



Project
MUSE[®]

Today's Research. Tomorrow's Inspiration.

<http://muse.jhu.edu>

Polycarp's Use of 1 Clement: An Assumption Reconsidered

KENNETH BERDING

Is Polycarp of Smyrna “particularly familiar” with *1 Clement*? Does he have “Clement”’s letter in his “mind’s eye” when he writes? Does he have it memorized? Is Polycarp’s dependence upon *1 Clement* greater than his dependence upon other literature he employs in his letter(s) to the Philippians (Polyc. *Phil.*)?¹

If one were to survey introductions to Polyc. *Phil.*, one might be left with the impression that the answer to each of these questions is yes. But this is one assertion that unfortunately has been perpetuated during the past few generations that stands in need of correction, particularly since it has functioned as an assumption for those entering into the study of Polycarp’s letter. The purpose of this article is to clear up a misunderstanding concerning Polycarp’s literary relationship to *1 Clement* and to locate Polycarp’s use of *1 Clement* in proper relationship to the other writings Polycarp employs. It will be argued that although Polycarp knows and uses *1 Clement*—as he does a number of other writings—Polycarp’s dependence upon *1 Clement* is less pronounced than is his dependence upon the letters of Paul (especially) and 1 Peter (secondarily).

1. I have tentatively adopted the position of P. N. Harrison that Polycarp’s letter is two letters rather than one letter, but it makes no appreciable difference in the present discussion since there are no connections to the writings of *1 Clement* in Polyc. *Phil.* 13 (or 13 + 14, Harrison’s “first” letter). Nor would I be overly disappointed if some day it could be demonstrated to my satisfaction that Harrison’s two-letter thesis was wrong. I have adopted an earlier date (120 c.e.) that is closer to those who think the letter is a unity than did Harrison who argued that the second of the two letters (chaps. 1–12 + perhaps 14) should be dated in 135 c.e. A date of 135 c.e. was important to Harrison since it affected his argument concerning whether Polycarp was responding to Marcion and concerning what NT documents Polycarp knew and used. For Harrison’s two-letter thesis, see P. N. Harrison *Polycarp’s Two Epistles to the Philippians* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1936). For arguments for an earlier date within a two-letter framework, see Kenneth Berding, *Polycarp and Paul: An Analysis of their Literary and Theological Relationship in Light of Polycarp’s Use of Biblical and Extra-Biblical Literature*, Supplements to *Vigiliae Christianae* 62 (Leiden: Brill, 2002), 13–24. Still, for the sake of simplicity, henceforth the singular “letter” will be employed in this article.

EXAMPLES OF THE MISUNDERSTANDING
IN SECONDARY LITERATURE

There will be no attempt here to trace every point at which this misunderstanding has appeared, but a few of the high points (or low points, as the case may be) of this misunderstanding in the secondary literature will be cited so as to demonstrate the need for a reorientation of our understanding of Polycarp's literary relationship to *1 Clement*.

Otto Bardenhewer comments that Polycarp can almost see "Clement"'s letter in his internal eyes when writing his own letter: "Polykarpus hat bei Abfassung seines Philipperbriefes unverkennbar den Brief des hl. Klemens vor Augen gehabt und stillschweigend von demselben Gebrauch gemacht."² B. H. Streeter takes it further: "Polycarp, again, must have known *1 Clement* by heart." A few years later Streeter adds: "In Smyrna by A.D. 115, Polycarp is more influenced by the language of Clement than by any book of the New Testament, except perhaps *1 Peter*."³ In apparent dependence upon Streeter's comment in *The Four Gospels*, Robert Grant writes: ". . . Polycarp knows the letter of the Romans to the Corinthian church (*1 Clement*) almost 'by heart,' and alludes to it throughout his own writing." And again some years later: ". . . Polycarp of Smyrna knew it practically by heart."⁴ William Schoedel makes the following comment: "Polycarp seems to have been particularly familiar with *1 Clement*."⁵ Paul Hartog writes: "Polycarp's use of *1 Clement* has been well-established. Grant comments that he 'knew it practically by heart.'" And a little later in the same monograph: "As we have noted, Polycarp knew *1 Clement* 'almost by heart.'"⁶ Michael Holmes echoes Schoedel's sentiment (using the modifier "particularly familiar") and prioritizes *1 Clement* along with *1 Peter* above the letters of Paul: "As for early Christian writings, Polycarp seems to be particularly familiar with *1 Peter* and *1 Clement* and also uses *1 Corinthians* and *Ephesians*."⁷

2. Otto Bardenhewer, *Geschichte der altkirchlichen Literatur*, vol. 1 (Freiburg: Herdersche Verlagschandlung, 1913), 120. Also on p. 166: "An früherer Stelle ist bereits darauf hingewiesen worden, daß Polykarpus den Korintherbrief des hl. Klemens von Rom sich gewissermaßen zum Muster genommen hat."

3. Burnett Hillman Streeter, *The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1925), 528, and *The Primitive Church* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1929), 159.

4. Robert M. Grant, "Polycarp of Smyrna," *Anglican Theological Review* 28 (1948): 141, and *The Formation of the New Testament* (New York: Harper & Row Publishers, 1965), 22–23.

5. William R. Schoedel, *Polycarp, Martyrdom of Polycarp, Fragments of Papias*, vol. 5, *The Apostolic Fathers: A New Translation and Commentary*, ed. Robert M. Grant (Camden, NJ: Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1967), 5.

6. Paul Hartog, *Polycarp and the New Testament: The Occasion, Rhetoric, Theme, and Unity of the Epistle to the Philippians and its Allusions to New Testament Literature* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002), 176, 194.

7. Michael W. Holmes, ed., *The Apostolic Fathers: Greek Texts and English Translations*, 3rd ed. (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007), 273. He uses the expres-

Is Polycarp “particularly familiar” with *1 Clement*, moreso than with the letters of Paul? Taking it a step further, has *1 Clement* been virtually memorized by Polycarp? Finally, does Polycarp treat *1 Clement* on the same authoritative level as other writings he cites? We will deal with each of these questions in turn.

FAMILIARITY

There can be little doubt that Polycarp knew *1 Clement*. In *Polyc. Phil.* 2.3, it is probable that Polycarp is aware of *1 Clem.* 13.1–2, at least regarding the fact that “Clement” had written a similar set of maxims and an introductory formula, even if Polycarp’s selection of maxims and the form he actually employs differs significantly from what “Clement” writes (see actual citation below). Moreover, in *Polyc. Phil.* 4.2–3, there are probable connections of some sort to *1 Clem.* 1.3, to *1 Clem.* 21.6, and to *1 Clem.* 21.3 (plus a possible allusion to *1 Clem.* 41.2 tucked in between them). The presence of this small cluster of connections to *1 Clement* increases the likelihood that Polycarp actually depends upon the letter of “Clement” in this instance. In addition, there may be reminiscences and echoes of *1 Clement* in *Polyc. Phil.* 3.2 (*1 Clem.* 47.1), *Polyc. Phil.* 5.2 (*1 Clem.* 21.1, though Paul’s *Philippians* 1.27 is primary), *Polyc. Phil.* 5.3 (*1 Clem.* 1.3), with the word *παντεπόπτην* in *Polyc. Phil.* 7. 2 (*1 Clem.* 55.6, 64.1), and perhaps *Polyc. Phil.* 11.4 (*1 Clem.* 37.5 with Paul’s body metaphor), though these are all tenuous.⁸

Thus, in light of two passages in Polycarp’s letter (the maxims of 2.3 and the cluster in 4.2–3) where he seems to write with awareness of *1 Clement* (plus a handful of possible points of contact sprinkled throughout the letter), it would

sion “quite familiar” in “Polycarp of Smyrna, Letter to the Philippians,” *Expository Times* 118 (2006): 55.

8. See J. B. Lightfoot, *The Apostolic Fathers: Clement, Ignatius, and Polycarp*, 2nd ed., 2 parts in 5 volumes (London: Macmillan and Co., 1890; repr. Peabody, MA.: Hendrickson Publishers, 1989), 1.2:149–52, for other possible connections to *1 Clement*. One wonders whether Lightfoot’s list might have been the impetus for the opinion of so many modern scholars that Polycarp was more profoundly influenced by *1 Clement* than by any other piece of literature. In the first volume of part one, Lightfoot wrote a chapter on the reception *1 Clement*, observing similarities between language found in *1 Clement* and seventy later sources. So on pp. 149–52 he drew up a maximal list of any point at which a later source like *Polyc. Phil.* might exhibit similarities to *1 Clement* simply to demonstrate that Polycarp knew *1 Clement*. But what contemporary readers often fail to distinguish is that Lightfoot’s list indicates every possible similarity rather than Polycarp’s actual dependence on *1 Clement*, which in the case of a large majority of the “parallels” simply cannot be demonstrated. (As a result, I have only included possible literary connections that have some merit, whether with *1 Clement* or with any other earlier piece of literature.) The same type of list as Lightfoot’s *1 Clement* “parallels” would emerge if someone were to draw up a maximal list of every possible similarity between *Polyc. Phil.* and, say, *1 Corinthians* or *1 Peter* (including some of the striking parallels that are included in this article).

be a mistake to deny that Polycarp knew and wrote with awareness of *1 Clement* when he sought to encourage the Philippians through his own letter. In fact, when all the evidence is viewed together, a literary connection to *1 Clement* is almost certain, even if any individual connection cannot be deemed more than probable on its own.

Nevertheless, the connections Polycarp makes with *1 Clement* are less striking than many of Polycarp's quotations from and allusions to other writings. The case for Polycarp's dependence upon *1 Clement* requires that the various allusions be viewed in combination so that the resulting cumulative case is persuasive that he does in fact depend upon *1 Clement*. By way of contrast, there are numerous points in Polyc. *Phil.* where Polycarp's dependence upon earlier sources seems almost certain simply because of the striking parallels and overlapping vocabulary between particular citations and their likely sources. In my estimation, there are nine almost certain citations or allusions from Paul in Polyc. *Phil.*, five from 1 Peter, and one each from Acts, 1 John, and Tobit.⁹ In addition, there are many other probable points of contact on the same level as Polycarp's use of *1 Clement*, including (in my estimation) eighteen from Paul, six from 1 Peter, three each from the Psalms and Matthew, and one each from 1 John (which has another that is stronger than any connections with "Clement"—see below), Proverbs, Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Luke.¹⁰

9. *Almost certain* from Paul: Eph 2.5, 8, 9 in 1.3; 1 Tim 6.10 in 4.1; 1 Tim 6.7 in 4.1; "weapons of righteousness" (cf. 2 Cor 6.7) in 4.1; Gal 6.7 in 5.1; 1 Cor 6.9–10 in 5.3; Rom 14.10, 12 in 6.2; 2 Tim 4.10 in 9.2; 1 Cor 6.2 in 11.2.

Almost certain from 1 Peter: 1 Pet 1.8 in 1.3; 1 Pet 3.9 in 2.2; 1 Pet 2.24 in 8.1; 1 Pet 2.22 in 8.1 (orig. Isa 53.9b); 1 Pet 2.12 in 10.2.

Almost certain from others: Acts 2.24 in 1.2; 1 John 4.2–3 in 7.1; Tob 4.10 and/or Tob 12.9 in 10.2.

10. *Probable* from Paul: "the word of truth" in 3.2; Gal 4.26 in 3.3; 1 Cor 13.13 in 3.3; Rom 13.8–10 and/or Gal 5.14 (cf. 6.2) in 3.3; general dependence upon the *Haustafeln* of 1 Timothy; 1 Cor 14.26 in 4.3; Phil 1.27 in 5.2; 2 Tim 2.12 in 4.2; influence by 2 Cor 5.10 on the form of the almost certain loose citation of Rom 14.10 in 6.2; allusion to Paul's equating of Christ with hope (cf. 1 Tim 1.1); Col 1.27 and Paul's use of the word ἀπαβών (cf. 1 Cor 1.22, 5.5; Eph 1.14), though a specific passage cannot be demonstrated in 8.1; Phil 2.16 in 9.2; allusion to a Pauline phrase either from 1 Cor 15.58 or Col 1.23 in 10.1; Rom 12.10 in 10.1; another allusion to Rom 12.10 in 10.1; 2 Thess 1.4 in 11.3; 2 Thess 3.15 in 11.4; Paul's body metaphor (cf. 1 Cor 12.12–27; Rom 14.4–8; Eph 4.4–13) in 11.4 (with possible influence from *1 Clem.* 37.5); Eph 4.26b (with awareness of Ps 4.5b); Phil 3.18 in 12.3.

Probable from 1 Peter: 1 Pet 1.12 (but influenced in content by the sayings of the Lord) in 1.3; 1 Pet 1.13 in 2.1; 1 Pet 1.21 in 2.1; 1 Pet 2.11 in 5.3; 1 Pet 4.7 in 7.2; 1 Pet 2.21 in 8.2.

Probable from others: reminiscence of the Lord's teaching such as is found in Luke 6.28–29 and Matt 5.39 in 2.2; conflation of Luke 6.20 (cf. Matt 5.3) with Matt 5.10 in 2.3; Prov 3.4 in 6.1; allusion to the Lord's Prayer (mediated orally?) in 6.1; Matt

So that readers can observe for themselves the qualitative differences between Polycarp's use of *1 Clement* and some of the other literature, I have selected the four strongest candidates for dependence upon *1 Clement* in *Polyc. Phil.* (the others listed earlier are possible, but only remotely) followed by nine of the strongest candidates for literary connections with other sources.¹¹ The connections I have selected between *Polyc. Phil.* and *1 Clement* are laid out in Greek and English, followed by a list of connections in Greek (and Latin) and English between *Polyc. Phil.* and other sources besides *1 Clement*.

6.12, 14–15 in 6.2; Ps 2.11 in 6.3; 1 John 3.8 in 7.1; Matt 6.13 in 7.2; Matt 26.41 in 7.2; Isa 52.5 (with possible influence from Ign. *Trall.* 8.2 and Rom 2.24) in 10.2–3; Jer 5.4–5 in 11.2; Ps 4.5a (with awareness of Eph 4.26a) in 12.1. For a summary and weighing of each possible quotation from and allusion to earlier literature in *Polyc. Phil.*, see Berding, *Polycarp and Paul*, 33–125 and 191–206.

11. It is possible to distinguish a pronounced methodological distance between those who read literary relationships thickly, that is, those who perceive echoes and reminiscences all over a particular writing to earlier writings, and those who read thinly and for whom the evidence has to be virtually incontrovertible for them to consider a literary dependency to exist. An older example of a “thick” reader of Polycarp's letter is P. N. Harrison (*Polycarp's Two Epistles*, 285–310, 327–35); a more recent example would be Charles E. Hill in his work on John, for which he claims to have found some echoes in *Polyc. Phil.* (*The Johannine Corpus in the Early Church* [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004], 416–20). An older example of “thin” readers would be the Oxford Society of Historical Theology (*The New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers* [Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1905]); recent examples would include Michael W. Holmes (“Polycarp's *Letter to the Philippians* and the Writings that Later Formed the New Testament,” in *The Reception of the New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers*, ed. Andrew F. Gregory and Christopher M. Tuckett [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005], 187–227), who characterizes (226) his own conclusions as even “more skeptical than the Oxford Committee”(!), and to a somewhat lesser degree, Paul Hartog, *Polycarp and the New Testament*. I take a moderate approach somewhere between the “thick” and “thin” readers. Models of this middle approach would be Edouard Massaux (*The Influence of the Gospel of Saint Matthew on Christian Literature before Saint Irenaeus. Book 2: The Later Christian Writings*, trans. Norman J. Belval and Suzanne Hecht, ed. Arthur J. Bellinzoni [Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1990]) and Donald A. Hagner in his work on *1 Clement* (*The Use of the Old and New Testaments in Clement of Rome* [Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1973]).

Polycarp, <i>Letter to the Philipians</i> ¹²	1 Clement
<p>2.3 (Holmes 282)</p> <p>μνημονεύοντες δὲ ὧν εἶπεν ὁ κύριος διδάσκων· Μὴ κρίνετε, ἵνα μὴ κριθῆτε· ἀφίετε, καὶ ἀφεθήσεται ὑμῖν· ἐλεᾶτε, ἵνα ἐλεηθῆτε· ὃ μέτρον μετρεῖτε, ἀντιμετρηθήσεται ὑμῖν</p>	<p>13.1b-2 (Holmes 60–61)</p> <p>μάλιστα μεμνημένοι τῶν λόγων τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ, οὓς ἐλάλησεν διδάσκων ἐπιείκειαν καὶ μακροθυμίαν· Οὕτως γὰρ εἶπεν· Ἐλεᾶτε, ἵνα ἐλεηθῆτε· ἀφίετε, ἵνα ἀφεθῇ ὑμῖν· ὡς ποιεῖτε, οὕτω ποιηθήσεται ὑμῖν· ὡς δίδοτε, οὕτως δοθήσεται ὑμῖν· ὡς κρίνετε, οὕτως κριθήσεσθε· ὡς χρηστεύεσθε, οὕτως χρηστευθήσεται ὑμῖν· ὃ μέτρον μετρεῖτε, ἐν αὐτῷ μετρηθήσεται ὑμῖν.</p>
<p>but remembering what the Lord said as he taught: “Do not judge, that you may not be judged; forgive, and it will be forgiven to you; show mercy, that you may be shown mercy; with what measure you measure, it will be measured back to you”</p>	<p>instead remembering the words of the Lord Jesus, which he spoke as he taught gentleness and patience. For thus he said: “Show mercy, that you may be shown mercy; forgive, that it may be forgiven to you. As you do, thus it shall be done to you. As you give, thus shall it be given to you. As you judge, thus you shall be judged. As you show kindness, thus kindness shall be shown to you. With the measure you measure, it will be measured to you”</p>
<p>4.2 (Holmes 284)</p> <p>στεργούσας τοὺς ἑαυτῶν ἄνδρας ἐν πάσῃ ἀληθείᾳ</p> <p>cherishing their own husbands with all truth</p>	<p>1.3 (Holmes 46)</p> <p>στεργούσας καθηκόντως τοὺς ἄνδρας ἑαυτῶν</p> <p>cherishing properly their own husbands</p>
<p>4.2 (Holmes 284)</p> <p>καὶ τὰ τέκνα παιδεύειν τὴν παιδείαν τοῦ φόβου τοῦ θεοῦ</p> <p>and to teach the children the instruction of the fear of God</p>	<p>21.6 (Holmes 74)</p> <p>τοὺς νέους παιδεύσωμεν τὴν παιδείαν τοῦ φόβου τοῦ θεοῦ</p> <p>let us teach the young ones the instruction of the fear of God</p>
<p>4.3 (Holmes 284)</p> <p>καὶ λέληθεν αὐτὸν οὐδὲν οὔτε λογισμῶν οὔτε ἐννοιῶν οὔτε τι τῶν κρυπτῶν τῆς καρδίας</p> <p>and nothing escapes him, neither thoughts nor intentions nor any of the secrets of the heart</p>	<p>21.3 (Holmes 74)</p> <p>καὶ ὅτι οὐδὲν λέληθεν αὐτὸν τῶν ἐννοιῶν ἡμῶν οὐδὲ τῶν διαλογισμῶν ὧν ποιούμεθα</p> <p>and that nothing escapes him of our intentions nor of the plans which we make</p>

12. Greek texts of the Apostolic Fathers are taken from Holmes, *The Apostolic Fathers*. The translations into English are my own unless otherwise indicated.

The connections listed above are the four strongest links between *1 Clement* and Polyc. *Phil.* Even though in the first instance the contact is probable, it is more for the *fact* that Polycarp knows Clement has such a list, but certainly not for the *form* that he employs. Besides, the list has a catechetical feel to it, suggesting at least the possibility that instead of Polycarp being directly dependent upon *1 Clement*, both “Clement” and Polycarp could be dependent upon other similar catechetical lists, whether they received them in oral or written forms. Still, I think it probable that Polycarp was cognizant of “Clement’s” list as he drew up his own, particularly in light of the attending introductory formulae in each case. Three allusions to *1 Clement* in Polyc. *Phil.* 4.2–3 are also probable connections, but the first two phrases Polycarp employs are somewhat mundane, so they cannot be deemed to be certainly dependent upon *1 Clement*; and the last is a very common idea in Jewish and Christian literature (cf. Jer 17.10; Heb 4.13). But since the expressions that appear to be connected to *1 Clement* are found in combination, it becomes probable that Polycarp is reflecting echoes of *1 Clement* as he writes. Still, the citations of other literature listed below are far more striking in their similarities than are those listed above.

Polycarp, <i>Letter to the Philippians</i>	Earlier NT Source ¹³
<p>1.2 (Holmes 280)</p> <p>ὄν ἤγειρεν ὁ θεός, λύσας τὰς ὠδῖνας τοῦ ἄδου</p> <p>whom God raised loosing the pangs of Hades</p>	<p><i>Acts</i> 2.24</p> <p>ὄν ὁ θεὸς ἀνέστησεν λύσας τὰς ὠδῖνας τοῦ θανάτου (ἄδου)</p> <p>whom God raised again loosing the pangs of death (“Hades” in the Western text)</p>
<p>1.3 (Holmes 280)</p> <p>εἰδότες ὅτι χάριτι ἐστε σεσωσμένοι, οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων, ἀλλὰ θελήματι θεοῦ διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ</p> <p>knowing that by grace you have been saved, not from works, but by the will of God through Jesus Christ.</p>	<p><i>Eph</i> 2.5, 8-9</p> <p>χάριτι ἐστε σεσωσμένοι . . . τῇ γὰρ χάριτι ἐστε σεσωσμένοι διὰ πίστεως· καὶ τοῦτο οὐκ ἐξ ὑμῶν, θεοῦ τὸ δῶρον· οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων, ἵνα μὴ τις καυχῆσῃται</p> <p>by grace you have been saved . . . for by grace you have been saved through faith, and this not of yourselves, it is the gift of God, not of works that no one should boast.</p>

continued on page 134

13. New Testament texts are taken from Barbara Aland, Kurt Aland, Johannes Karavidopoulos, Carlo M. Martini, and Bruce M. Metzger, *The Greek New Testament*, 4th rev. ed. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1994).

Polycarp, <i>Letter to the Philippians</i>	Earlier NT Source
<p>4.1 (Holmes 284)</p> <p>Ἀρχὴ δὲ πάντων χαλεπῶν φιλαργυρία. εἰδότες οὖν ὅτι οὐδὲν εἰσηνέγκαμεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ ἐξενεγκεῖν τι ἔχομεν</p>	<p>1 Tim 6.7, 10</p> <p>οὐδὲν γὰρ εἰσηνέγκαμεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον, ὅτι οὐδὲ ἐξενεγκεῖν τι δυνάμεθα . . . ῥίζα γὰρ πάντων τῶν κακῶν ἐστὶν ἡ φιλαργυρία</p>
<p>but love of money is a beginning of all troubles. Knowing, therefore, that we have brought nothing into the world, nor do we have anything to take out</p>	<p>for we have brought nothing into the world, so that we cannot take anything out of it either . . . for the love of money is a root of all kinds of evils</p>
<p>5.3 (Holmes 286)</p> <p>καὶ οὐτε πόρνοι οὐτε μαλακοὶ οὐτε ἀρσενοκοῖται βασιλείαν θεοῦ κληρονομήσουσιν</p>	<p>1 Cor 6.9–10</p> <p>ἢ οὐκ οἴδατε ὅτι ἄδικοι θεοῦ βασιλείαν οὐ κληρονομήσουσιν; μὴ πλανᾶσθε· οὐτε πόρνοι οὐτε εἰδωλολάτραι οὐτε μοιχοὶ οὐτε μαλακοὶ οὐτε ἀρσενοκοῖται οὐτε κλέπται οὐτε πλεονέκται, οὐ μέθυσοι, οὐ λοῖδοροὶ, οὐχ ἄρπαγες βασιλείαν θεοῦ κληρονομήσουσιν</p>
<p>and neither fornicators nor male prostitutes nor homosexuals will inherit the kingdom of God . . .</p>	<p>Or do you not know that the unrighteous will not inherit the kingdom of God? Do not be deceived; neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor male prostitutes, nor homosexuals,¹⁴ nor thieves, nor the covetous, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor swindlers, shall inherit the kingdom of God</p>
<p>6.2 (Holmes 288)</p> <p>καὶ πάντας δεῖ παραστῆναι τῷ βήματι τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ ἕκαστον ὑπὲρ ἑαυτοῦ λόγον δοῦναι</p>	<p>Rom 14.10, 12¹⁵</p> <p>ἀδελφόν σου; πάντες γὰρ παραστησόμεθα τῷ βήματι τοῦ θεοῦ . . . ἄρα οὖν ἕκαστος ἡμῶν περὶ ἑαυτοῦ λόγον δώσει τῷ θεῷ</p>
<p>and all must stand at the judgment seat of Christ and each one must give account for himself</p>	<p>for we will all stand at the judgment seat of God . . . so then each one of us shall give account of himself to God</p>

continued on page 135

14. On the use of the English word “homosexuals” to translate ἀρσενοκοῖται, see the dialogue between D. F. Wright and William L. Petersen: David F. Wright, “Homosexuals or Prostitutes: The Meaning of ΑΡΣΕΝΟΚΟΙΤΑΙ (1 Cor. 6:9, 1 Tim. 1:10),” VC 38 (1984): 125–53; William L. Petersen, “Can ΑΡΣΕΝΟΚΟΙΤΑΙ Be Translated by ‘Homosexuals’? (1 COR. 6.9; 1 TIM. 1.10),” VC 40 (1986): 187–91; David F. Wright, “Translating ΑΡΣΕΝΟΚΟΙΤΑΙ (1 Cor. 6:9; 1 Tim. 1:10),” VC 41 (1987): 396–98.

15. Perhaps conflated with 2 Cor 5.10: τοὺς γὰρ πάντας ἡμᾶς φανερωθῆναι δεῖ ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ βήματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ. Notice the δεῖ and the τοῦ Χριστοῦ.

Polycarp, <i>Letter to the Philippians</i>	Earlier NT Source
<p>7.1 (Holmes 288)</p> <p>Πᾶς γάρ ὃς ἂν μὴ ὁμολογῇ Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἐν σαρκὶ ἐληλυθῆναι ἀντίχριστός ἐστιν</p> <p>for everyone who does not confess Jesus Christ as coming in the flesh is antichrist</p>	<p>1 John 4.2–3</p> <p>πᾶν πνεῦμα ὃ ὁμολογεῖ Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἐν σαρκὶ ἐληλυθότα ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐστιν, καὶ πᾶν πνεῦμα ὃ μὴ ὁμολογεῖ τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ οὐκ ἐστιν· καὶ τοῦτο ἐστιν τὸ τοῦ ἀντιχρίστου</p> <p>every spirit that confesses Jesus Christ has come in the flesh is from God; and every spirit that does not confess Jesus is not from God; and this is the spirit of the antichrist</p>
<p>8.1 (Holmes 288–90)</p> <p>ὃς ἀνήνεγκεν ἡμῶν τὰς ἀμαρτίας τῷ ἰδίῳ σώματι ἐπὶ τὸ ξύλον, ὃς ἀμαρτίαν οὐκ ἐποίησεν, οὐδὲ εὐρέθη δόλος ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτοῦ</p> <p>who carried our sins in his own body upon the tree, who committed no sin, nor was deceit found in his mouth</p>	<p>1 Pet 2.22, 24</p> <p>ὃς ἀμαρτίαν οὐκ ἐποίησεν οὐδὲ εὐρέθη δόλος ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτοῦ . . . ὃς τὰς ἀμαρτίας ἡμῶν αὐτὸς ἀνήνεγκεν ἐν τῷ σώματι αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τὸ ξύλον</p> <p>who committed no sin, nor was deceit found in his mouth . . . who himself carried our sins in his body upon the tree</p>
<p>10.2 (Holmes 290–92)</p> <p><i>conversationem vestram irreprehensibilem habentes in gentibus, ut ex bonis operibus vestris et vos laudem accipitis</i>¹⁶</p> <p>having an irreproachable standard of conduct among the Gentiles, so that you may be praised for your good deeds</p>	<p>1 Pet 2.12</p> <p>τὴν ἀναστροφὴν ὑμῶν ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ἔχοντες καλὴν, ἵνα, ἐν ᾧ καταλαλοῦσιν ὑμῶν ὡς κακοποιῶν ἐκ τῶν καλῶν ἔργων ἐποπτεύοντες δοξάσωσιν τὸν θεὸν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἐπισκοπῆς</p> <p>having your good conduct among the Gentiles, so that in the thing in which they slander you as evildoers, they may on account of your good deeds, as they observe them, glorify God in the day of visitation</p>
<p>11.2 (Holmes 292)</p> <p><i>Aut nescimus, quia sancti mundum iudicabunt, sicut Paulus docet?</i></p> <p>Or do we not know that the saints will judge the world, as Paul teaches?</p>	<p>1 Cor 6.2</p> <p>ἢ οὐκ οἴδατε ὅτι οἱ ἄγιοι τὸν κόσμον κρινουσιν;</p> <p>Or do you not know that the saints will judge the world?</p>

16. This and the following example have only been preserved in Latin.

This list contains literary connections that are significantly closer both verbally and conceptually than the earlier list of probable connections between Polyc. *Phil.* and *1 Clement*. Each example also contains operative words that securely link the appearance in Polyc. *Phil.* with the passage with which it is connected. In this particular list of non-“Clement” passages, it is clear that Polycarp is making conscious links with earlier literature (even though at other points in his letter some of his connections appear almost incidental). But it is difficult to deny that this list of nine passages (not forgetting that there are many other possible literary connections in Polyc. *Phil.* than just these) are much closer to their sources than are the connections with *1 Clement*.

MEMORIZATION

What about the assertion that Polycarp had virtually memorized *1 Clement*? There is no evidence for this assertion from the way Polycarp actually uses *1 Clement* in Polyc. *Phil.*, and there is no way to support such an assertion apart from simply observing what Polycarp does in his letter. The irony is that the sense one gets from spending time in Polycarp’s letter is that Polycarp’s memory was quite good. Whatever else scholars may say about his ability (or lack of ability) to think creatively,¹⁷ no one questions whether Polycarp had a good memory. His quotations and allusions show that earlier literature was constantly running through his mind. And, of course, Polycarp lived in a day when the ability to memorize was highly prized. Polycarp alludes to a wider range of literature in a seemingly effortless way than does any other of the Apostolic Fathers. He quotes, alludes to, and echoes earlier literature more frequently (in a very short span) than perhaps any other writer of his time. But in the four closest parallels to *1 Clement*, the actual verbal parallelism is not close. I’m not suggesting that quotations have to be exact when a memorized text is employed. Quite to the contrary, ancient writers usually felt free to adapt various texts to their compositional purposes, and Polycarp does the same with texts that he knows well. But the lack of verbal parallels between Polyc. *Phil.* and *1 Clement* does contrast with repeated points in his letter where there is identical or extremely close wording between the source and Polycarp’s use of that source. Simply put, although it may be true that the assertion that Polycarp had memorized *1 Clement* cannot be denied by what actually appears in his letter, the evidence does not confirm that he memorized it either.

17. Scholars have been fond of viewing Polycarp as something of a simpleton, though the tide has begun to turn against this opinion. See corrective comments in Hartog, *Polycarp and the New Testament*, 61–67, 237; Andreas Lindemann, “Paul in the Writings of the Apostolic Fathers,” in *Paul and the Legacies of Paul*, ed. William S. Babcock (Dallas, TX: Southern Methodist University Press, 1990), 43; Berding, *Polycarp and Paul*, 3–8.

AUTHORITY

What kind of authority does Polycarp attribute to *1 Clement*? Polycarp clearly is willing to employ *1 Clement* for encouragement and the strengthening of his readers. But there seem to be some differences between the way Polycarp uses *1 Clement* and how he depends upon other authors, Paul in particular. A good starting point for looking into this is Polyc. *Phil.* 6.3 (trans. Holmes 289) where Polycarp explicitly mentions three streams of authority: “So, then, let us serve him with fear and all reverence, just as he himself [Christ] has commanded, as did the apostles who preached the gospel to us, and the prophets who announced in advance the coming of our Lord.”

The three streams of authority mentioned by Polycarp are: 1) the commands of Christ, 2) the preaching of the apostles, and 3) the prophecies of the ancient prophets. Polycarp does not equate the three streams or subsume them under a single “canonical rubric,” but he considers each authoritative and their words to be binding upon one’s actions. In contrast to the authority accorded these three streams, Polycarp “. . . does not use the letters of Ignatius as authorities—even though they ‘contain faith, endurance, and all the edification which pertains to our Lord’ (13.2).”¹⁸ Nor, arguably, does he use *1 Clement* as an authority, since it is unlikely that Polycarp would have corrected the form of an apostolic citation of the Lord, whereas that appears to be what Polycarp has done in the maxims in Polyc. *Phil.* 2.3 (assuming that he is writing with conscious awareness of *1 Clement* in this case, which seems likely). Furthermore, neither *1 Clement* nor the letters of Ignatius are ever referred to with a citational formula in Polyc. *Phil.* This contrasts with the eight clearest formulae that function as formulae in his letter (1.3; 2.3; 4.1; 5.1; 6.1–2; 7.2; 11.2; 12.1). In these, Polycarp once refers to a Psalm quotation (mediated through Paul) (12.1), three times refers to the teaching of the Lord (2.3; 6.1–2; 7.2), and four times draws directly from Paul (1.3; 4.1; 5.2; 11.2). It would be surprising if Polycarp’s contemporaries Ignatius and “Clement”¹⁹ were not included in the οὔτε ἄλλος ὅμοιος (“nor anyone like me”) when he says about Paul: “For neither I nor anyone like me can keep up with the wisdom of the blessed and glorious Paul” (Polyc. *Phil.* 3.1).

DEPENDENCE

The assertion that Polycarp was “particularly familiar” with *1 Clement*, either as his most important source or on the same level as 1 Peter minimizes an important feature of Polyc. *Phil.*, that is, his dependence and intentional connection to Paul.

18. Grant, *Formation*, 106.

19. This, of course, assumes a traditional dating of *1 Clement* to ca. 96 C.E. which is supported by most of modern scholarship, rather than the earlier date before the fall of the Jerusalem Temple in 70 C.E. argued by Thomas J. Herron, “The Most Probable Date of the First Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians,” *SP* 21 (1989): 106–21, and Clayton N. Jefford, *The Apostolic Fathers and the New Testament* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2006), 18–19.

Half of Polycarp's references to earlier literature in Polyc. *Phil.* are from the letters of Paul. Polycarp mentions Paul's name in three different chapters, once each in chapters 3 and 9 and twice in chapter 11. Each time Polycarp mentions Paul's name, he clusters quotations from and allusions to Paul around the mention of Paul's name.²⁰ Paul seems to be the primary source (though there are others) for many of Polycarp's theological themes, particularly those that emerge from Paul's ethical teaching.²¹ In short, Polyc. *Phil.* evinces substantial dependence upon Paul. This should not be surprising considering that the Philippian congregation to which Polycarp addresses his letter was itself a Pauline congregation.

One of the reasons that Paul is often minimized in discussions of literary influences upon Polyc. *Phil.* is that the focus is often on sources rather than upon authors. As a result, Polycarp's dependence upon *1 Clement* gets compared to how frequently Polycarp uses Romans or 1 Corinthians or Philippians individually instead of how frequently he uses *Paul*. I would contend that Polycarp's use of 1 Corinthians alone is as pronounced as his use of *1 Clement*.²² But when all of Paul's letters are viewed together, the assertion that Polycarp is "particularly familiar" with *1 Clement* shows itself to be misguided. It also has the function of masking an important observation about Polyc. *Phil.*, namely, that the primary author that has influenced Polycarp in his letter to the Philippians is Paul.

By placing Polycarp's use of *1 Clement* above or on the same level as his use of 1 Peter, contemporary scholars not only miss the foundational connection to Paul, they also minimize Polycarp's dependence on 1 Peter. Of course, when compared with the frequency with which Polycarp uses the letters of Paul, his employment of 1 Peter is significantly less. Still, in my judgment there exist five almost certain citations of 1 Peter, six probable citations or allusions to 1 Peter, and three other references that should be considered possible literary connections to 1 Peter.²³ Eusebius actually comments on Polycarp's use of 1 Peter.²⁴ 1 Peter is a more important literary source both in terms of frequency of use and in terms of verbal similarities than is *1 Clement*.

20. Berding, *Polycarp and Paul*, 142–55; also "Polycarp's View of the Authorship of 1 and 2 Timothy," *Vigiliae Christianae* 53 (1999): 349–60.

21. Berding, *Polycarp and Paul*, 156–86. See also Peter Oakes, "Leadership and Suffering in the Letters of Polycarp and Paul to the Philippians," in *Trajectories through the New Testament and the Apostolic Fathers*, ed. Andrew F. Gregory and Christopher M. Tuckett (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 353–73.

22. An almost certain compressed citation of 1 Cor 6.9–10 in 5.3; an almost certain true citation of 1 Cor 6.2 in 11.2; a probable allusion to 1 Cor 13.13 in 3.3; a probable allusion to 1 Cor 14.25 in 4.3; a probable allusion to a Pauline phrase either from 1 Cor 15.58 or Col 1.23 in 10.1; and a probable reminiscence of Paul's body metaphor such as is found in 1 Cor 12.12–27 (though it is found elsewhere as well).

23. See list in n. 9 and n. 10 for "almost certain" and "probable" literary connections with 1 Peter. Also "possible" are 1 Pet 4.16 in 8.2; 1 Pet 2.17 or 3.8 in 10.1; and 1 Pet 5.5 in 10.2.

24. *H. e.* 4.14.9. Unfortunately, Eusebius's comment has distracted other scholars from seeing the profound dependence of Polycarp upon Paul in Polyc. *Phil.*

Finally, there are literary connections to 1 John in Polycarp's own letter. Not unlike the little cluster of allusions to *1 Clement* in Polyc. *Phil.* 4.2–3, there is a short cluster of references drawn from 1 John in Polyc. *Phil.* 7.1 (though one of them is verbally stronger than anything in the “Clement” cluster of 4.2–3). The small paragraph found in 7.1 contains the compressed citation of 1 John 4.2–3 already listed on the chart above, a probable allusion to 1 John 3.8, and possible reminiscences of 1 John 5.6–9 and 1 John 3.12. Though overall dependence upon 1 John is not as strong as upon *1 Clement* in Polyc. *Phil.* (possible allusions to 1 John in the rest of the letter are few or non-existent, unlike *1 Clement*), the overall case for *1 Clement* is still only slightly stronger than the overall case for 1 John because of the clarity of the first citation in the 1 John cluster.

As a result, Polycarp's primary literary influences should be ranked as follows: 1) Paul, 2) 1 Peter, 3) *1 Clement*, 4) 1 John.²⁵

CONCLUSION

It is time for those who study and write about Polyc. *Phil.* to readjust their comments concerning Polycarp's familiarity and dependence upon *1 Clement*. Polycarp's dependence on earlier literature is first and foremost upon the writings of Paul, secondly upon 1 Peter; it is then followed at some distance by *1 Clement* and 1 John (which are followed by a number of other possible sources). Polycarp knew and used *1 Clement*, but his familiarity with this early Christian document should not be exaggerated.

Kenneth Berding is Associate Professor of New Testament at Talbot School of Theology/Biola University in La Mirada, California

25. His dependence on Matthew is also probable, but it is difficult to know whether to rank Matthew above or below 1 John. It is anyway of a different genre and character than the other writings listed.