffered because of ζῆλος. It sufficed to remind (ὑπομιμνήσκω in 7:1) the audience of the fate of these individuals. In the case of the narrative about Cain and Abel, the deed of Cain and the cause of it are quoted in full. But why?

Within the context of the letter, the aetiological use of the text fuses the causes of present revolt in the assembly and the cause of the first murder by Cain. Both are the result of ζῆλος. Cain's jealousy is presented as the first of a string of examples caused by ζῆλος. The narrative from the beginning of humankind also serves as an aetiology to explain the origins of physical death, and how it came into the world because of fratricide. In the present, the author and his addressees have the same battle: to combat ζῆλος and its consequences (7:1).[49] In quoted narrative mode, the aetiology about jealousy as the cause of death locates the present consequences of ζῆλος within a trajectory of evildoing that started with the very first fratricide by Cain at the very beginning. In this way the narrative about Cain murdering his brother because of jealousy entails a strong vilification of those among the addresses who instigate sedition because of jealousy. The author associates them with a dubious historical character.[50] Explicitly addressing the addressees as siblings (ἀδελφοί), the author implicitly warns that jealousy and envy (ζῆλος καὶ φθόνος) can lead to the death in the family of believers, between the brothers (1 Clem 4:7).

4 Aetiology and Argument in Comparable Greek Literature

The aetiological use of the narrative from Genesis and the other examples from the Greek Bible documents that the author of 1 Clement shares a "scriptural universe"[51] with Greek speaking Jews. This does not mean that 1 Clement, as is the case for the writings of Josephus and Philo, is not part of the Greek literature of the early Roman Empire. The letter shares many traits with the Greek literature of the time, e.g., a symbouleutic rhetorical strategy.[52] Does its use of aetiology also reflect the rhetorical conventions of a specialized group within an epistemic community of the time?

49 For a similar reading of 1 Clem 7:1 see Jonathan Reichel's contribution in this volume.

50 On this rhetorical device, see du Toit, "Vilification," 53.

51 See Stroumsa, *Universe*.

52 See van Unnik, "Studies"; Bakke, *Concord and Peace*.

Centuries after the use of aetiological narratives in Callimachus' *Aetia*,[53] literature contemporary to 1Clement continued to explain the present state of affairs or practice in this manner. There are many such examples. Two must suffice:

> Pausanias, *Descr*. 9.27.6:
> Καὶ Ἡρακλέους Θεσπιεῦσίν ἐστιν ἱερόν· ἱερᾶται δὲ αὐτοῦ παρθένος, ἔστ᾽ ἂν ἐπιλάβῃ τὸ χρεὼν αὐτήν. αἴτιον δὲ τούτου φασὶν εἶναι τοιόνδε, Ἡρακλέα ταῖς θυγατράσι πεντήκοντα οὔσαις ταῖς Θεστίου συγγενέσθαι πάσαις πλὴν μιᾶς ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ νυκτί· ταύτην δὲ οὐκ ἐθελῆσαί οἱ τὴν μίαν μιχθῆναι· τὸν δὲ ὑβρισθῆναι νομίζοντα δικάσαι μένειν παρθένον πάντα αὐτὴν τὸν βίον ἱερωμένην αὐτῷ.
>
> At Thespiae is also a sanctuary of Heracles. The priestess there is a virgin, who acts as such until she dies. The reason of this is said to be as follows. Heracles, they say, had intercourse with the fifty daughters of Thestius, except one, in a single night. She was the only one who refused to have connection with him. Heracles, thinking that he had been insulted, condemned her to remain a virgin all her life, serving him as his priest.[54]

> Plutarch *Quest. gr*. 58.304c–e:
> "Διὰ τί παρὰ Κῴοις ὁ τοῦ Ἡρακλέους ἱερεὺς ἐν Ἀντιμαχείᾳ γυναικείαν ἐνδεδυμένος ἐσθῆτα καὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν ἀναδούμενος μίτρᾳ κατάρχεται τῆς θυσίας;" Ἡρακλῆς ταῖς ἓξ ναυσὶν ἀπὸ Τροίας ἀναχθεὶς ἐχειμάσθη, καὶ τῶν ἄλλων διαφθαρεισῶν μιᾷ μόνῃ πρὸς τὴν Κῶν ὑπὸ τοῦ πνεύματος ἐλαυνόμενος ἐξέπεσε κατὰ τὸν Λακητῆρα καλούμενον, οὐδὲν ἄλλο περισώσας ἢ τὰ ὅπλα καὶ τοὺς ἄνδρας. ἐντυχὼν δὲ προβάτοις ᾔτει κριὸν ἕνα παρὰ τοῦ νέμοντος· ὁ δ᾽ ἄνθρωπος ἐκαλεῖτο μὲν Ἀνταγόρας, ἀκμάζων δὲ τῇ ῥώμῃ τοῦ σώματος ἐκέλευσεν αὐτῷ διαπαλαῖσαι τὸν Ἡρακλέα, κἂν καταβάλῃ, τὸν κριὸν φέρεσθαι. καὶ συμπεσόντος αὐτῷ τοῦ Ἡρακλέους ἐς χεῖρας, οἱ Μέροπες τῷ Ἀνταγόρᾳ παραβοηθοῦντες, οἱ δ᾽ Ἕλληνες τῷ Ἡρακλεῖ, μάχην καρτερὰν συνῆψαν, ἐν ᾗ λέγεται τῷ πλήθει καταπονούμενος ὁ Ἡρακλῆς καταφυγεῖν πρὸς γυναῖκα Θρᾷτταν καὶ διαλαθεῖν ἐσθῆτι γυναικείᾳ κατακρύψας ἑαυτόν. ἐπεὶ δὲ τῶν Μερόπων αὖθις κρατήσας καὶ καθαρθεὶς ἐγάμει τὴν Χαλκιόπην, ἀνέλαβε στολὴν ἀνθινήν. διὸ θύει μὲν ὁ ἱερεὺς ὅπου τὴν μάχην συνέβη γενέσθαι, τὰς δὲ νύμφας οἱ γαμοῦντες δεξιοῦνται γυναικείαν στολὴν περιθέμενοι.

53 Clayman, *Callimachus*, e.g., *Aetia*, 1.31g, 35; 3.83b. See Harder, "Invention."

54 Text and trans. Jones, *Pausanias*, 288–289 (LCL). See also Pausanias, *Descr*. 2.6.1–3.

> Why is it that among the Coans the priest of Heracles at Antimacheia dons a woman's garb, and fastens upon his head a woman's head-dress before he begins the sacrifice? Heracles, putting out with his six ships from Troy, encountered a storm; and when his other ships had been destroyed, with the only one remaining he was driven by the gale to Cos. He was cast ashore upon the Laceter, as the place is called, with nothing salvaged save his arms and his men. Now he happened upon some sheep and asked for one ram from the shepherd. This man, whose name was Antagoras, was in the prime of bodily strength, and bade Heracles wrestle with him; if Heracles could throw him, he might carry off the ram. And when Heracles grappled with him, the Meropes came to the aid of Antagoras, and the Greeks to help Heracles, and they were soon engaged in a mighty battle. In the struggle it is said that Heracles, being exhausted by the multitude of his adversaries, fled to the house of a Thracian woman; there, disguising himself in feminine garb, he managed to escape detection. But later, when he had overcome the Meropes in another encounter, and had been purified, he married Chalciopē and assumed a gay-coloured raiment. Wherefore the priest sacrifices on the spot where it came about that the battle was fought, and bridegrooms wear feminine raiment when they welcome their brides.[55]

These examples are either part of Pausanias' descriptive explanation of current practice, names or states of affairs in Greece, or part of Plutarch's lists of *aetiae* (αἰτίαι) in question-answer format by which he explains cultural phenomena of the Romans and the Greeks.[56]

The functions of aetiologies in this narrow sense of the αἰτίαι are manifold in different modes of discourse of the early Roman period.[57] Plutarch and Dio Chrysostom used aetiological myth or reference to past times in historical narrative,[58] Plutarch, e.g., to explain Theseus' move to Crete,[59] or Dio to explicate the origin of the sacrifice of young Athenians to the Minotaur and the ori-

55 Text and trans. Babbitt, *Moralia*, 244–247 (LCL). See also Plutarch, *Quest. rom.* 40. 274d.

56 See Boulogne, "Questiones"; Schmidt, *Questions*; Meeusen, "Borders."

57 Lucian even used parody against those who tried to rationalize mythic aetiology. See Kuin, "Patroclus," 191–195, 189: "The underlying message is that a rationalist attitude towards myth is erroneous, because it looks for historical plausibility and likelihood in a genre that deals with a different kind of truth." On Ovid, see Myers, *Ovid*, 61–94.

58 See Grandjean, "Le recours," 150–152.

59 Plutarch, *Thes.* 15.1–2; *Sol.* 2. See also Meeusen, "Borders," 206–210, on Plutarch, *Quaest. nat.* 10.914d; 14.915c and 23.917 f.

gin of the Macedonians and of water in Alexandria.[60] These occurrences of aetiological narratives are not, as in the case of 1 Clement, integrated in an argumentative mode of communication, but rather part of longer narratives. They do, however, illustrate that the use of aetiological narratives was widespread in the wider literary context of the Second Sophistic.

More examples from Plutarch can be offered as *comparanda*. He explains that love of riches and luxury only came to Sparta during the reign of Agis (244–241 BCE), when Lysander brought gold and silver from the war, reducing by this policy (καταπολιτεύομαι) the laws of Lycurgus, the founder of the political and social order of Sparta.[61] This aetiological explanation is not part of argumentative but of narrative discourse. The same applies to Plutarch's reference to these past events in his narrative (διήγησις) in which he compares Agis and Cleomenes with the Gracchi Tiberius and Gaius.[62]

In his argument against envy between people having the same trade, Dio tells what happened when the Egyptian physicians could not cure Darius and were imprisoned. The Greek healer Democedes of Croton cured the Persian king and, as reward, Democedes asked that the Egyptian physicians be released. They were grateful that there was another one of their trade and not jealous.[63] However, neither the narrative about Darius nor those about the musical skills of the Theban flutist or of Orpheus and his cithara draw on the beginnings and have an aetiological function.[64]

Since the work of Harnack, Jaeger, and van Unnik,[65] many have shown that 1 Clement belongs to symbouleutic rhetoric and can fruitfully be compared to orators of the Second Sophistic such as Aelius Aristides, Dio Chrysostom, and Plutarch. The selected examples above show how widely Plutarch,[66] and Dio to a lesser extent, made use of aetiologies.

We conclude this section with an analogy from Dio Chrysostom in a text that integrates examples from the past in narrative mode to substantiate the

60 Dio Chrysostom, *Alex.* (Or. 32) 65 and 15.

61 Plutarch, *Lyc.* 30.

62 Plutarch, *Ag. Cleom.* 3: "When once the love of silver and gold had crept into the city, closely followed by greed and parsimony in the acquisition of wealth and by luxury, effeminacy, and extravagance in the use and enjoyment of it, Sparta fell away from most of her noble traits, and continued in a low estate that was unworthy of her down to the times when Agis and Leonidas were kings" (trans. Perrin, *Plutarch*, 12–13 [LCL]).

63 Dio Chrysostom, *Invid.* (Or 77/78) 10–11.

64 Dio Chrysostom, *Invid.* (Or 77/78) 18–20.

65 See the essays in Breytenbach/Welborn, *Encounters*.

66 See Grandjean, "Le recours,"; Schmidt, *Questions*; Meeusen, "Borders," 206–210; Boulogne, "Questiones," 4704–4706.

author's argument and to support his exhortation. In his argument, like Clement's also against jealousy, Dio states that masters of their art or trade do not envy the ability of their peers, and he makes a strong argument that "the praise of experts above all others is sweetest to the ears of connoisseurs and worth the most serious attention."[67] Illustrating that the work (δημιούργημα) made according to the craft of one person is superior to the product of "polytechnic workmanship" (πολύτεχνον δημιούργημα), Dio refers to the myth about Pandora. She was made not by only one of the gods, but by all of them together. Even the gods were not able to produce a good and flawless mutual work but a figure like Pandora that became a manifold and varied evil to those who receive her.[68] Likewise, the virtuous should not regard that which is done by many, the opinion of the masses of public praise and recognition as important, valuable, or good. "But not regarding it as a good, he will be incapable of envying those who have it because of it."[69] The virtuous do not envy the public praise others get.

Albeit on very different grounds, 1 Clement and Dio use a narrative aetiologically. Both narratives were taken from what constitutes the beginnings for the "epistemic community" each author shared with his addressees. They both do this to support their very diverse arguments against present conduct born of jealousy.

5 Conclusion

Against the background of the reception of the figure of Cain in ancient Judaism, the author of 1 Clement uses the narrative in Genesis about Cain's fratricide aetiologically. Following rhetorical practice of Greek orators of his time, the author's strategy is clear. He writes to warn (νουθετέω in 7:1) the Corinthian assembly to leave useless effort (ματαιοπονία), strife (ἔρις), and "the jealousy that leads to death" (τὸ εἰς θάνατον ἄγον ζῆλος) behind them (9:1). By selecting the story of Cain's fratricide and presenting it aetiologically as the result of ζῆλος and the origin of death in 3:4–4:7, he creates continuity between the current circumstances caused by jealousy in the Corinthian church and the very beginnings of fratricide. The author moves from the present to the past to give

67 Dio Chrysostom, *Invid.* (Or 77/78) 21 (trans. Crosby, *Dio Chrysostom*, 279 [LCL]).

68 Dio Chrysostom, *Invid.* (Or 77/78) 25: παντοδαπὸν δὲ καὶ ποικίλον τοῖς λαβοῦσιν ἀποβῆναι (text, Crosby, *Dio Chrysostom*, 282).

69 Dio Chrysostom, *Invid.* (Or 77/78) 25: μὴ νομίζων δὲ ἀγαθὸν βασκαίνειν ἐπ' αὐτῷ τοῖς ἔχουσιν ἀδύνατος (text and trans. Crosby, *Dio Chrysostom*, 284–285).

instruction for the present. The negative associations evoked by Cain help the author to vilify those who act in boastfulness and disorder. The assembly should not follow these leaders of loathsome jealousy (μυσερὸς ζῆλος, 14:1). By taking up unjust and impious jealousy, they are led by the desires of their evil hearts. They are like Cain, the epitome of wickedness. Their conduct might lead to death in the community of brothers and sisters. The addresses should cut out the unlawful anger (originating from) of their jealousy (ἐκκόψητε τὴν ἀθέμιτον τοῦ ζήλους ὑμῶν ὀργήν) and live according to the letter's instructions on peace and concord (63:2).[70]

Primary Sources Cited

Hebrew Bible/Septuagint: Editions and Translations

Rudolph, W./H.P. Rüger, eds., *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (Editio tertia emendata; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1987). [= BHS]

Pietersma, A./B.G. Wright, eds., *A New English Translation of the Septuagint and the Other Greek Translations Traditionally Included under That Title* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007). [= NETS]

Wevers, J.W., ed., *Genesis* (Septuaginta. Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis editum 1; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1974).

Apostolic Fathers: Editions and Translations

Bihlmeyer, K., *Die Apostolischen Väter. Neubearbeitung der Funkschen Ausgabe. Zweite Auflage mit einem Nachtrag von W. Schneemelcher* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [P. Siebeck], 1957).

Ehrmann, B.D., ed./trans., *The Apostolic Fathers: 1 Clement, 2 Clement, Ignatius, Polycarp, Didache* (LCL 24; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2003).

Ancient Sources: Editions and Translations

Callimachus, *Aetia, Iambi, Lyric Poems* (trans. D. Clayman; LCL 421; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2022).

---

70 This essay originated within the DFG Research Group 5323: "Aitiologien: Figuren und Funktionen begründenden Erzählens in Wissenschaft und Literatur." I am indebted to the group for an insightful discussion of a draft of this paper, especially to Christine Gerber for her accurate comments on the manuscript and to the spokesperson of the group, Susanne Gödde, who helped me navigate the research on aetiology in Greek literature. I thank Margaret M. Mitchell for a crucial correction.

Dio Chrysostom, *Discourses 61–80. Fragments. Letters* (trans. H.L. Crosby; LCL 385; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1951).

Pausanias, *Description of Greece. Books VIII.22–X* (trans. W.H.S. Jones; LCL 297; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1935).

Plutarch, *Lives, Volume X: Agis and Cleomenes. Tiberius and Gaius Gracchus. Philopoemen and Flamininus* (trans. B. Perrin; LCL 102; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1921).

Plutarch, *Moralia. Volume IV* (trans. F.C. Babbit; LCL 305; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1936).

Secondary Sources Cited

Aleknienė, T., "Caïn et Abel dans l'oeuvre de Philon de l'Alexandrie: Arrière-plan Platonicien," *SPhilo* 35 (2023) 13–34.

Bakke, O.M., *"Concord and Peace": A Rhetorical Analysis of the First Letter of Clement with an Emphasis on the Language of Unity and Sedition* (WUNT II/143; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001).

Boulogne, J., "Les *Questions Romaines* de Plutarque," in W. Haase, ed., *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, II 33.6 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1992) 4682–4708.

Brayford, S., *Genesis* (Septuagint Commentary Series; Leiden: Brill, 2007).

Breytenbach, C., "The Historical Example in 1 Clement," *ZAC* 18.1 (2014) 17–28.

Breytenbach C./L.L. Welborn, eds., *Encounters with Hellenism: Studies on the First Letter of Clement* (AGJU 53; Leiden: Brill, 2004).

du Toit, A., "Vilification as a Pragmatic Device in Early Christian Epistolography," in idem, *Focusing on Paul*, ed. A. du Toit et al. (BZNW 151; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2007) 45–56.

Gerz, J.C., *Das erste Buch Mose, Genesis: Die Urgeschichte, Gen 1–11* (ATD 1/1; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2018).

Gradzikiewicz, A.J., "New Testament Onomastics—Lexicon of Personal Names Found in the New Testament" (PhD diss., Berlin, 2021).

Grandjean, T., "Le recours à l'étiologie chez Dion de Pruse et chez Plutarque de Chéronée," in M. Chassignet, ed., *L'étiologie dans la pensée antique* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2008) 147–164.

Grant, R.M., ed., *Theophilus of Antioch:* Ad Autolycum (OECT; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1970).

Hagner, D.A., *The Use of the Old and New Testaments in Clement of Rome* (NovTSup 34; Leiden: Brill, 1973).

Harder, A., "The Invention of Past, Present and Future in Callimachus' *Aetia*," *Hermes* 131 (2003) 290–306.

Hempfer, K.W., "Gattung," in K. Weimar, ed., *Reallexikon der deutschen Literaturwissenschaft* (Band I; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1997) 651–655.

Kuin, I.N.I., "Patroclus was a Parasite: Lucian's Satirical Aitia," in A.B. Wessels/J.J.H. Klooster, eds., *Inventing Origins: Aetiological Thinking in Greek and Roman Antiquity* (Euhormos 2; Leiden: Brill, 2022) 183–198.

Lindemann, A., *Die Clemensbriefe* (HNT 17; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1992).

Lona, H.E., *Der erste Clemensbrief* (KAV 2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998).

Meeusen, M., "Crossing Borders: Aetiological Overlap in Plutarch's Collections of Questions," in A.B. Wessels/J.J.H. Klooster, eds., *Inventing Origins: Aetiological Thinking in Greek and Roman Antiquity* (Euhormos 2; Leiden: Brill, 2022) 199–214.

Muraoka, T., *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint* (Leuven: Peeters, 2009).

Myers, K.S., *Ovid's Causes: Cosmogony and Aetiology in the Metamorphoses* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1994).

Prestel, P./S. Schorch, "Genesis. Das erste Buch Mose," in M. Karrer/W. Kraus, eds., *Septuaginta Deutsch. Erläuterungen und Kommentare zum griechischen Alten Testament. Band I. Genesis bis Makkabäer* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2011) 145–257.

Plett, H.F., "The Poetics of Quotation," in J.S. Petöfi and T. Olivi, eds., *Von der verbalen Konstitution zur symbolischen Bedeutung* (Papiere zur Textlinguistik 62; Hamburg: Buske, 1988) 313–334.

Schmidt, T., "Les Questions barbares de Plutarque: un essai de reconstitution," in M. Chassignet, ed., *L'étiologie dans la pensée antique* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2008) 165–184.

Stroumsa, G.G., *The Scriptural Universe of Ancient Christianity* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2016).

Thackeray, H.St.J., ed., *Josephus. Jewish Antiquities. Books I–IV* (LCL 242; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1930).

Tuckett, C.M., "1 and 2 Clement," in J. Verheyden, J. Schröter, and T. Nicklas, eds., *Texts in Context: Essays on Dating and Contextualising Christian Writings from the Second and Early Third Centuries* (BETL CCCXIX; Leuven: Peeters, 2021) 51–72.

van Dijk, T.A., *Discourse and Knowledge: A Sociocognitive Approach* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014).

van Unnik, W.C., "Studies on the so-called First Epistle of Clement: The Literary Genre" (1970), in C. Breytenbach/L.L. Welborn, eds., *Encounters with Hellenism: Studies on the First Letter of Clement* (AGJU 53; Leiden: Brill, 2004) 115–181

Welborn, L.L., *The Young against the Old. Generational Conflict in First Clement* (New York: Lexington Books/Fortress Academic, 2018).

Wessels, A.B./J.J.H. Klooster, eds., *Inventing Origins. Aetiological Thinking in Greek and Roman Antiquity* (Euhormos 2; Leiden: Brill, 2022).